

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

*Report  
from January 1, 2002  
through December 31, 2002*

*140 East 62nd Street, New York, New York 10021  
(212) 838-8400  
<http://www.mellon.org>*



*Trustees*

Hanna H. Gray, *Chairman*  
Lewis W. Bernard  
William G. Bowen  
Paul LeClerc  
Colin Lucas  
Walter E. Massey

W. Taylor Reveley, III  
Anne M. Tatlock

*Chairmen Emeriti*

William O. Baker  
John C. Whitehead

*Officers of the Corporation*

William G. Bowen, *President*  
Harriet Zuckerman, *Senior Vice President*  
Mary Patterson McPherson, *Vice President*  
Michele S. Warman, *General Counsel and Secretary*  
John E. Hull, *Financial Vice President*  
Glenda K. Burkhart, *Vice President for Operations and Planning*  
Eileen M. Scott, *Treasurer*

*Program Officers*

Danielle Carr Ramdath  
Lydia L. English  
Saul Fisher  
Ira H. Fuchs  
Krista L. House  
Suzanne M. Lodato  
Joseph S. Meisel  
Thomas I. Nygren  
William Robertson IV  
Angelica Z. Rudenstine  
Donald J. Waters  
Catherine (Wichterman)  
Maciariello

*ARTstor*

Neil L. Rudenstine, *Chairman*  
James Shulman, *Executive Director*  
Nancy Allen  
Tony Gill  
Max Marmor  
Linda Tadic  
Gretchen A. Wagner  
William Ying

*Senior Advisors*

Bernard Bailyn  
Phillip A. Griffiths  
J. Paul Hunter  
Carolyn Makinson  
Susan Perry  
Richard E. Quandt  
Stuart Saunders  
Gilbert R. Whitaker, Jr.

*Administrative Staff*

Ira H. Fuchs, *Vice President for Research in Information Technology*  
Jodie R. Gaudet, *Assistant Secretary*  
Thomas I. Nygren, *Director of Technology, Director of Princeton Office*  
Susanne C. Pichler, *Librarian*  
Kelly S. Risi, *Controller*  
Virginia Simone, *Files Manager*

*Research Staff*

Susan H. Anderson  
Martin A. Kurzweil  
Sarah A. Levin  
Cara C. Nakamura  
Roger C. Schonfeld



THE ANDREW W. MELLON FOUNDATION, a not-for-profit corporation under the laws of the State of New York, is the result of the consolidation on June 30, 1969 of the Old Dominion Foundation into the Avalon Foundation with the name of the Avalon Foundation being changed to The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The Avalon Foundation had been founded by Ailsa Mellon Bruce, Andrew W. Mellon's daughter. The Old Dominion Foundation had been established in 1941 by Paul Mellon, Andrew W. Mellon's son.

The Foundation makes grants in four core program areas: higher education; museums and art conservation; performing arts; and conservation and the environment. Collaborative planning by the Foundation and its grantee institutions generally precedes awards and is an integral part of grantmaking. Unsolicited proposals are rarely supported. Prospective applicants are therefore encouraged not to submit a full proposal at the outset but rather a query letter of a page or less that sets forth the need, nature, and amount of any request, along with evidence of suitable classification by the Internal Revenue Service. The Foundation does not make grants to individuals or to primarily local organizations.

Within each of its core programs, the Foundation concentrates most of its grantmaking in a few areas. Institutions and programs receiving support are often leaders in fields of Foundation activity, but they may also be promising newcomers, or in a position to demonstrate new ways of overcoming obstacles to achieve program goals. The Foundation seeks to strengthen institutions' core capacities rather than encouraging ancillary activities, and it seeks to continue with programs long enough to achieve meaningful results. These considerations require thoughtful, long-term collaboration with recipients.

The Foundation makes its particular areas of emphasis within core programs known in a variety of ways. Annual Reports describe grantmaking activities and present complete lists of recent grants. The Foundation's Web site, at <http://www.mellon.org>, describes the core programs in some depth, offers complete texts of past Annual Reports, and furnishes other information concerning the Foundation's history, evolution, and current approach to grantmaking.



## PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Periodic stock-taking is healthy for all organizations, but it is vital for private foundations. Otherwise these privileged and often sheltered organizations run the risk of becoming complacent if not stagnant. It is especially important for foundations to reassess their programs on a regular basis because they lack the external checks provided routinely by impersonal and unforgiving markets in the case of for-profit entities. They also lack the oversight provided by donors (private and public) and “consumers of services” (such as students, audiences, and fee-paying visitors) in the case of colleges, universities, performing arts organizations, and museums. Tighter spending constraints, brought about by the continuing weakness in financial markets and the attendant reductions in endowments, have provided still another impetus for disciplined internal review of program priorities.

At their September 2002 Retreat, the Trustees started out by considering whether the Foundation's overall grantmaking budget should be reduced in line with recent reductions in the average market value of the endowment (which, at about \$3.6 billion in early 2003, is roughly 25 to 30 percent below its September 2000 peak of more than \$5 billion, though still roughly *twice* its value in 1990).<sup>1</sup> A year earlier, in September 2001, the same question about grantmaking levels was posed, and the Trustees decided to “stay the course.” At that time they reaffirmed the Foundation's commitment to the basic level of grantmaking already projected for 2001 (around \$185 million) and, in addition, approved a special, additional, appropriation of \$50 million that was to be used to assist New York cultural institutions (and parks) in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks.<sup>2</sup>

Since then, the Trustees have continued to believe that when financial adversity hits the institutions that the Foundation sup-

<sup>1</sup> The year-to-year history of the Foundation's endowment and appropriations can be read from the Annual Reports. The end-of-the-year market value of the endowment changed relatively little during the early 1990s but then began a steady ascent in 1994–95 before peaking in September 2000. Subsequently, a sizable part of the last stages of the run-up has been reclaimed by the market.

<sup>2</sup> See last year's Annual Report (pp. 7–10) for a description of this special initiative.

ports, the Foundation should not add to their problems by curtailing its own grantmaking. Consistent with this view, the most basic decision reached in 2002 was to keep the overall grantmaking budget at roughly the \$185 million level. Wealthy foundations can and should “stretch” in such special situations, even if this means allowing the payout rate to rise modestly above the basic IRS requirement.<sup>3</sup>

### *Shifts in Program Priorities*

“Staying the course” has its dangers, however. There is a natural temptation to continue doing just what the Foundation has been doing, and to halt consideration of new initiatives. We have not followed this course. Rather, we have asked ourselves, as we regularly do, a cluster of connected questions: What are our major priorities, and what is the best way to achieve them? What new initiatives are especially promising? What ongoing programs should be sustained or even built upon? Finally, are there ways to give an even sharper focus to our grantmaking and to phase out, in an orderly way, programs that have achieved their major objectives and are less central to the Foundation’s mission than other activities we might support? The rest of this report is an attempt to provide at least provisional answers to these questions.

I would like to begin by explaining the rationale that emerged from this assessment for paring back and refocusing two of the Foundation’s programs.

- First, after lengthy deliberations over several years which included an intensive “seminar” with leaders in the field, the Foundation has decided that it is time to phase out grantmaking in its population and forced migration program—but to do so in a carefully staged way that provides grantees with considerable notice and, in most cases, a final round of support.

The orderly conclusion of the program, which is underway now, implies no change in our view of the importance of the field of demography; in fact, there is abundant evidence that the discipline is stronger than ever—with, for example,

<sup>3</sup> The IRS payout requirement is 5+ percent of the average market value of the endowment over the last 12 months; we expect to stay comfortably in the broad middle of the 5 to 6 percent range.

increasing numbers of demographers being elected to the National Academy of Sciences. Rather, a central issue for us had to do with changes in the principal areas of application. The Foundation's long-standing support of the population field had grown in large measure out of the Trustees' concern about population growth. In recent years, however, dramatic declines in fertility rates in many regions of the world have reduced the interest of leading demographers in this area. Attention has shifted to topics such as aging, urbanization, and public health, all of which fall outside the Foundation's range of grantmaking priorities, important as they are in their own right. In the field of forced migration, considerable progress has been made, we believe, in encouraging the institutionalization of programs of training and research, which now seem likely to sustain themselves.

As all those involved in the discussions leading up to this decision are well aware, the Foundation's program officer in this area for the last 14 years, Carolyn Makinson, did a superb job of program development. Then, after deciding that it was time to leave the Foundation and consider opportunities in the university world, she played an enormously constructive role in first helping with the review of the program and subsequently planning a well-conceived set of final grants. Ms. Makinson has since accepted a position at MIT as Executive Director of its Center for International Studies, and we miss greatly her day-to-day presence among us, even as we are delighted by the fine opportunity she has been given to do new things at a great university. She has been an exceptionally valuable colleague in every way, and her work at Mellon, both in the population field and in crafting an imaginative program in forced migration, will have lasting effects. We are delighted that she has agreed to work with us as a senior advisor for the next year and a half.

- Second, we have decided that the Foundation's program in Conservation and the Environment should be refocused and reduced somewhat in scale. A principal objective is to tie appropriations in this program more closely to the Foundation's most central interests, including especially its interest in fostering collaborations among research universities and other scholarly entities, in strengthening undergraduate teaching in

liberal arts colleges, and in taking advantage of advances in information technology to create new scholarly resources and enhance scholarly communication.

This modification in program guidelines has meant that the Foundation will phase out its long-standing support of the Trust for Public Land (TPL). By any standard, the TPL has been hugely successful in leveraging the nearly \$20 million it has received from the Foundation since 1981, and we now plan to make a final series of challenge grants intended to assist this preeminent organization expand its funding base. The Foundation will also phase out its program of competitive research grants in plant ecosystems ecology (while continuing to make modest grants to the most outstanding junior faculty in the field). This program of research grants, designed and led ably by William Robertson, the Foundation's program officer with long experience in this field, has an enviable record of having supported outstanding research and leading scientists. There has been, however, only limited connection between these research projects and the rest of the Foundation's grant-making. Also, in sharp contrast to earlier days, the National Science Foundation now supports work in this field, as in other areas of basic science; in addition, we believe that other foundations, particularly the recently formed Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, are likely to be active in this area.

To avoid any risk of misunderstanding, I should emphasize that the Foundation will continue to be an active grantmaker in specified areas of the Conservation and the Environment field. As Mr. Robertson's statement of program objectives on the Foundation's Web site indicates, we will continue to invest in major research consortia such as the Hawaii Ecosystem Study organized through Stanford University and an array of projects involving Kruger National Park in South Africa. We also expect to continue to support a series of initiatives involving liberal arts colleges, including some that promote environmental sciences programs and others that allow students at these colleges to spend time at major research sites such as the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, the Organization for Tropical Studies in Costa Rica, and Kruger National Park. Special mention should also be made of the Foundation's plan to increase its already extensive efforts to use advances in digital technologies to

increase access to the holdings of major natural history institutions and to the collections of leading centers of botanical research.

### *Ongoing Program Priorities*

The Mellon Foundation has long been known principally for its support of the humanities, the arts, and programs in higher education. This emphasis will, if anything, be even more pronounced in the next few years than it has been historically. Specifically, the Foundation intends to concentrate its grantmaking in the following programmatic areas: museums and art conservation; the performing arts; higher education (research universities, liberal arts colleges, and centers for advanced study); minority education (including especially the [Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program](#) and its offshoots); scholarly communications; and research in information technology and teaching. Support for activities outside the United States, including particularly those in South Africa, will be provided under several of these headings. The emphasis in recent years on harnessing advances in information technology to serve needs within the arts and sciences will be reinforced within a number of these programs as well as through several new initiatives. Also, in the near term at least, the Foundation will continue both to sponsor and carry out social science research in targeted areas within higher education. Except in rare cases, we do not expect to be making grants in the broad field of public and international affairs.

### *Museums, Art Conservation, and the Performing Arts*

Our staff and Trustees feel strongly that we should maintain our current levels of grantmaking in these fields, notwithstanding a decline in our endowment. The basic reason is simply that the economy of New York City is suffering, and funding from public sources for these critically important institutions is being sharply curtailed; similar problems exist nationwide. Although we cannot repeat the special, one-time \$50 million initiative that we undertook last year to assist New York-based museums, libraries, and performing arts organizations, we do plan, in 2003 and for the foreseeable future, to continue our sizable commitments to these fields, in New York and more generally.

In the museum field, the Trustees intend to continue the Foundation's focus on curatorial scholarship through, on the one hand, the establishment of securely endowed positions, and on the other, of publication funds, while also continuing to support post-doctoral opportunities for young scholars in art history to enter the museum profession. In the conservation field, our commitment to both training and the establishment of positions in the field of photograph conservation now runs parallel with a growing investment in the scientific component of art conservation that was stimulated by the Foundation's program officer for museums and art conservation, Angelica Rudenstine. Proposals approved during 2002 in this latter arena illustrate our current thinking: a challenge grant to the Metropolitan Museum of Art will facilitate the restructuring of its science department through the appointment of an additional senior scientist to lead the effort; grants to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Walters Art Museum will assist in the establishment of new positions for scientists; and a grant to the Harvard University Art Museums for postdoctoral fellowships will help to meet a growing demand in the field for well-trained scientists wishing to enter conservation.

In the performing arts, the Trustees continue to follow closely the progress of the Foundation's program for symphony orchestras (including the "orchestra forum") that has been developed and led by the program officer for this field, Catherine (Wichter-  
man) Maciariello. In December 2002, the Trustees also approved a series of 18 renewal grants under the national theater program, having acted earlier in the year to support new work in dance. The summary table at the end of the text of this report indicates that, in 2002, the Foundation appropriated between \$15 and \$16 million in support of its program in performing arts and a similar sum in support of its program in museums and art conservation. The same level of grantmaking is anticipated in 2003.

### *Higher Education*

The Foundation appropriated more than \$65 million in direct support of programs of higher education in 2002, excluding appropriations for minority education, scholarly communications, research on information technology, research and training programs in the fields of population and ecology, and support of college and university museums and performing arts programs. When

we add up grants for all purposes made to and through institutions of higher education, including institutes for advanced study and organizations such as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, the total comes to about \$141 million. The customary listing of all individual grants at the end of the report illustrates the wide range of programs, projects, and institutions that together define the Foundation's commitment to this core area of activity. In 2002, the Foundation made 372 separate grants in this area, including 73 foreign grants.<sup>4</sup>

*Research universities and the humanities.* A top priority within the research universities/humanities part of the Foundation's higher education program (which is overseen by the Foundation's senior vice president, Harriet Zuckerman, and her associate, Joseph Meisel) is support for a wide array of fellowship programs. The number and extent of these programs has increased dramatically in the last few years, as we have decided to shift some (but by no means all) of our grants from support of graduate students to support of faculty members—and also to commit new resources. These faculty fellowship programs, which are centered in the humanities and related disciplines and cover the “academic life cycle,” were described in detail in last year's Annual Report. In brief, they support:

- junior faculty with at least two years' teaching experience;
- assistant professors with exceptional records of scholarship (the “Charles A. Ryskamp Research Fellowships”);
- the “Frederick Burkhardt Residential Scholarships for Recently Tenured Scholars”;

<sup>4</sup> Even this number and the others in this paragraph understate the Foundation's activities in the broad field of advanced education and training. For example, the Foundation's museum program includes several grants to leading US museums—including the Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Cleveland Museum of Art, and Metropolitan Museum—to introduce Chinese scholars and administrators to American museum practices through a carefully structured study of curatorial and management principles. Museums are, of course, important teaching institutions, and this set of grants is another illustration of the ways in which the Foundation seeks to integrate its program elements—in this case building on relationships established through the imaging of cave art at Dunhuang to assist in broadening the experience of Chinese scholars and administrators in the museum field.

- sabbatical fellowships for mid-career faculty members that supplement institutional support;
- “New Directions” fellowships awarded to faculty members in the humanities and kindred social sciences who wish to acquire systematic training outside their own disciplines;
- Distinguished Achievement Awards that support the work of professors who have made major contributions to their own disciplines and whose current work promises significant new advances through both teaching and scholarship; and, finally
- “Emeritus Fellowships,” to be awarded to eminent scholars who wish to continue their scholarly work and remain affiliated with their home institutions when they retire from their permanent posts.

In addition, the Foundation funds a wide variety of postdoctoral awards, resident fellowships based at centers of advanced study and in some special library collections, and fellowships for graduate study in the humanities.

As noted, a number of these fellowship programs are relatively new. The Ryskamp Fellowships and the Distinguished Achievement Awards were initiated in 2001, the New Directions Fellowships in 2002, and the Emeritus Fellowships are being launched in 2003. As presently conceived, these still-developing programs, taken together, involve appropriations totaling more than \$40 million annually. At a time when colleges and universities are hard pressed financially, we are more persuaded than ever of the value of these targeted efforts to recognize, reward, and assist outstanding scholars in the humanities. But we also recognize that organizing and managing such programs is a demanding undertaking that requires careful administration as well as substantial monetary outlays.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, we are reviewing these commitments and the frequency with which certain national competitions are held. Experience may teach us that we can achieve our basic objectives (and, in fact, achieve them even more fully in some respects) without being quite as ambitious as we have been, in terms of both scale and aspects of program definition.

<sup>5</sup> This is a good place to express again our appreciation to the American Council of Learned Societies, the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, and the Foundation’s senior advisors for their invaluable assistance in managing these fellowship programs.

The Foundation needs to retain budgetary “room” to do new things and to take advantage of special opportunities when they present themselves. In 2002, for instance, we made a special grant of \$1.4 million to the Courtauld Institute of Art in London to strengthen its faculty and enrich its scholarly activities at an important transitional point in its history. To provide a second example, the Foundation also made a grant of \$1 million to help the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York maintain and build on its present strengths by recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty members at a time of severely constrained resources.

*Liberal arts colleges.* The liberal arts college component of the higher education program (overseen by the Foundation’s Vice President, Pat McPherson, and her colleague, Danielle Carr Ramdath) is also ambitious—properly so, we believe, given both the importance of these colleges as places where talented students can focus on the study of the basic arts and sciences and the limited amount of funding from foundation, corporate, and governmental sources that is available to them. The Foundation supports postdoctoral fellowships in these settings, as well as in research universities; indeed, the Foundation’s postdoctoral fellowship model originated with a grant to Bryn Mawr in 1975. More recently, emphasis has been placed on a series of collaborative/consortial programs intended to give smaller colleges the scale they require in some areas and opportunities to interact with institutions pursuing similar missions and facing similar problems. Examples include projects designed to:

- increase educational effectiveness, often by modifying curricula and sharing programs;
- promote faculty career enhancement by meeting the special needs that emerge at different stages in a career;
- find more educationally effective ways of carrying out study abroad programs;
- build a stronger sense of academic community by involving faculty more fully in residential life; and
- encourage ever more sophisticated forms of library collaboration.

Perhaps the most important of the collaborative initiatives spawned recently is the creation of a cluster of regional technology

centers in 2001 through appropriations totaling about \$10 million. Further Foundation funding will be required in future years as we seek, working with the relevant associations of liberal arts colleges, to have these centers evolve into institutionalized entities that will address common issues in the application of information technology in cost-effective ways. At the same time, the participating colleges will also need to testify directly to the value of these centers on their campuses by committing more of their own funds. Otherwise, the centers will not be able to sustain themselves over the long run.

In 2002, the Foundation's liberal arts college program supported another, very different, kind of consortial undertaking: the College Retirement Project, designed to permit pre-funding and joint purchasing of supplemental medical insurance for (in the first instance) retiring faculty and staff at national liberal arts colleges. The co-directors, Linda and Kenneth Cool, have worked energetically and imaginatively to test the feasibility of this concept and have now received non-binding expressions of strong interest from 100 colleges. This is such an important initiative because it is concerned not only with an evident national problem experienced by people in many sectors (how to pay for medical care after retirement) but also because the failure to find viable solutions at liberal arts colleges can have severe implications for faculty staffing. Senior faculty who may have been planning to retire could now pull back in the face of rising medical costs and no assured way of protecting themselves and their families. The Foundation's role, as we envision it at this juncture, is to cover the costs of designing a plan and convening meetings to discuss it; if the plan is to succeed, it will have to make economic sense and be self-sustaining. Giving effect to such an ambitious undertaking is obviously complicated and difficult, but we believe there are grounds for at least guarded optimism.<sup>6</sup>

### *Minority Programs*

At both colleges and universities, the Foundation continues to support programs designed to increase educational opportunities for talented minority students. The Mellon Minority Undergraduate

<sup>6</sup> If this project comes to fruition, membership in the consortium will not be limited to colleges; universities and other not-for-profit entities, including foundations, will also be welcome to participate.

Fellowship Program (MMUF), created 14 years ago under the leadership of Henry Drewry and now directed by Lydia English, is the major programmatic vehicle for these efforts, which have never been more important than they are today. The great success of MMUF has been gratifying. Almost 2,000 undergraduates have participated in it since its inception, and the flow of students into and through PhD programs is accelerating.<sup>7</sup> To date, the Foundation has appropriated \$54 million to MMUF and its “extensions” (which include special programs that provide a limited amount of support for MMUF students in graduate school and for minority and women faculty beginning their academic careers).

Still, the need to attract more minority students to graduate study and academic careers remains overwhelming, and in all likelihood the Foundation will elect to commit even more resources to support the growing number of MMUF students enrolled in PhD programs, earning their doctorates, and entering the professoriate. We realize, however, that the particular mechanisms used to support some activities (such as annual conferences, which have been very effective in creating an *esprit de corps* and stimulating valuable interactions) will need to be re-examined in light of the continuing growth in the numbers of participants. It is important that available resources be spent as effectively as possible and that convening and administrative costs not divert funds from direct student support.

Under the leadership of Danielle Carr Ramdath, the Foundation also supports programs intended to assist historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). These have included library programs, efforts to assist HBCUs to take full advantage of scholarly resources such as JSTOR, and, most recently, a highly targeted set of “institution-building” grants. The HBCUs face distinctive problems, and we expect this program, as well as companion work with Appalachian colleges, to continue.<sup>8</sup> Of course, the leading HBCUs also compete effectively with other nationally regarded liberal arts colleges for support through the Foundation’s broader liberal arts college program.

<sup>7</sup> For recent data on the program, see <http://www.mellon.org/programs/highered/mmuuf>. For an account of the formation of the program and its operating philosophy, see Henry Drewry’s essay in the Foundation’s 1993 Annual Report [<http://www.mellon.org/AnnualReports/1993>].

<sup>8</sup> For an excellent history of private HBCUs, and an examination of their present circumstances, see Henry Drewry and Humphrey Doermann, *Stand and Prosper: Private Black Colleges and their Students* (Princeton University Press, 2001).

*Research in Higher Education*

Another continuing activity of the Foundation in higher education is the support of research projects, some carried out by Mellon staff and many conducted elsewhere by leading scholars. The Foundation is pleased that research it has supported over several years has led to important contributions to scholarship and to publications that have been cited extensively in the opinion pieces and briefs prepared in conjunction with the University of Michigan affirmative action cases that are soon to be argued before the United States Supreme Court. Whatever the Court decides, in one of the most significant cases to come before it in decades, a clear understanding of policy choices and their implications will continue to matter greatly—to higher education, of course, but also to the country at large. A principal objective of both our own research and the work we have sponsored by scholars such as Charles Hirschman, John Kain, Thomas Kane, Glenn Loury, Douglas Massey, and Marta Tienda, has been to provide empirical evidence that can answer, at least in part, some of the basic questions in this contentious debate and also to frame the open issues. The essay that is appended to the Annual Report this year is a paper that Neil Rudenstine and I published recently in an effort to pull together much of this work, to relate it to what are fundamentally questions of values, and to explain why the two of us continue to believe so strongly in race-sensitive admission policies.<sup>9</sup>

Other research projects directly related to higher education include the studies of college sports and educational values that James Shulman and I began in 2001 with the publication of *The Game of Life* and that Sarah Levin and I have continued with the completion, in 2002, of a more detailed exploration of the continued widening of what we term the academic-athletic divide. The new book is titled *Reclaiming the Game*, and it is to be published

<sup>9</sup> “Race-sensitive Admissions: Back to Basics,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 7, 2003; the paper is also available on the Foundation’s Web site. Among the various briefs submitted to the Court, the one by Glenn Loury and other social scientists contains the most extensive summary of research supported mainly by the Mellon Foundation. *Brief of Social Scientists Glenn C. Loury, Nathan Glazer, John F. Kain, Thomas J. Kane, Douglas Massey, Marta Tienda, and Brian Bucks as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents, Grutter v. Bollinger, et al.; Gratz and Hamacher v. Bollinger, et al.* (2003). Available at: [http://www.umich.edu/~urell/admissions/legal/gru\\_amicus-ussc/um/SocSci-both.pdf](http://www.umich.edu/~urell/admissions/legal/gru_amicus-ussc/um/SocSci-both.pdf)

by the Princeton University Press in the fall of 2003. In 2002, the Foundation also appropriated the funds needed to conduct a large-scale survey of graduate students who participated in the Foundation's now-concluded program of institutional support for graduate study in carefully selected departments at ten universities—and of a control group of departments at other major universities. These data will be combined with institutional records as part of an ambitious effort to study the effects of the Foundation's major commitment to enhancing the effectiveness of doctoral education in the humanities and related fields. This study (tentatively titled "The Mellon Graduate Education Initiative: A Review after a Decade") is being carried out under the leadership of Harriet Zuckerman at the Foundation and Ronald Ehrenberg at Cornell University.

### *Scholarly Communications*

The Foundation's Scholarly Communications program, under the leadership of Donald Waters and his associate, Suzanne Lodato, has finished another extremely active year and has an equally ambitious agenda for the future. This is one of the Foundation's major areas of emphasis looking ahead. As in the case of the Conservation and Environment program, some pruning of the tree has been accomplished, in this instance through a decision to conclude what had been a modest program of support for Latin American libraries. Projects supported in 2002 included traditional book and manuscript conservation and cataloging efforts (represented by grants of \$1 million to the University of Oxford and \$1 million to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign); two major initiatives intended to address the unsolved problem of how to archive "born-digital content" in scholarly journals; a series of projects aimed at finding new ways to create, harvest, and use metadata, especially cataloging information related to art images; the support of digitization of content in fields as diverse as inscriptions of ancient Near Eastern texts, moving images in the field of ethnomusicology, and records of dance performance. Support was also provided for a pilot project designed by the Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation and three research universities to explore the scholarly uses of video-taped interviews with Holocaust survivors. In addition, substantial start-up funding was also provided for ARTstor and a new organization called Ithaka. An update on ARTstor and a detailed description of Ithaka are provided later in this report.

Space constraints permit only brief mention of a few of these projects. Columbia University received a grant of \$542,000 to develop computational linguistic techniques for identifying and extracting metadata from text sources that can be used to describe works of art. This project is potentially of great significance for large image-based collections of the kind that will appear in ARTstor and other digital repositories since the time and expense required to provide robust descriptive information generally far exceeds that required for digitizing and storing images. A second grant was made to the University of California at San Diego (\$750,000) to support the creation of a prototype union catalog for art images that would link various “home built” databases so that the best cataloging information can be associated with the best images. A third grant was made to the Rochester Institute of Technology (\$874,000) to develop and implement a spectral digital imaging system that has the potential to improve dramatically the quality of color values associated with images and simultaneously to reduce costs by eliminating the need for manual “color corrections.”

Indiana University and the University of Michigan have outstanding musicology programs, and in 2002 the Foundation made a grant of \$875,000 to support the joint development of a digital archive of annotated field recordings of moving images made by leading figures in ethnomusicology. A smaller grant (\$166,000) was made to the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York to support the planning of an online archive of moving images that document dance history and performance. In both of these instances, complex issues of intellectual property rights have to be resolved, along with administrative and financial issues, before we can be confident that something of lasting value can be created. But these fields are so important, and so central to the Foundation’s interests in art and culture, that the provision of start-up funding has seemed justified. A third, very different, digitization project is located at the University of Southern California, where a grant of \$750,000 will support the further development of a photographic archive of ancient Near Eastern inscriptions (taken from the Dead Sea Scrolls; Hebrew, Aramaic, and Canaanite texts from the Biblical period and earlier; Mesopotamian documents; and medieval Jewish manuscripts).

As the dollar figures cited above illustrate, path-breaking work in this area is expensive. Nonetheless, the Foundation expects to continue to invest substantial resources in new ideas that offer the

promise of lasting improvements in the ability of students and scholars, worldwide, to have access to resources that otherwise would not exist at all or be available only on a very limited basis. The advantages of scale are obvious, as are the close connections of these projects to core commitments of the Foundation in the humanities and the arts.

### *Basic Research in Information Technology*

At a still more fundamental level, the Foundation's Vice President for Research in Information Technology, Ira Fuchs, continues to look for unusually promising opportunities to strengthen the basic infrastructure in information technology that is especially relevant to higher education. In the last two years, special efforts have been made to encourage the development of software and technological tools that will be based on the specifications and standards developed through the Open Knowledge Initiative (OKI) that originated at MIT. OKI is a technical framework, including a set of standard application programming interfaces, that is intended to facilitate the collaborative development of software components and modules for storing, preserving, and disseminating a wide range of research and educational materials.

One such OKI-compliant tool is the Assignment and Assessment Manager to support classroom teaching (which was built at Stanford and received a grant of \$560,000 in 2002). Tufts University received a grant of \$470,000 to develop a "concept-mapping" tool called the Visual Understanding Environment that would allow users to select, organize, and integrate electronic resources within and among collections. Because the Tufts project and other OKI tools depend on easy access to a variety of online collections, the Foundation is also supporting the development and deployment of OKI-compatible digital repositories. Tufts is planning to add OKI interfaces to FEDORA, an open-source repository that is being developed with Foundation support (\$1,000,000 in 2001) at the University of Virginia. MIT has also developed open-source repository software, which it calls DSpace. Both FEDORA and DSpace allow institutions to store online course materials as well as a variety of research and other online scholarly materials. In 2002, the Foundation appropriated \$300,000 to allow MIT to create the appropriate OKI interfaces for DSpace, and to assist in its deployment at five other institutions (Columbia University,

University of Toronto, University of Rochester, University of Washington, and Ohio State University). Our hope is that the experience gained through these various grants will demonstrate that collaborative development of open-source software within the broader OKI framework is promising and deserves the active support of the scholarly community—which is an absolute requirement for its success.

Within the Foundation, we are now combining support of research of this kind with support of particular research projects designed to test the utility of applications of technology to teaching in specific settings. Another program officer, Saul Fisher, is working with Ira Fuchs in this area. Initial projects are based at locations ranging from the Associated Colleges of the South (where scholars are evaluating the work of a Virtual Classics Department), to a joint Stanford-Russian study of ways of teaching international relations, to an imaginative project at Claremont Graduate University designed to assess the benefits of using technology in the teaching of the humanities and social sciences at the graduate level.

More generally, the Foundation has continued to support broad-based research on the application of information technology to scholarship, learning, and teaching. Mr. Fisher is at work on a study of the lessons learned from Foundation-sponsored projects on the cost-effective uses of technology in teaching (in collaboration with David Stern, Professor at the University of California at Berkeley). Roger Schonfeld has finished a major study of the development of JSTOR, which will be published in the spring of 2003 by the Princeton University Press (*JSTOR: A History*). Mr. Schonfeld's in-depth analysis of the evolution of JSTOR, including mistakes made as well as lessons learned, should be of interest to others contemplating new initiatives in this area. The next part of this report, dealing with new digital initiatives, is in many ways an outgrowth of JSTOR.

### *New Digital Initiatives*

Perhaps the most important programmatic development in 2002 was the decision to provide substantial start-up funding for two digital initiatives that are expected to become independent not-for-profit entities in 2003: ARTstor and Ithaka. The William and Flora Hewlett and Stavros S. Niarchos Foundations have

joined with Mellon to provide start-up funding to launch Ithaka; Mellon is the sole foundation funder of ARTstor. We have received a number of inquiries about both of these undertakings, and I hope that the following discussion will be useful in explaining our objectives and providing some context.

### *The JSTOR Background*

When the Foundation launched JSTOR in 1995, the goal was to solve a specific problem faced by libraries, scholars, and publishers of journal literature in the humanities and social sciences; namely, how to gain greatly improved access to the back issues of important scholarly journals while at the same time creating an enduring electronic archive that would save shelf space, reduce operating costs, and address preservation concerns. The result was the creation of a searchable electronic archive. As an independent not-for-profit entity, JSTOR subsequently earned classification by the IRS as a “public charity” and by now has proven its value many times over. Under Kevin Guthrie’s leadership, it has delivered on its original objectives at a level that has exceeded even the most optimistic expectations.

As of the end of December 2002, the JSTOR archive contained the full-runs, back to inception, of 322 journals from 26 disciplines and 168 publishers. This archive of more than 11 million pages continues to grow as new journals in a variety of fields are added (along with new issues of journals already represented). More than 1,500 institutions from 71 countries around the world participate in JSTOR and have access to one or more of its collections. In 2002, users conducted 16 million searches and printed more than 10 million articles. The cumulative average annual growth rate in JSTOR usage has been more than 50 percent at participating sites with access since the beginning of 1998.<sup>10</sup>

JSTOR has also met its financial targets and is now financially self-sufficient, although it still depends upon support from various foundations to build new collections and to subsidize access to some users and in some regions of the world where affordability is

<sup>10</sup> Anecdotal evidence of JSTOR’s popularity is abundant and sometimes amusing. Recently a graduate student in history at Marquette University wrote that he and some of his fellow students “decided to name our bowling team J-STOR after our favorite on-line resource.” The team is now searching for shirts with a JSTOR logo.

a serious issue.<sup>11</sup> Revenue from annual access charges covers annual operating costs, and JSTOR is building a restricted Archive Capital Fund to be used to cover the future costs associated with software and data migration and other long-term archiving expenses. It is also now able to distribute revenues from a modest pool back to the publishers of the growing body of content that it digitizes and makes available (including a large number of scholarly societies). At the same time, JSTOR remains committed to value-based pricing: fees for participating institutions depend on a variety of factors that match the amount institutions pay to the potential value they are expected to derive from participation. Fees are also adjusted using national GDP data to address disparities in wealth in various parts of the world. This approach to pricing supports JSTOR's mission of extending access to a broad array of institutions. Finally, it is worth noting that the price per page of content in JSTOR has actually fallen every year for all participants.<sup>12</sup>

JSTOR has reached these milestones by pursuing a system-wide approach that has allowed it to deliver benefits to libraries, publishers, and users—and, in the process, to develop effective working relationships with all of these important stakeholders. This history, which is instructive in its own right (see the earlier mention of Roger

<sup>11</sup> In addition to the Mellon Foundation, JSTOR has received support from the Freeman Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, the Stavros S. Niarchos Foundation, the Sherman-Fairchild Foundation, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

<sup>12</sup> Although JSTOR may someday have to raise its annual access fees to reflect increases in operating costs, it has not done so thus far. Since annual fees have remained constant since each collection was originally released, the cost per page declines with each year's addition of new content from issues that can now be included in the JSTOR archive because of the moving wall—for example, approximately 247,000 pages were added to the database in January 2003. (See the JSTOR Web site [[www.jstor.org/about/movingwall.html](http://www.jstor.org/about/movingwall.html)] for a further explanation of this unique feature of JSTOR. In brief, in order to protect the publisher's ability to continue to sell subscriptions to new issues of the journal, the JSTOR archive does not contain "current content." The JSTOR archive contains the "backfile," which goes all the way back to the inception of the journal. "Current content" is separated from the "backfile" by a "moving wall" that may be located anywhere from 1 to 5 years backwards in time from the most recent issue. As each calendar year passes, the wall "moves" forward one year, and another year's content is added to the backfile; for example, a journal's content for 1999 might be added at the end of 2002 if there was a three-year moving wall.)

Schonfeld's forthcoming book), has encouraged the Foundation to explore additional ways in which it could serve its core mission by stimulating the creation of other sustainable scholarly initiatives, especially in the arts and humanities. No one any longer questions the usefulness of digital technologies, disputes their growing importance worldwide, or believes that the institutions we seek to serve could ignore or avoid them even if they had any such inclination.

The widespread desire in the community for even faster progress in these areas has resulted in increasing requests for JSTOR and its staff to become involved in initiatives and projects that extend beyond JSTOR's core set of activities. In many cases, JSTOR's experience is highly relevant and potentially useful to other projects serving higher education, and JSTOR's Board has deliberated on ways that it can best serve its broad mission to assist the scholarly community without losing the focus on its core activities, a focus that we believe has been—and remains—critical to its success.

The conclusion reached was that JSTOR should work with Mellon in encouraging both ARTstor and Ithaka to become independent not-for-profit entities that could function as “supporting organizations” to JSTOR (with each supporting the mission of JSTOR, which is the “supported” organization in the terminology of the law). The basic idea is that by working closely and collaboratively with these new entities, JSTOR can advance its broad mission without departing from its own primary role as a trusted digital archive of scholarly journals.

From the Foundation's perspective, the case for investing heavily in this domain rests on a combination of assets that we believe we are in an unusually good position to marshal. These include the considerable knowledge and skills of staff members associated with previous and ongoing projects, including their practical experience in working through legal and business issues; institutional relationships that are already in place; the financial and organizational resources needed to launch any large-scale initiative that requires a reliable infrastructure and economies of scale to succeed; the credibility associated with the success of JSTOR; and, above all, a reasonably clear sense of the underlying values intrinsic to the humanities and higher education.

### *ARTstor*

ARTstor has a modestly longer history than Ithaka. As readers of recent Annual Reports will know, the Foundation decided in

April 2001 to encourage the development of a digital repository that would complement JSTOR's work with the texts of scholarly journals by focusing on art images and associated scholarly materials. Early experience in digitizing the Design Collection at the Museum of Modern Art and Buddhist cave art at Dunhuang in China (as well as related paintings, manuscripts, and sculptures that are now widely dispersed) had demonstrated the potential value to scholars of work of this kind. It was evident from the start that rapidly improving digital technologies were ideally suited not only to capture art images at high quality, but also to combine and manipulate images, and catalog other data, texts, and related scholarly materials assembled from sources all over the world. Finally, the Foundation's longstanding interest in art, museums, the humanities, and the field of art history within the humanities, made support of this particular undertaking a "natural" for Mellon.

In brief, ARTstor's not-for-profit mission is:

- To assemble image collections of high quality from across many time periods and cultures that will, in the aggregate, have sufficient depth, breadth, and coherence to support a wide range of educational and scholarly activities;
- To create an organized, regulated, and reliable resource on the Internet that makes available images and related texts to museums, colleges and universities, and other educational institutions exclusively for the noncommercial purposes of research, teaching, and learning; and
- To work with the arts and other educational communities to derive collective solutions to the complex challenges that are an inescapable part of working in a digital environment.

In the time since this initiative was first announced, much progress has been made in clarifying concepts, acquiring content, recruiting a core staff, working through complex legal and organizational issues, building a technological infrastructure, and enlisting the advice and support of a wide variety of scholars, curators, and librarians. Neil Rudenstine, as Chairman of the ARTstor Advisory Board, and James Shulman, as Executive Director, have provided strong leadership and (I am glad to report) appear to remain undaunted by the complexity of the tasks that they continue to address. ARTstor's elegant Web site can now be visited on the Internet (*www.artstor.org*), and ARTstor expects to test a

sample of its collections at a limited group of institutions in the fall of 2003.

The initial digitized content that ARTstor expects to have available for user testing includes:<sup>13</sup>

- An extensive selection of images from the Museum of Modern Art's Digital Design Collection.
- A portion of the Mellon International Dunhuang Archive (MIDA), consisting of a selection of images of art from major caves in Dunhuang, along with paintings, photographs, manuscripts, and related objects from Dunhuang now held by the Lo Collection in Princeton, the British Museum, The British Library, Oxford University, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Musée national des Arts asiatiques—Guimet, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- The complete "Carnegie Collection" of the Arts of the United States (4,200 images of American art and architecture that has been widely used in teaching for many years).
- About one-third of the volumes in *The Illustrated Bartsch* (a classic reference collection of old master prints).
- An initial selection of 1,000 images from the Huntington Archive of Asian Art (a personal collection of 10,000 photographs of major monuments that has been assembled over three decades by John and Susan Huntington, faculty members at Ohio State University).
- An initial set of about 80,000 images and associated cataloging data from the 250,000 items in the Slide Library at the University of California at San Diego (covering a wide variety of fields) that will ultimately be available.

Production processes, including quality control protocols, continue to be developed, and there is no substitute for proceeding carefully. Considerable work also remains to be done on the architecture of the database and on a number of features of the software that will be available to users. One important decision has been made: ARTstor will enable users to access its database by means

<sup>13</sup> See the ARTstor Web site for fuller descriptions of these collections as well as additional information.

of both a relatively easy-to-use browser interface designed in conjunction with colleagues at James Madison University (where a team of faculty and staff have developed and distributed at no charge a presentation software known as the Madison Digital Image Database or MDID) and the sophisticated Insight software designed by Luna Imaging (which has an exceptional range of additional functionality developed explicitly for scholarly uses in art and related fields).

ARTstor staff are working hard to incorporate into the database content that is currently being digitized, and to build an initial Internet offering that will provide a basis for assessing both the kinds of images and associated metadata being provided and the software available to use the content. At the same time, they are also exploring new collections that may be incorporated within ARTstor in the future. Consideration is being given to several possible new collections, including: *The Image of the Black in Western Art*, which is housed at The W. E. B. Du Bois Institute for Afro-American Research at Harvard, and a large assemblage of architectural photographs that is the work of Alec Hartill. These and other ideas for new collections are being explored as ARTstor looks for projects that will both add important content to the digital repository and provide an opportunity to learn about the benefits of various types of collections to different segments of the user community.

In addition, ARTstor may include various collections being created with somewhat other objectives in mind through separate grants from the Mellon Foundation. Examples include a large set of photographs of rock art in Africa (along with associated scholarly materials) and the "First Fleet" collection of drawings and art depicting Australia at the time the British arrived (held at the Museum of Natural History in London). The basic point is that the content in ARTstor will never be static. If ARTstor is as successful as we hope it will be, increasing numbers of holders of content may want to contribute their images, or their knowledge about collections in the database, to the ever growing repository.

Over the course of the last six months, ARTstor representatives have met with museum directors, curators, and staff at a number of leading museums. These visits have been valuable in providing reactions to proposed ARTstor collections and plans, discussing what other collections (including museum-based efforts) might be explored, and, finally, thinking together about how to vet

and improve images and cataloging data. The entire ARTstor initiative has to be conceived as a collaborative effort of foundations (Mellon initially), the ARTstor Board and staff, and a wide array of scholars, museums, colleges, universities, libraries, and other institutions that together define the community that believes in the importance of disseminating art images and data for noncommercial educational use. ARTstor's general counsel (Gretchen Wagner) along with outside counsel and representatives of the community will work on a continuing basis to understand and explain ARTstor's attempts to balance the interests of all involved in this complex territory, so as to allow the widest reasonable use of digital images and cataloging data for these not-for-profit scholarly purposes. Obtaining community-wide support for ARTstor's approach to the underlying legal issues would by itself represent a major accomplishment.

ARTstor had made sufficient progress by the end of 2002 to justify four organizational steps: first, obtaining standing as a separately incorporated entity (now accomplished); second, applying for start-up funding from the Mellon Foundation (also accomplished); third, applying for IRS approval as a separate 501(c)(3) public charity that, as noted earlier, would be linked to JSTOR as a "supporting organization" (in process); and, fourth, selecting the initial members of a Board of Trustees. At present, the members of the ARTstor Board consist of: Neil Rudenstine, former president of Harvard University, chairman; James Shulman, ex officio; Kevin Guthrie, now chairman of JSTOR and president of Ithaka; James Cuno, Director of the Courtauld Institute of Art in London; and Peter Wendell, a highly experienced investor in start-up entities who is General Partner of Sierra Ventures. In time, other Trustees will be added.

At their December meeting, the Trustees of the Foundation approved a start-up grant of \$5 million for ARTstor, with the funds to be disbursed when IRS approval is obtained; meanwhile, ARTstor is continuing to be incubated as a Mellon-sponsored project. Although ARTstor will continue to work closely with the Foundation, it is important that it become a separate not-for-profit entity, linked to JSTOR, as it begins the more "public" phase of its operations. Independence from the Foundation will send an important signal to the community about ARTstor's viability and permit the Foundation to switch from funding its operations through internal expenditures to the more normal grant mode of support.

As an independent not-for-profit public charity, ARTstor will also be able to collect user fees—as a grantmaking foundation such as Mellon does not. A recurring stream of revenue provided by those institutions that benefit most directly from access to ARTstor’s digital collections is important both as a test of the value of the enterprise and as an essential component of the business model needed to sustain ARTstor indefinitely. It seems unlikely, however, that ARTstor will achieve the financial results of JSTOR, at least in the near to medium term. As ARTstor seeks to become an established, respected organization that connects content owners and educational users of art images, continued philanthropic support, at some still undefined level, will be required. The exact blend of philanthropic support and participation fees will almost certainly evolve over time, but at a pace and in ways that no one can forecast with any precision. It is useful to remember that almost all well-established not-for-profit museums, libraries, colleges, and universities rely on some mix of earned income and contributions, including returns on endowment. JSTOR relies much more heavily on its form of earned income (participation fees) to cover operating expenses than do almost all of these other not-for-profits; in short, it is JSTOR, not ARTstor, that is the outlier in this regard.

### *Ithaka*

Perhaps the most telling compliment that JSTOR has received is that it shows signs of becoming a verb. The representative of a national library initiative in one European country told Kevin Guthrie, the founding president of JSTOR, that his minister of culture wanted him to learn how to “JSTOR” various cultural and scholarly materials that his country was eager to preserve electronically. As noted earlier, both JSTOR and Mellon staff have been asked by many others whether—and how—it might be possible to leverage the lessons learned through the development of JSTOR. In 2002, the decision was reached to encourage the creation of a new not-for-profit entity that would have the following broad mission: *To accelerate the adoption of productive and efficient uses of information technology for the benefit of the worldwide scholarly community.*

The new organization has been named “Ithaka” (or, more formally, “Ithaka Harbors, Inc.”) after the title of the poem by C. P.

Cavafy that describes a voyage in the classical world marked by high purpose, visits to many “harbors seen for the first time,” and a purposeful commitment to reach its destination (Ithaka), however long the journey takes, combined with a recognition that it is the wisdom and experience gained along the way that are most valuable.<sup>14</sup>

As presently envisioned, Ithaka will have four interconnected functions:

- To incubate promising new projects and entities;
- To work with a “family” of affiliated organizations, linked to JSTOR, in order to facilitate a mutually beneficial sharing of resources, experiences, and strategies;
- To conduct comprehensive research on the impact of digital technologies on the scholarly community, mapping what has been done (with what outcomes), and identifying new opportunities;
- To offer a specialized advising service to selected organizations that could benefit from workshops, retreats, or seminars focused on strategic planning, technical and legal issues, organizational design, and business modeling—all of which are necessary to achieve sustainability.

1. *The Incubation Function.* Among the many kinds of new entities that might be incubated, two are already at different stages of planning and development. The first, provisionally called “E-Archive” and currently housed within JSTOR, is dedicated to developing a permanent archive of born-digital scholarly journals. Electronic versions of some publications are already being recognized as “the copy of record,” and yet there has been little success to date in establishing a trusted infrastructure that will ensure that these electronic documents remain available in the future. It makes no sense to expect individual libraries to take on such an archiving function, and publishers traditionally have not assumed responsibility for archiving the content that they offer. A centralized electronic

<sup>14</sup> See *The Essential Cavafy*, selected and with an introduction by Edmund Keeley, translated by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard. Hopewell, N.J.: Ecco Press, paperback edition, 1996.

archive would also have the major advantage of permitting cross-searching, a feature of JSTOR that is highly valued. The plan is to transfer responsibility for incubating E-Archive from JSTOR to Ithaka, in part because the sets of journals included in the two archives could end up being very different, and in part because E-Archive is likely to require a quite different technical approach, legal framework, and business model. Success can by no means be regarded as certain, but the need for E-Archive is clear and the potential rewards are great (including allowing libraries, with confidence, to subscribe only to electronic versions of certain journals, thereby achieving substantial savings in both capital costs and operating expenses).<sup>15</sup>

The second candidate for incubation is an entity provisionally called the “Network of International Digital Resources” (NIDR) that would be dedicated to building and supporting an interconnected set of broadly conceived JSTOR-like scholarly resources—which would not, however, be limited to scholarly journals. As one of its core purposes, this new network would focus on building content originating in various regions of the world, with an initial emphasis on including content from developing countries that is important both to these countries and to the worldwide scholarly community. The enthusiastic and rapidly growing use of the JSTOR archive in more than 70 countries is direct evidence of the worldwide appetite for high quality scholarly content. At present, however, there are inadequate resources and expertise available to select,

<sup>15</sup> Prior to the establishment of Ithaka, the Mellon Foundation appropriated \$1,285,000 (in September 2002) to support the initial stage of development of E-Archive. At their previous meeting in June 2002, the Trustees approved a grant of \$1 million to Stanford to develop a different, distributed, system of archiving electronic journals (called LOCKSS for “Lots Of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe”). Even earlier, in December 2000, the Trustees approved planning grants to seven institutions to work on the same general problem, which was of evident importance even then. A major conclusion of that process was that a third-party organization was needed to take on the task of creating an efficient archive at the right scale of operation. For further discussion of the planning projects and their results, see Donald J. Waters, “Good Archives Make Good Scholars: Reflections on Recent Steps Toward the Archiving of Digital Information,” in *The State of Digital Preservation: An International Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, 2002), pp. 78–95. In an important sense, one part of the rationale for Ithaka emerged from this set of planning grants.

prepare, digitize, and make accessible collections of scholarly materials pertaining to or located in developing regions.

A possible prototype is a digitization project currently supported by the Foundation in South Africa. Scholars and librarians in that country are building an electronic collection of literature published during South Africa's struggle under Apartheid. Consideration is now being given to including in this "node" related content located in other parts of Africa, the United Kingdom, Europe, and the United States. The resulting collection would be valuable, we believe, not just in South Africa, but to scholars in other countries as well. There is the much larger question of what other content, drawn at least in part from the region, would be especially valuable in sub-Saharan Africa, as well as (again) of interest more broadly. If experience with this prototype were sufficiently encouraging, and if the requisite resources could be found, the model might be extended to the Indian sub-continent, and possibly to parts of the Middle East, Latin America, and Asia.

Whatever content is chosen, it is clear that this new entity could also play a constructive role in helping with the deployment of digital resources in areas such as Africa. As the Vice-Chancellor of one leading South African university explained in a visit to New York, there is a pressing need for content, but there is also a pressing need for assistance in accessing and using content. The problem of connectivity remains, and there is also a need for technical support (such as assistance with the installation and use of software). Institutions such as the World Bank, other foundations, and major educational institutions are actively concerned with such issues. Ithaka could hardly be expected to meet all such needs, but its expertise could be useful.

There is no limit to the number of intriguing projects that one could imagine pursuing within the still broader Ithaka framework in order to test out their appeal and sustainability. But we know that providing guidance and expertise to any start-up enterprise can be enormously time-consuming and expensive. Thus, it will be necessary for Ithaka to be highly selective in choosing projects to explore as candidates for incubation. There is an obvious danger in trying to do too much too fast. The Mellon Foundation has no intention of allowing the open-ended possibilities for expansion of Ithaka to divert resources from its own core programs listed earlier in this report.

2. *The Sharing Function.* Ithaka will also function as the organizational core of a collaborative, non-hierarchical “family” of closely related affiliates that embrace JSTOR’s overarching mission and can benefit from the sharing of expertise, the linking of scholarly content, and economies of scale. Initially, we envision four other members of such a family (in addition to Ithaka itself): one (JSTOR) is already highly developed; one (ARTstor) is rapidly developing; one (E-Archive) is at a somewhat earlier stage of development; and one (NIDR) is still defining itself and setting priorities. The latter two would presumably become full-fledged affiliates when and as they emerge from incubation within Ithaka.

The members of this “family” are expected to help each other in two primary ways: by exchanging ideas and experiences and by taking advantage of operating efficiencies (for example, sharing an internal computer and networking structure, an accounting system, human resource functions, and certain legal services, as well as a common library). The Foundation has been able to acquire contiguous space on the immediate south side of our present location in New York, which ARTstor and Ithaka can use, and which should facilitate the kind of sharing that is contemplated. The objective is to encourage as much mutually beneficial interaction as possible, including interaction with the Foundation’s grantmaking program in scholarly communications, while expecting each affiliate to benefit from the challenges (and the discipline) of functioning as an independent entity.

3. *The Research Function.* Ithaka is well positioned, working in collaboration with Mellon librarians and staff, as well as with staff at the affiliated entities, to organize, collect, and coordinate research on the role of new technologies in higher education and related fields. Access to the results of user studies, analysis of usage logs, conventional library research, and active participation in meetings and conferences could provide a continually refreshed base of information that would enhance decision-making and the quality of work at all of the affiliated entities. Ithaka staff members would seek opportunities to publish analyses and results of such work for the benefit of the scholarly community. In addition, such information would be of great value in assessing the potential of candidates

for incubation. Other constituents, including colleges and universities trying to decide what they should be doing in this rapidly changing territory, might also benefit from access to this kind of centralized information resource.

4. *The Strategic Advising Function.* Ithaka may also offer specialized advising services to projects and entities at very early stages in their life cycles. The idea is to provide a kind of “mini-incubation” capacity that could help entities interested in creating digitized scholarly resources anticipate technical requirements and production problems, think through copyright issues, “position” what they intend to do within the context of initiatives known to the Foundation or to staff at Ithaka or other affiliates, and develop viable business plans. More broadly aimed seminars and workshops might also be offered.

Experience to date with a number of Foundation-sponsored projects and grantees suggests any number of candidates for participation in work of this kind. All too often, our staff encounter people and institutions with excellent ideas and great enthusiasm—but also a lack of the knowledge and experience needed to create workable and economically sustainable not-for-profit business models. The Mellon Foundation itself, and Mellon staff, are not in a position to address such needs, but they could identify promising ideas and “introduce” the leaders of such nascent projects to Ithaka.

*Funding and Leadership.* As noted earlier, initial funding for Ithaka is being provided by the Mellon Foundation (which authorized a start-up grant of \$5 million at its December 2002 Trustees’ meeting) and The William and Flora Hewlett and Stavros S. Niarchos Foundations (each of which has committed \$2.5 million). Over time, we hope that Ithaka and its various affiliates and projects will attract funding from other sources. As in the case of JSTOR, fees paid by beneficiaries of Ithaka’s activities could also be important in both calibrating the value of services being offered and obtaining the wherewithal needed to sustain ongoing operations.

Leadership, as always, will be critical. Kevin Guthrie has agreed to be the first president of Ithaka, and it is his experience, standing in the community, and unusual blend of talents and skills that, more than anything else, has given those involved in recommending the creation of Ithaka the confidence that this new venture can succeed. Mr. Guthrie and the Board of JSTOR have been

fortunate in recruiting Michael Spinella, formerly of *Science Magazine* and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to become the new executive director of JSTOR, thereby allowing Mr. Guthrie to concentrate on his new responsibilities. At the same time, Mr. Guthrie has now been elected chairman of JSTOR (to succeed me in that role), so that he can continue his active involvement with the work of that thriving organization that he has built from scratch. Eileen Fenton, who has been in charge of production at JSTOR, has agreed to serve as the first executive director of E-Archive, and Thomas Nygren, who has directed both the Foundation's program of grantmaking in South Africa and its internal IT operations, has agreed to be the first executive director of NIDR.

Our ambitions for Ithaca are also reflected in the initial membership of its Board of Trustees. Mr. Guthrie will serve as a Trustee *ex officio*, and I will chair the board. We have been fortunate to enlist four outstanding individuals, with complementary backgrounds, to join us as founding Trustees. They are: Paul Brest, president of the Hewlett Foundation and former Dean of the Stanford Law School; Charles E. Exley, Jr., former chairman and CEO of the NCR Corporation; Mamphela Ramphele, Managing Director of the World Bank and formerly Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cape Town in South Africa; and Charles Vest, the distinguished president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In addition, Andreas Dracopoulos, a member of the board of the Stavros S. Niarchos Foundation, has agreed to serve as an advisor.

### *Staff and Board Leadership at the Foundation*

The year just past, and the early months of 2003, have been a period of transition in leadership, at both staff and board levels. The list of officers shown at the front of the report includes, for the first time, John Hull, our recently elected (and very capable) Financial Vice President. The other new officer shown on that page, Glenda Burkhart, Vice President for Operations and Planning, has made invaluable contributions on many fronts in helping the Foundation achieve a smooth transition to a new organizational structure; in the early part of 2003, having concluded that she had accomplished what she had promised us she would do, she led the search for a longer-term successor that culminated in the appointment of Patricia L. Irvin. Ms. Irvin has been a partner

in major law firms in New York and Washington as well as having been a ranking official in charge of humanitarian programs at the Defense Department. She will serve both as Vice President for Operations and Planning at the Foundation and in a senior role at Ithaka. Fortunately for us, Ms. Burkhart has agreed to continue to assist the Foundation and Ithaka with special projects.

At the Board level, Timothy Mellon elected to resign as a Trustee in the fall of 2002, following 21 years of dedicated service. Mr. Mellon was a faithful and highly effective Trustee, and his presence among us will be missed greatly. Among his many other contributions, Mr. Mellon was an early proponent of moving aggressively to take advantage of the possibilities offered by the new digital technologies. The emergence of JSTOR and then of the other new digital initiatives described in this report (including especially the Dunhuang part of ARTstor) are one part of his legacy of service on the Board of the Foundation.

A major change in Board leadership was anticipated in 2002 and then given effect at the March 2003 Annual Meeting of the Foundation. At that meeting, Hanna H. Gray completed 24 years of service as a Trustee, including the last six as chairman. This is an instance in which words and descriptive phrases, however carefully chosen, are hopelessly inadequate in conveying the spirit as well as the substance of one person's inspired leadership. Mrs. Gray has been a simply exemplary chairman of the board: always thoroughly informed, thoughtfully independent, ready to ask the probing question as well as to make (and support) difficult decisions, creative in her ideas, constantly aware of the difference between overseeing an organization and managing one, and ever mindful of the need to adhere to the Foundation's core mission. Those of us who have been her colleagues at Mellon, and who have seen her in action at Board dinners as well as Board meetings, will always treasure the wisdom, wit, and friendship that she has bestowed so generously on the Foundation, and on each of us. Speaking for myself, I could never have asked for a better partner.

"Partner" is, I think, the right word. In not-for-profit organizations of all kinds, a highly productive working relationship between the chairman of the board and the president is widely regarded as essential to good governance. This is, in my experience, absolutely right—indeed, I would elevate this innocent-sounding proposition to the status of a cardinal principle. Since coming to the Mellon Foundation, I have been privileged to work

with three outstanding (albeit very different) chairmen: William O. Baker, John C. Whitehead, and Hanna H. Gray. And it is now my good fortune to work with a fourth chairman who will, the Trustees are confident, carry on this strong tradition of Board leadership.

In March 2003, the Trustees elected Anne M. Tatlock as Mrs. Gray's successor in this key leadership position. Mrs. Tatlock knows the Mellon Foundation well, having served as a loyal and highly effective Trustee for the last eight years. Professionally, she is distinguished in the worlds of investment and finance. As chairman and CEO of the Fiduciary Trust Company, she led that organization through the most difficult period in its history, following the loss on 9/11 of nearly 90 staff members who worked on the top floors of the World Trade Center. Mrs. Tatlock is also conversant with the worlds of the arts, higher education, and research—serving as a trustee of the American Ballet Theater, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Mayo Foundation, and Vassar College.

In reflecting on these changes at both staff and Trustee levels, I am reminded again of how fortunate all of us at the Foundation are to have such extraordinary colleagues.

*William G. Bowen*  
*March 21, 2003*

## RACE-SENSITIVE ADMISSIONS: BACK TO BASICS\*

*William G. Bowen*  
*President*

*Neil L. Rudenstine*  
*ARTstor Chairman*

The controversy (and confusion) surrounding the White House's recent statements on the use of race in college and university admissions indicate the need for careful examination of the underlying issues. The Justice Department has filed a brief with the U.S. Supreme Court urging it to declare two race-sensitive policies at the University of Michigan unconstitutional; however, the brief does not rule out ever taking race into account, but argues that institutions should first exhaust all "race-neutral" alternatives. Secretary of State Colin Powell has publicly said that he supports not just affirmative action, but also the Michigan policies. National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice says she opposes the specific methods used by Michigan, but recognizes the need to take race into account in admissions.

As the Supreme Court prepares to hear oral arguments in a case that will shape college admissions processes in the coming decades, those of us who believe that such processes should be permitted to include a nuanced consideration of race must speak out clearly as well as forcefully. Too often, we fear, the key issues have been oversimplified or overlooked. Having been personally involved with this highly contentious subject for more than 30 years, we would like to try to frame the discussion by offering a set of nine connected propositions about race and admissions that derive from core human values and substantial empirical research.

### **1. The twin goals served by race-sensitive admissions remain critically important.**

The debate over race-sensitive admissions has relevance only at public and private institutions of higher education that have to choose among considerably more qualified candidates than they

\*The substance of this article was originally published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 7, 2003.

can admit. Essentially all of these “academically selective” colleges and universities have elected to take race into account in making admissions decisions, a fact that, in itself, has considerable import. Race-sensitive admissions programs are intended to serve two important purposes:

- To enrich the learning environment by giving *all* students the opportunity to share perspectives and exchange points of view with classmates from varied backgrounds. The recognition of the educational power of diversity led many colleges and universities—well before the mid-1960s, when the term affirmative action began to be used—to craft incoming classes that included students representing a wide variety of interests, talents, backgrounds, and perspectives. *The Shape of the River*, written by William Bowen and Derek Bok, provides abundant evidence that graduates of these institutions value educational diversity and, in general, are strong supporters of race-sensitive admissions. Survey responses from more than 90,000 alumni of selective colleges and universities show that nearly 80 percent of those who enrolled in 1976 and 1989 felt that their alma mater placed the right amount of emphasis—or not enough—on diversity in the admissions process. That same survey also found that there is much more interaction across racial lines than many people suppose. In the 1989 entering cohort, 56 percent of white matriculants and 88 percent of black matriculants indicated that they “knew well” two or more classmates of the other race.<sup>1</sup>
- To serve the needs of the professions, of business, of government, and of society more generally by educating larger numbers of well-prepared minority students who can assume positions of leadership—thereby reducing somewhat the continuing disparity in access to power and responsibility that is related to race in

<sup>1</sup> William G. Bowen and Derek Bok, *The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000[1998]), pp. 232–3, 241–7. Recognition of the educational value of diversity has a substantial history. For an extended discussion of the value of diversity in higher education as viewed by 19th and 20th century thinkers, see Neil L. Rudenstine, “Diversity and Learning,” *The President’s Report: 1993–95* [Harvard University, 1995], pp. 3–12.

America.<sup>2</sup> Since colonial days, colleges and universities have accepted an obligation to educate individuals who will play leadership roles in society. Today, that requires taking account of the clearly articulated needs of business and the professions for a healthier mix of well-educated leaders and practitioners from varied racial and ethnic backgrounds. Professional groups like the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association, and businesses like General Motors, Microsoft, and American Airlines (among many others), have explicitly endorsed affirmative-action policies in higher education.<sup>3</sup> Leading law firms, hospitals, and businesses depend heavily on their ability to recruit broadly trained individuals from many racial backgrounds who are able to perform at the highest level in settings that are themselves increasingly diverse. A prohibition on the consideration of race in admissions would drastically reduce minority participation in the most selective professional programs.<sup>4</sup> Does it make any sense to resegregate, de facto, many of the country's most respected professional schools and to slow the progress that has been made in achieving diversity within the professions? We don't think so.

<sup>2</sup> In *Bakke*, Justice Powell concluded that achieving the educational benefits of diversity was a compelling reason for considering race in making admissions decisions. But he never suggested that this was the only compelling purpose. We agree with Derek Bok and others that educating individuals who can play leadership roles in helping to meet contemporary societal needs is another vital purpose. Bok, "The Uncertain Future of Race-Sensitive Admissions," January 2003, pp. 2–12; available at [http://www.nacua.org/documents/Uncertain\\_Future\\_of\\_Race\\_Sensitive\\_Admissions\\_Revised.pdf](http://www.nacua.org/documents/Uncertain_Future_of_Race_Sensitive_Admissions_Revised.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> See *Law Brief of the American Bar Association as Amicus Curiae in Support of Defendants-Appellants in Grutter v. Bollinger et al.* (2002); Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association, *Diversity in Medical Education* (1999); *Brief of General Motors Corporation as Amicus Curiae in Support of Defendants in Gratz v. Bollinger et al.* (2001); and *Brief of Jon Abbott Laboratories, American Airlines, et al. as Amici Curiae in Support of Defendants-Appellants in Grutter v. Bollinger et al.* (2001).

<sup>4</sup> See Linda F. Wightman, "The Threat to Diversity in Legal Education: An Empirical Analysis of the Consequences of Abandoning Race as a Factor in Law School Admissions Decisions," *New York University Law Review* 72(1) (1997): 1–53. Wightman computed the number of minority students who would have been admitted on the basis of undergraduate grades and standardized test scores alone using data on every student who applied in 1990–91 to all 173 American Bar Association-approved U.S. law schools. See also Bok, n. 20, p. 12.

## **2. Private colleges and universities are as likely as their public counterparts to be affected by the outcome of this debate.**

The fact that litigation over affirmative action has, thus far, centered on public universities should not lead us to believe that private institutions will be unaffected. The 1996 federal-court ruling in *Hopwood v. Texas*, banning race-sensitive admission policies in Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, has been understood to cover Rice University as well as public universities such as the University of Texas. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 subjects all institutions that receive federal funds to any court determinations as to what constitutes “discrimination.” Because many private colleges and universities have invested substantial resources in creating diverse entering classes, they might well be *more* dramatically affected by any limitation on their freedom to consider race than would most public institutions. That is especially true because they are, in general, smaller and more selective in admissions than their public counterparts.

It matters that minority applicants have access to the most selective programs, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, in both private and public institutions. The argument that they will surely be able to “get in somewhere” rings hollow to many people. As one black woman quoted in *The Shape of the River* observed wryly to a white parent: “Are you telling me that all those white folks fighting so hard to get their kids into Duke and Stanford are just ignorant? Or are we supposed to believe that attending a top-ranked school is important for their children but not for mine?” That interchange was not just about perceptions. Various studies show that the short-term and long-term gains associated with attending the most selective institutions are, if anything, greater for minority students than for white students, and that academic and other resources are concentrated increasingly in the top-tier colleges and universities.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See Bowen and Bok, p. xxxix and references cited therein. Also, see Caroline M. Hoxby, “The Effects of Geographic Integration and Increasing Competitiveness in the Market for College Education,” May 2000 revision of NBER Working Paper No. 6323.

**3. Race-sensitive admissions policies involve much “picking and choosing” among individual applicants; they need not be mechanical, are not quota systems, and involve making bets about likely student contributions to campus life and, subsequently, to the larger society.**

Contrary to what some people believe, admissions decisions at academically selective public and private colleges and universities are much more than a “numbers game.” They involve considerations that extend far beyond test scores and GPAs. Analysis of new data from leading private research universities for the undergraduate class entering in 1999 (reported in the forthcoming *Reclaiming the Game*, by William G. Bowen and Sarah A. Levin) indicates that a very considerable number of high-scoring minority students were turned down. For instance, among male minority applicants with combined SAT scores in the 1200–1299 range (which put them well within the top 10 percent of minority test-takers and the top 20 percent of all test-takers, regardless of race), the odds of admission were about 35 percent: that is, roughly two out of three of these minority applicants were denied admission. At the very top of the SAT distribution (in the 1400-plus range), nearly two out of five were *not* admitted. Public universities are larger and somewhat less selective, but they also turn down very high-scoring minority candidates. At two public universities for which detailed data are available, one out of four minority candidates in the 1200 to 1399 SAT range was rejected.

In short, admissions officers at both private and public universities have been doing exactly what Justice Powell, in the landmark 1978 decision, *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, said that they should be allowed to do: pursuing “race-sensitive” admission policies that entail considering race among other factors. They have been weighing considerations that are both objective (advanced- placement courses taken in high school, for example) and subjective (indications of drive, intellectual curiosity, leadership ability, and so on). And they have been selecting very well. According to all the available evidence, minority students admitted to academically selective colleges and universities as long ago as the mid-1970s have been shown to be successful in completing rigorous graduate programs, doing well in the market-

place, and, most notably, contributing in the civic arena out of all proportion to their numbers.<sup>6</sup>

Minority candidates are, of course, by no means the only group of applicants to receive special consideration. Colleges and universities have long paid special attention to children of alumni, to “development cases,” to applicants who come from poor families or who have otherwise overcome special obstacles, to applicants who will add to the geographic (including international) diversity of the student body, to students with special talents in fields such as music, and, especially in recent years, to athletes. Some readers may be surprised to learn from *Reclaiming the Game* that recruited athletes at many selective colleges are far more advantaged in the admission process (that is, are much more likely to be admitted at a given SAT level) than are minority candidates.

A related topic deserves some emphasis, and that is the issue of “quotas.” There is not space here to discuss the subject in detail, but one point is important to clarify. The fact that the percentage of minority students in many colleges and universities does not fluctuate substantially from year to year is in no sense *prima facie* evidence that quotas are being used. Anyone familiar with admissions processes—and with their basic statistics—knows that percentages for virtually all subgroups of any reasonable size are remarkably consistent from year to year. That is because the size of the college-going population does not change significantly on an annual basis, nor do the number and quality of secondary schools from which institutions draw applications, nor does the number of qualified candidates. All of these numbers are very stable, and it is therefore not at all surprising that incoming college classes should change very little in their composition from year to year. (For example, we suspect that the fraction of an entering class wearing eyeglasses is remarkably consistent from year to year, but that would hardly persuade us that an eyeglass quota is being imposed.)

<sup>6</sup> See Bowen and Bok, chapters 4, 5, and 6. Examples of civic activities include community service, youth organizations, cultural and arts activities, college-related functions such as fund-raising, professional and trade associations, religious activities, and political organizations.

#### **4. Selectivity and “merit” involve predictions about on-campus learning environments and future contributions to society.**

One of the most common misconceptions is that candidates who have scored above some level or earned a certain grade-point average “deserve” a place in an academically selective institution. That “entitlement” notion is squarely at odds with the fundamental principle that, in choosing among a large number of well-qualified applicants, all of whom are over a high threshold, colleges and universities are making bets on the future, not giving rewards for prior accomplishments. Institutions are meant to take well-considered risks. That can involve turning down candidate “A” (who is entirely admissible but does not stand out in any particular way) in favor of candidate “B” (who is expected to contribute more to the educational milieu of the institution and appears to have better long-term prospects of making a major contribution to society). All applicants, of course, deserve to be evaluated fairly, which means treating them the same way as other similarly situated candidates; but, in the words of Lee Bollinger, president of Columbia University and former president of the University of Michigan, “there is no right to be admitted to a university without regard to how the overall makeup of the student body will affect the educational process or without regard to the needs of the society . . .”<sup>7</sup> “Merit” is not a simple concept. It has certainly never meant admitting all the valedictorians who apply, or choosing students strictly on the basis of test scores and GPAs.

An elaborate admissions process, which focuses on the particular characteristics of individuals within many subgroups—and on those of the entire pool of applicants—is designed to craft a class that will, in its diversity, be a potent source of educational vitality.<sup>8</sup> Colleges use a variety of procedures to take account of race, and it is essential that differences of opinion concerning the wisdom (or even the legality) of any single approach not lead to an outcome that precludes other approaches.

<sup>7</sup> Lee C. Bollinger, “Seven Myths About Affirmative Action in Universities,” 38 *Willamette Law Review* 535 (2002), p. 544.

<sup>8</sup> See Rudenstine, pp. 50–51 and p. 54.

**5. Paying special attention to any group in making admissions decisions entails costs; but the costs of race-sensitive admissions have been modest and well-justified by the benefits.**

The “opportunity cost” of admitting any particular student is that another applicant will not be chosen. But such choices are rarely “head-to-head” decisions. For example, there is no reason to believe—as reverse-discrimination lawsuits generally assume—that if a particular minority student had not been accepted, his or her place would have been given to a complainant with comparable or better test scores or grades. The choice might, instead, have been an even higher-scoring minority student who had not been admitted, a student from a foreign country, or a lower-scoring white student from one of several subgroups that are given extra consideration in the admissions process. Making hard choices on the margin is never easy and always—fortunately—involves human judgments made by experienced admissions officers. It is, in any case, wrong to assume that race-sensitive admissions policies have significantly reduced the chances of well-qualified white students to gain admission to the most selective colleges. Findings reported in *The Shape of the River*, based on data for a subset of selective colleges and universities, demonstrate that elimination of race-sensitive policies would have increased the admission rate for white students by less than two percentage points: from roughly 25 percent to 26.5 percent.<sup>9</sup>

It should be emphasized that taking race into account in making admissions decisions does *not* appear to have two kinds of costs often mentioned by critics of these policies.

First, there is no systemic evidence that race-sensitive admissions policies tend to “harm the beneficiaries” by putting them in settings in which they are overmatched intellectually or “stigmatized” to the point that they would have been better off attending a less selective institution. On the contrary, extensive analysis of data reported in *The Shape of the River* shows that minority students at selective schools have, overall, performed well. The more selective the school that they attended, the more likely they were to graduate and earn advanced degrees, the happier they were with

<sup>9</sup> Bowen and Bok, p 26.

their college experience, and the more successful they were in later life.<sup>10</sup>

Second, the available evidence disposes of the argument that the substitution of “race-sensitive” for “race-neutral” admissions policies has led to admission of many minority students who are not well-suited to take advantage of the educational opportunities they are being offered. Examination of the later accomplishments of those students who would have been “retrospectively rejected” under race-neutral policies shows that they did just as well as a hypothetical reference group that might have been admitted if GPAs and test scores had been the primary criteria (which is, itself, a questionable assumption). There are no significant differences in graduation rates, advanced-degree attainment, earnings, civic contributions, or satisfactions with college.<sup>11</sup> In short, the abandonment of race-sensitive admissions would not have removed from campuses a marginal group of mediocre students. Rather, it would have deprived campuses of much of their diversity and diminished the capacity of the academically selective institutions to benefit larger numbers of talented minority students.

## **6. Progress has been made in narrowing test-score gaps between minority students and other students, but gaps remain.**

A frequently asked question is: Are we getting anywhere? Data on average test scores in *Reclaiming the Game* are encouraging. At a group of liberal-arts colleges and universities examined in 1976 and 1995, average combined SAT test scores for minority students rose roughly 130 points at the liberal-arts colleges and roughly 150 points at the research universities. Test scores for other students rose, too, but by much smaller amounts (roughly 30 points at the

<sup>10</sup> Bowen and Bok, pp. xxxi–ii, 60–1, 110–1, 138–40, 198–201.

<sup>11</sup> Bowen and Bok, pp. 281–2. By “race neutral,” we mean that the admissions office is essentially blind to the race of applicants. To estimate the effects of such an admissions policy, Bowen and Bok apply the acceptance rate of white applicants in each SAT range to the black matriculants in that SAT range (31). Thus, if the white acceptance rate were half the black acceptance rate in a given SAT range, half of the black matriculants in that SAT range would have been retrospectively rejected.

liberal-arts colleges and roughly 70 points at the research universities). Test-score gaps narrowed over this period, and the average rank-in-class of minority students on college graduation improved even more than one would have predicted on the basis of test scores alone.<sup>12</sup> As anyone who has studied campus life can attest, there are also many impressionistic signs of progress. Minority students are more involved in a wide range of activities, and increasing numbers of children of minority students of an earlier day are now reaching the age where they are beginning to enroll as “second generation” college students. Graduates are also increasingly making their presence known in the professions and business world.

Still, test-score gaps remain (of roughly 100 to 140 points in the private colleges and universities for which we have data), and so there is still more progress to be made. That is hardly surprising, given the deep-seated nature of the factors that impede academic opportunity and achievement among minority groups—including the fact that a very large proportion of such students continue to attend primary and secondary schools that are underfinanced, insufficiently challenging, and often segregated. It would be naive to expect that a problem as long in the making as the racial divide in educational preparation could be eradicated in a generation or two.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The last statement comparing actual rank-in-class with predicted rank-in-class means that there has also been at least modest progress in reducing academic underperformance by minority students—which was identified as a serious problem in *The Shape of the River*. However, minority students still underperform academically, and Douglas Massey and others continue to analyze the source of this problem, which appears to be closely related to the phenomenon of “stereotype vulnerability” first identified by the Stanford psychologist Claude Steele. (Douglas S. Massey and Mary J. Fischer, “Stereotype Threat and Academic Performance: New Data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen,” University of Pennsylvania Mimeo, June 2002.) Interestingly, academic underperformance by recruited athletes, and especially male athletes playing football, basketball, and hockey, is an appreciably more serious problem than underperformance among minority students. The differences and similarities are examined in Bowen and Levin (forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup> Thus, it seems to us misleading to argue that “affirmative action has failed to integrate colleges” (See report cited in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 8, 2003.)

**7. There are alternative ways of pursuing diversity, but all substitutes for race-sensitive admissions have serious limitations.**

Many of us have a strong appetite for apparently painless alternatives, and it is natural to look for ways to achieve “diversity” without directly confronting the emotion-laden issue of race. Several alternatives to race-sensitive admissions have been suggested. For example, colleges and universities have been urged to:

- Focus on the economically disadvantaged. The argument is that, since racial minorities are especially likely to be poor, racial diversity could be promoted in this way (an approach sometimes referred to as “class-based affirmative action”). The results, however, would not be what some people might expect. Several studies have shown that there are simply very few minority candidates for admission to academically selective institutions who are both poor and academically qualified.<sup>14</sup>
- Adopt a “percentage plan” whereby all high-school students in a state who graduate in the top X percent of their classes are automatically guaranteed a place in one of the state’s universities. In states like Texas, where the secondary-school system is highly segregated, that approach can yield a significant number of minority admissions at the undergraduate level (although the actual effects, even at the undergraduate level, have been shown by the social scientists Marta Tienda and John F. Kain to be more limited than many have suggested).<sup>15</sup> Moreover, the process is highly mechanical. Students in the top X percent are not simply awarded “points,” as the under-

<sup>14</sup> Bowen and Bok, pp. 46–51. See also Thomas J. Kane, “Racial and Ethnic Preferences in College Admission,” in Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips, eds., *The Black-White Test Score Gap* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1998).

<sup>15</sup> Both Tienda and Kain show that the percentage of minority students in Texas public universities has declined significantly at a time when the percentage of minority graduates at the secondary level has risen. See John F. Kain and Daniel M. O’Brien “Hopwood and the Top 10 Percent Law: How They Have Affected the College Enrollment Decisions of Texas High School Graduates,” presented at the National Bureau of Economic Research Meeting on Higher Education (Boston: November 9, 2001; revised December 2002) and Marta Tienda, Kevin T. Leicht, Teresa Sullivan, and Kim Lloyd, “Closing the Gap?: Texas College Enrollments After Affirmative Action,” working paper (January 2003).

graduate program at the University of Michigan does. Rather, they are given automatic admission without any prior scrutiny, and without any consideration of the fact that some high schools are much stronger academically than others.

Even if one considered the top-X-percent plan to be viable at state institutions, it could not work at all at private institutions, which admit from national and international pools of applicants and are so selective that they must turn down the vast majority who apply—including very large numbers of students who graduate at or near the top of their secondary-school classes. Private institutions could not conceivably adopt a policy that would automatically give admission to students in the top X percent of their class at the hundreds and hundreds of schools—worldwide—from which they attract applicants.

The top-X-percent plan is also entirely ineffective at the professional and graduate-school level, because (like selective undergraduate colleges) these schools have national and international applicant pools, with no conceivable “reference group” of colleges to which they could possibly give such an admission guarantee. Even if there were a set of undergraduate colleges whose top graduates would be guaranteed admission to certain professional schools, the result would not represent any marked degree of racial diversity. For example, if the top 10 percent of students in the academically selective colleges and universities studied in *Reclaiming the Game* were offered admission to a professional school (an unrealistically high percentage given the intensely competitive nature of the admissions process), only 3 percent of the students included in that group would be underrepresented minorities—and, of course, only some modest fraction of those students would be interested even in applying to such programs. If we are examining a top-5-percent plan, the minority component of the pool would be about *one-half of 1 percent*. Without some explicit consideration of race, professional schools that ordinarily admit a significant number of their students from selective colleges would simply not be able to enroll a diverse student body.

Other troubling questions include: Do we really want to endorse an admissions approach that depends on de facto segregation at the secondary-school level? Do we want to impose an arbitrary and mechanical admissions standard—based on fixed rank-in-class—on a process that should involve careful consider-

ation of all of an applicant's qualifications as well as thoughtful attention to the overall characteristics of the applicant pool?

- Place heavy weight on “geographic distribution” and so-called “experiential” factors, such as a student's ability to overcome obstacles and handicaps of various kinds, or the experience of living in a home where a language other than English is spoken. The argument here is that, if special attention were given to these and analogous criteria, then a sizeable pool of qualified minority students would automatically be created.

But, as we have mentioned, colleges have been using precisely such criteria for many decades, and they have discovered—not surprisingly—that there are large numbers of very competitive “majority” candidates in all of the suggested categories. For example, if a student's home language is Russian, Polish, Arabic, Korean, or Hebrew, will that be weighted by a college as strongly as Spanish? If not, then the institutions will clearly be giving conscious preference to a group of underrepresented minority students—Hispanic students—in a deliberate way that explicitly takes ethnicity (or, in other cases, race) into account.

Similar issues arise with respect to other experiential categories, as well as geographic distribution. There is no need to speculate about (or experiment with) such approaches, because colleges have already had nearly a half century of experience applying them, and there is ample evidence that the hoped-for results, in terms of minority representation, are not what many people now suggest or claim. Moreover, insofar as such categories were to become surreptitious gateways for minority students, they would soon run the risk of breeding cynicism, and almost certainly inviting legal challenges.

All of the indirect approaches just described pose serious problems. Nor can they be accurately described as “race-neutral.” They have all been proposed with the clear goal (whether practicable or not) of producing an appreciable representation of minority students in higher education. In some cases, they involve the conscious use of a kind of social engineering decried by critics of race-sensitive admissions.

Surely the best way to achieve racial diversity is to acknowledge candidly that minority status is one among many factors that

can be considered in an admissions process designed to judge individuals on a case-by-case basis. We can see no reason why a college or university should be compelled to experiment with—and “exhaust”—all suggested alternative approaches before it can turn to a carefully tailored race-sensitive policy that focuses on individual cases. The alternative approaches are susceptible to systematic analysis, based on experience and empirical investigation. A preponderance of them have been tested for decades. All can be shown to be seriously deficient. Indeed, if genuinely race-neutral (and educationally appropriate) methods were available, colleges and universities would long ago have gladly embraced them.

**8. Reasonable degrees of institutional autonomy should be permitted—accompanied by a clear expectation of accountability.**

As the courts have recognized in other contexts (for example, in giving reasonable deference to administrative agencies), a balance has to be struck between judicial protection of rights guaranteed to all of us by the Constitution and the desirability of giving a presumption of validity to the judgments of those with special knowledge, experience, and closeness to the actual decisions being made.<sup>16</sup> The widely acclaimed heterogeneity of the American system of higher education has permitted much experimentation in admissions, as in other areas, and has discouraged the kinds of government-mandated uniformity that we find in many other parts of the world. Serious consideration should be given to the disadvantages of imposing too many “do’s” and “don’ts” on admissions policies.

The case for allowing a considerable degree of institutional autonomy in such sensitive and complex territory is inextricably tied, in our view, to a clear acceptance by colleges and universities of accountability for the policies they elect and the ways such policies are given effect. There is, to be sure, much more accountability today than many people outside the university world recognize. Admissions practices are highly visible and are subject to challenge by faculty members, trustees and regents, avid investigative reporters, disappointed applicants, and the public at large. Colleges and universities operate in more of a “fishbowl” environ-

<sup>16</sup> See Bok’s long essay for a carefully calibrated discussion of this issue as it relates to the consideration of race in admissions.

ment than the great majority of other private and public entities. Nonetheless, we favor even stronger commitments by colleges and universities to monitor closely how specific admissions policies work out in practice. Studies of outcomes should be a regular part of college and university operations, and if it is found, for example, that minority students (or other students) accepted with certain test scores or other qualifications are consistently doing poorly, then some change in policy—or some change in the personnel responsible for administering the stated policy—may well be in order.

That point was made with special force by a very conservative friend of ours, Charles Exley, former chairman and CEO of NCR Corporation and a onetime trustee of Wesleyan University. In a pointed conversation that one of us (Bowen) will long remember, Exley explained that he held essentially the same view that we hold concerning who should select the criteria and make admissions decisions. “I would probably not admit the same class that you would admit, even though I don’t know how different the classes would be,” he said. “You will certainly make mistakes,” he went on, “but I would much rather live with your errors than with those that will inevitably result from the imposition of more outside constraints, including legislative and judicial interventions.” And then, with the nicest smile, he concluded: “And, if you make *too* many mistakes, the trustees can always fire you!”<sup>17</sup>

## **9. Race matters profoundly in America; it differs fundamentally from other “markers” of diversity, and it has to be understood on its own terms.**

We believe that it is morally wrong and historically indefensible to think of race as “just another” dimension of diversity. It is a critically important dimension, but it is also far more difficult than others to address. The fundamental reason is that racial classifications were used in this country for more than 300 years in the most odious ways to deprive people of their basic rights. The fact that overt discrimination has now been outlawed should not lead us to believe that race no longer matters. As the legal scholar Ronald

<sup>17</sup> The quotation from Exley appeared originally in the paperback edition of *The Shape of the River*, p. xliii.

Dworkin has put it, “the worst of the stereotypes, suspicions, fears, and hatreds that still poison America are color-coded . . .”<sup>18</sup>

The after effects of this long history continue to place racial minorities (and especially African-Americans) in situations in which embedded perceptions and stereotypes limit opportunities and create divides that demean us all. This social reality, described with searing precision by the economist Glenn C. Loury in *The Anatomy of Racial Inequality*, explains why persistence is required in efforts to overcome, day by day, the vestiges of our country’s “unlovely racial history.”<sup>19</sup> We believe that it would be perverse in the extreme if, after many generations when race was used in the service of blatant discrimination, colleges and universities were now to be prevented from considering race at all, when, at last, we are learning how to use nuanced forms of race-sensitive admissions to improve education for everyone and to diminish racial disparities.

The former Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach draws a sharp distinction between the use of race to exclude a group of people from educational opportunity (“racial discrimination”) and the use of race to enhance learning for all students, thereby serving the mission of colleges and universities chartered to serve the public good.<sup>20</sup> No one contends that white students are being excluded by any college or university today simply because they are white.

<sup>18</sup> Ronald Dworkin, “Affirming Affirmative Action.” *The New York Review of Books*, October 22, 1998, pp. 99–100.

<sup>19</sup> See Glenn Loury, *The Anatomy of Racial Inequality* (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2002) and Loury, “Response to Critics of *The Anatomy of Racial Inequality*,” presented at the *First Things* Symposium on *The Anatomy of Racial Inequality* (May 2002). See also Rudenstine, pp. 49–50.

<sup>20</sup> Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, working paper on affirmative action, (January 2003).

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## Summary of Grants and Contributions, 2002

	<i>Payable and Committed at</i>	<i>2002 Grants and Commissions</i>		<i>Payable and Committed at</i>
	<i>Dec. 31, 2001*</i>	<i>Appropriated</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Dec. 31, 2002</i>
Conservation and the Environment . . . . .	\$ 1,999,251	\$ 16,851,000	\$ 18,600,251	\$ 250,000
Museums and Art Conservation . . . . .	11,128,073	15,714,293	13,069,010	13,773,356
Performing Arts . . . . .	2,417,576	16,299,450	16,524,450	2,192,576
Higher Education and Scholarship . . . . .	35,130,614	109,405,205	108,528,594	36,007,225
Population . . . . .	3,652,884	22,485,000	22,510,000	3,627,884
Public Affairs . . . . .	840,019	775,000	1,322,581	292,438
Other . . . . .	—	41,872,500	41,872,500	—
Program Grants & Commitments—Totals . . .	\$ 55,168,417	\$ 223,402,448	\$ 222,427,386	\$ 56,143,479
Contributions . . . . .	—	240,000	235,000	5,000
Totals: . . . . .	<u>\$ 55,168,417</u>	<u>\$ 223,642,448</u>	<u>\$ 222,662,386</u>	<u>\$ 56,148,479</u>

The “Other” category includes disaster related grants, representing the balance of the \$50 million fund approved by the Trustees in 2001.

\* Restated. Reflects one cancellation of commitment of \$250,000.



# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## *Classification of Grants*

### CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

*Appropriated*

#### Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

To support research on the interplay between regulations and technological changes in the automotive industry . . . . .	\$ 85,000
---	-----------

#### Cornell University, Ithaca, New York:

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	486,000
---	---------

#### Duke University, Durham, North Carolina:

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	500,000
---	---------

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	330,000
---	---------

#### Ecological Society of America, Inc., Washington, DC:

To support a joint program to encourage minority participation in ecological research and training . . . . .	850,000
--	---------

To support the expansion of JSTOR's collection of titles in ecology and biology . . . . .	109,000
---	---------

#### Environmental Law Institute, Washington, DC:

To support research on state approaches to the regulation of nonpoint source water pollution . . . . .	200,000
--	---------

CONSERVATION AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Florida International University,  
Miami, Florida:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 440,000

Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 500,000

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 338,000

Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Inc.,  
Millbrook, New York:

To support a planning workshop for a history of Hubbard  
Brook Experimental Forest stream ecology . . . . . 15,000

Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 150,000

Marine Biological Laboratory,  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 850,000

Michigan State University,  
East Lansing, Michigan:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 340,000

Missouri Botanical Garden,  
St. Louis, Missouri:

To support World Wide Web access to the  
information resources of the institution . . . . . 400,000

CONSERVATION AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT

*Appropriated*

(continued)

To digitize rare botanical reference works and make high-quality images available to scholars and others using the Internet . . . . .	200,000
Nacional Financiera Fideicomiso Fondo para la Biodiversidad, Mexico City, Mexico:	
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	340,000
Organization for Tropical Studies, Inc., Durham, North Carolina:	
To provide support for initiating a program of undergraduate courses in ecology in South Africa for South African and US students . . . . .	1,300,000
To support the establishment of a revolving operating reserve fund . . . . .	300,000
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey:	
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	650,000
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, United Kingdom:	
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	340,000
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC:	
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	850,000
South African National Parks, Skukuza, South Africa:	
To support a planning effort for Kruger National Park that would restructure the ways in which it approves and supports outside research projects . . . . .	42,000

CONSERVATION AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Trust for Public Land,  
San Francisco, California:

To provide general support . . . . .	1,500,000
To provide general support . . . . .	1,000,000

United Negro College Fund, Inc.,  
Fairfax, Virginia:

To support a joint program to encourage minority participation in ecological research and training . . . . .	288,000
--	---------

University of Alaska at Fairbanks,  
Fairbanks, Alaska:

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	260,000
---	---------

University of California at Santa Barbara,  
Santa Barbara, California:

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	700,000
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	450,000
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	30,000

University of Colorado at Boulder,  
Boulder, Colorado:

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	260,000
---	---------

University of Florida,  
Gainesville, Florida:

To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	340,000
To support programs of ecosystems research and training . . . . .	300,000

CONSERVATION AND  
THE ENVIRONMENT  
(continued)

*Appropriated*

The University of Fort Hare,  
Alice, South Africa:

To support ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 36,000

University of Maine,  
Orono, Maine:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 67,000

University of Minnesota,  
Minneapolis, Minnesota:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 275,000

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 70,000

University of Natal,  
Durban, South Africa:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 150,000

University of Pennsylvania,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 440,000

University of Washington,  
Seattle, Washington:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 420,000

University of Wisconsin at Madison,  
Madison, Wisconsin:

To support programs of ecosystems research  
and training . . . . . 650,000

Total—Conservation and the Environment

\$16,851,000

MUSEUMS AND  
ART CONSERVATION

*Appropriated*

Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To support a strategic planning process that aims to  
strengthen the Academy's educational programs,  
laboratories, and overall operations . . . . . \$ 48,000

American Museum of Natural History,  
New York, New York:

To provide supplemental funding to support one short-  
term fellowship as part of the pilot initiative to train  
Chinese museum professionals . . . . . 4,293

The Art Institute of Chicago,  
Chicago, Illinois:

To support the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral  
Curatorial Fellowships . . . . . 395,000

Barnes Foundation,  
Merion, Pennsylvania:

To support a collection assessment program, research,  
and permanent collection preservation . . . . . 300,000

Cleveland Museum of Art,  
Cleveland, Ohio:

To support a pilot program to introduce Chinese museum  
professionals to American museum practices . . . . . 23,000

Emory University,  
Atlanta, Georgia:

To strengthen the educational role of the Michael C.  
Carlos Museum's collections and programs . . . . . 475,000

Frick Collection,  
New York, New York:

To establish a predoctoral curatorial fellowship  
program . . . . . 488,000

MUSEUMS AND  
ART CONSERVATION  
(continued)

*Appropriated*

George Eastman House,  
Rochester, New York:

To support training in the field of photograph conservation . . . . .	1,500,000
To support an evaluation of the achievements and prospects of the Advanced Residency Program in Photograph Conservation . . . . .	17,200

Metropolitan Museum of Art,  
New York, New York:

To endow the position of Scientist in Charge . . . . .	1,500,000
To support a pilot program to introduce Chinese museum professionals to American museum practices . . . . .	100,000
To provide a pilot program to introduce Chinese museum professionals to American museum practices . . . . .	91,000

Museum Associates,  
Los Angeles, California:

To endow and support the position of Senior Conservation Scientist and to purchase scientific equipment . . . . .	1,860,000
---	-----------

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston,  
Boston, Massachusetts:

To support the purchase of scientific equipment . . . . .	362,000
---	---------

Museum of Modern Art,  
New York, New York:

To support the purchase of scientific equipment . . . . .	215,000
To support costs for one year of interim distribution of the MoMA Digital Design Collection by Luna Imaging, Inc. and for essential updating of catalogue data . . . . .	42,500

National Gallery of Art,  
Washington, DC:

To support the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Curatorial Fellowships . . . . .	475,000
---	---------

MUSEUMS AND  
ART CONSERVATION

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Philadelphia Museum of Art,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To strengthen the permanent endowment for scholarly  
publications . . . . . 2,500,000

To support the Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral  
Curatorial Fellowships . . . . . 280,000

Princeton University,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To strengthen the educational role of the Princeton  
University Art Museum's collections and programs . . . 700,000

Rhode Island School of Design,  
Providence, Rhode Island:

To support an endowment to strengthen the  
educational role of collections and programs . . . . . 850,000

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey,  
New Brunswick, New Jersey:

To support an endowment to strengthen the  
educational role of collections and programs . . . . . 700,000

Smithsonian Institution,  
Washington, DC:

To support a pilot program to introduce Chinese museum  
professionals to American museum practices . . . . . 15,000

To support a pilot program to introduce Chinese museum  
professionals to American museum practices . . . . . 2,300

University of Delaware,  
Newark, Delaware:

To support training in the field of photograph  
conservation . . . . . 199,000

Wadsworth Atheneum,  
Hartford, Connecticut:

To support the endowment of the position of Senior  
Curator of European Painting and Sculpture . . . . . 1,250,000

MUSEUMS AND  
ART CONSERVATION  
(continued)

*Appropriated*

Walters Art Gallery Endowment Foundation, Inc.,  
Baltimore, Maryland:

To support the position of Conservation Scientist . . . . 955,000

Worcester Art Museum,  
Worcester, Massachusetts:

To support the purchase of scientific equipment . . . . . 350,000

Yale University,  
New Haven, Connecticut:

To support the publication of the Yale University  
Art Gallery's *Early Italian Painting: Approaches to  
Conservation* resulting from the symposium held in  
April 2002 . . . . . 17,000

Total—Museums and Art Conservation \$15,714,293

## PERFORMING ARTS

*Appropriated*Actors Theatre of Louisville, Inc.,  
Louisville, Kentucky:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	\$ 100,000
--	------------

American Repertory Theatre Company, Inc.,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	400,000
--	---------

American Symphony Orchestra League,  
New York, New York:

To support costs of a planning study on conductor training and residencies . . . . .	25,000
--	--------

Appalshop, Inc.,  
Whitesburg, Kentucky:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	250,000
--	---------

Ballet Theatre Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the creation of new work . . . . .	1,200,000
---	-----------

Bang On A Can, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the Bang On A Can Summer Institute of Music . . . . .	150,000
--	---------

The Vivian Beaumont Theater, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	400,000
--	---------

Berkeley Repertory Theatre,  
Berkeley, California:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	300,000
--	---------

## PERFORMING ARTS

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Brooklyn Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra, Inc.,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support programming initiatives of the 2002/03 season . . . . .	18,500
--	--------

Center Theatre Group of Los Angeles,  
Los Angeles, California:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	400,000
--	---------

Cornerstone Theater Company, Inc.,  
Los Angeles, California:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	300,000
--	---------

Creative Capital Foundation,  
New York, New York:

To support and enhance services to participating artists . . . . .	50,000
--	--------

Dance USA,  
Washington, DC:

To support a forum for artistic directors of major ballet companies . . . . .	16,500
---	--------

Di Capo Opera Theatre Corp.,  
New York, New York:

To support Fast Forward at Di Capo Opera, a series of concerts and semi-staged operas not yet produced by major opera companies . . . . .	40,000
---	--------

Eugene O'Neill Memorial Theater Center, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	100,000
--	---------

## PERFORMING ARTS

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Hartford Stage Company, Inc.,  
Hartford, Connecticut:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	300,000
--	---------

Kansas City Symphony,  
Kansas City, Missouri:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	850,000
--	---------

To support the research and development of the orchestra's Technology Initiative .....	50,000
--	--------

Manhattan Theatre Club, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	250,000
--	---------

Martha Graham Center of Contemporary Dance, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the planning activities of the Martha Graham Archive Project .....	50,000
---	--------

Meet the Composer, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	1,500,000
--	-----------

Musical Arts Association,  
Cleveland, Ohio:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	800,000
--	---------

New Jersey Symphony Orchestra,  
Newark, New Jersey:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	850,000
--	---------

## PERFORMING ARTS

*Appropriated*

(continued)

New York Shakespeare Festival,  
New York, New York:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	300,000
--	---------

Perseverance Theatre, Inc.,  
Douglas, Alaska:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	200,000
--	---------

Roundabout Theatre Company, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	400,000
--	---------

Seattle Repertory Theatre,  
Seattle, Washington:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	300,000
--	---------

South Coast Repertory, Inc.,  
Costa Mesa, California:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	300,000
--	---------

St. Louis Symphony Society,  
St. Louis, Missouri:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	850,000
--	---------

Steppenwolf Theatre Company,  
Chicago, Illinois:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development .....	100,000
--	---------

Teachers College—Columbia University,  
New York, New York:

To support an international study of the dance field . . .	49,450
--	--------

## PERFORMING ARTS

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Theatre and Arts Foundation of San Diego County,  
La Jolla, California:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	100,000
--	---------

Theatre Communications Group, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the New Generations Program . . . . .	1,800,000
--	-----------

Toledo Orchestra Association, Inc.,  
Toledo, Ohio:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	600,000
--	---------

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,  
Blacksburg, Virginia:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	2,500,000
--	-----------

To support costs of the Orchestra Forum . . . . .	50,000
---	--------

Washington Drama Society, Inc.,  
Washington, DC:

To support artistic initiatives and organizational development . . . . .	300,000
--	---------

Washington Opera,  
Washington, DC:

To support the Washington Opera's production of Samuel Barber's <i>Vanessa</i> . . . . .	50,000
--	--------

Total—Performing Arts

---



---

\$16,299,450

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

Aga Khan Foundation USA,  
Washington, DC:

To support a review of higher education in Pakistan . . . \$ 50,000

American Anthropological Association,  
Arlington, Virginia:

To support the planning of an online information service  
for distributing electronic journals and related scholarly  
materials of interest to anthropologists . . . . . 50,000

American Council of Learned Societies,  
New York, New York:

To support the Charles A. Ryskamp Research Fellowship  
program for advanced junior faculty members . . . . . 1,274,000

To support the Charles A. Ryskamp Research Fellowship  
program for advanced junior faculty members . . . . . 1,270,000

To support an editorial project of *The Correspondence  
of Charles Darwin* . . . . . 220,000

To support the Frederick Burkhardt Residential  
Fellowship program for faculty members . . . . . 86,000

To support two editorial projects of *The Correspondence  
of William James* . . . . . 75,000

American Indian College Fund,  
Denver, Colorado:

To support the Fund's plan to increase the number of  
American Indian students pursuing graduate degrees  
and academic careers, and to support professional  
development for faculty members at tribal colleges  
and universities . . . . . 50,000

American Institute of Physics,  
College Park, Maryland:

To support the documentation of the history of  
physicists in industry . . . . . 98,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

American Philosophical Society,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To support a program of fellowships for mid-career college and university faculty members in the humanities and social sciences that would supplement their sabbatical salaries and permit them to spend a full year on research . . . . . 2,000,000

American School of Classical Studies at Athens,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To support a roundtable discussion concerning the school's libraries . . . . . 6,600

American University of Paris, Inc.,  
Paris, France:

To support academic services and collaboration between its library and the American Library in Paris . . . . . 175,000

To support faculty development and assessment costs . . . . . 25,550

Amherst College,  
Amherst, Massachusetts:

To support programs designed to increase faculty involvement in residential life . . . . . 100,000

Anatolia College,  
Boston, Massachusetts:

To support a core library collection and faculty training in the use of information technology . . . . . 300,000

Appalachian College Association,  
Berea, Kentucky:

To support the expansion of electronic collections, to extend development opportunities for library staff, and to fund an endowment for collection fees and library operations . . . . . 1,900,000

To design a plan that would centralize technological services . . . . . 200,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

ARTstor Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support initial operating costs, to be paid after  
ARTstor achieves tax-exempt status . . . . . 5,000,000

Asian University for Women Support Foundation,

New York, New York:

To support planning efforts to establish the Asian  
University for Women . . . . . 25,000

Associated Colleges of the South, Inc.,

Atlanta, Georgia:

To support an evaluation of a joint distance education  
program in classics . . . . . 380,000

To support a collaborative environmental studies  
program . . . . . 230,000

Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training,

Arlington, Virginia:

To support the *Legacy Project: Oral Histories of Minority  
Foreign Service and Foreign Service Officers*, the first  
compilation of oral histories about the roles and con-  
tributions of minorities in the formulation, execution,  
and articulation of US foreign policy . . . . . 40,000

Association of American Colleges and Universities,

Washington, DC:

To support research on how liberal arts colleges  
address global preparation and democratic engagement  
for their students . . . . . 50,000

Association pour le Rayonnement des Arts asiatiques

(Musée Guimet),

Paris, France:

To support the completion of the digitization and  
documentation of the Paul Pelliot photographic  
collection . . . . . 285,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Atlanta University Center, Inc.,  
Atlanta, Georgia:

To support two libraries serving private, historically  
black colleges and universities . . . . . 100,000

Bard College,  
Annandale-on-Hudson, New York:

To support the Bard-Smolny Virtual Campus project . . . 450,000

To support programs designed to increase faculty  
involvement in residential campus life . . . . . 90,000

Barnard College,  
New York, New York:

To support programs designed to increase faculty  
involvement in residential campus life . . . . . 100,000

Bennett College,  
Greensboro, North Carolina:

To support strengthening selected aspects of its  
programs . . . . . 200,000

Berea College,  
Berea, Kentucky:

To support research at Berea College on the  
determinantsof student attrition . . . . . 38,000

Bowdoin College,  
Brunswick, Maine:

To support programs designed to increase faculty  
involvement in residential campus life . . . . . 100,000

The British Library,  
London, United Kingdom:

To support initiatives by research libraries to develop  
new models for assisting scholars, and managing and  
disseminating scholarly information . . . . . 151,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

British Museum,  
London, United Kingdom:

To support the digitization and documentation of  
Dunhuang-related objects to be included in the  
Mellon International Dunhuang Archive . . . . . 380,000

Brown University,  
Providence, Rhode Island:

To support pilot projects to improve the academic  
support and research skills of students within  
institutions participating in the Mellon Minority  
Undergraduate Fellowship Program . . . . . 250,000

Bryn Mawr College,  
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania:

To support the appointment of new junior or  
intermediate-level faculty members in the humanities  
and social sciences in advance of faculty retirements . . . 770,000

To strengthen the collaborative collection management  
program in the Tri-College Library Consortium  
(Tripod) . . . . . 450,000

To provide supplemental support for the 2002  
summer program, designed to prepare women for  
doctoral programs in mathematics . . . . . 6,800

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,  
Washington, DC:

To support the junior fellows program . . . . . 500,000

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences,  
Stanford, California:

To support summer institutes for young scholars . . . . 450,000

Center for Research Libraries,  
Chicago, Illinois:

To support catalog initiatives, distributed print  
archives, and cooperative collection development . . . . 510,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

To support planning for the systematic preservation of Web-based documents for scholarly researchers . . .	445,000
To support an international meeting to plan the initial activities of the newly established Center for South Asia Libraries . . . . .	11,000
China Cultural Property Promotion Association, Beijing, China:	
To support the costs of training staff of the State Administration of Cultural Heritage to design and implement projects involving digital photography and computer processing of digital images at cultural sites . . . . .	14,400
Citizens' Scholarship Foundation of America, Inc., St. Peter, Minnesota:	
To support the involvement of liberal arts colleges in programs designed to prepare low-income and minority students for higher education . . . . .	50,000
Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California:	
To support an evaluation of the use of instructional technologies in graduate education in the humanities . . . .	190,000
Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, California:	
To support a collaborative academic computing program . . . . .	665,000
Columbia University, New York, New York:	
To develop computational linguistic techniques that identify and extract metadata from text sources . . . .	542,000
Committee of University Principals, Pretoria, South Africa:	
To build management capacity at South African universities subject to confirmation of exempt status . .	250,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut:	
To support programs in information literacy . . . . .	660,000
The Constitutional Court Trust, Braamfontein, South Africa:	
To support the establishment of the Virtual Law Library at the South African Constitutional Court . . .	500,000
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York:	
To support further development of Project Euclid, an electronic publishing initiative of the Cornell University Library in the fields of theoretical and applied mathematics . . . . .	400,000
To support a survey of students on the effects of the Foundation's Graduate Education Initiative, and a subsequent analysis of the data that will be collected . . .	185,000
To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . .	171,000
To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . .	139,000
To support plans to develop new models of academic support by the libraries of research universities . . . . .	120,000
To support data collection activities related to the Graduate Education Initiative . . . . .	48,000
To support institutional subventions provided in the New Directions Fellowships awarded to Professors Delia Graff and Annette Richards, but which were erroneously omitted from the original budget request . .	20,000
Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, DC:	
To provide support for representatives from select historically black colleges and Appalachian colleges to attend a conference on library development . . . . .	10,500

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Council on Library and Information Resources,  
Washington, DC:

To support higher education leaders' annual workshop  
on improving scholarly communications . . . . . 656,000

Courtauld Institute of Art,  
London, United Kingdom:

To strengthen its faculty and enrich its scholarly  
activities . . . . . 1,400,000

Dartmouth College,  
Hanover, New Hampshire:

To support the creation of a descriptive catalog of  
the Institute of Current World Affairs' archive . . . . . 18,200

Debrecen University,  
Egyetem, Hungary:

To support librarians' attendance of the Foundation-  
sponsored Tallinn Conference on Union Catalogs . . . . . 12,000

DePauw University,  
Greencastle, Indiana:

To support new curricular projects . . . . . 197,000

Dillard University,  
New Orleans, Louisiana:

To support the libraries at private, historically black  
colleges and universities . . . . . 300,000

East Asian History of Science Trust,  
Cambridge, United Kingdom:

To support long-term fellowships for historians of  
science from the People's Republic of China and  
short-term fellowships for US scholars at the  
Needham Research Institute . . . . . 555,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Fisk University,  
Nashville, Tennessee:

To support strengthening selected aspects of its  
programs . . . . . 250,000

Five Colleges, Inc.,  
Amherst, Massachusetts:

To support the planning of an academic career  
network to make the institutions more attractive  
to dual-career couples in the academy . . . . . 600,000

To support the Five College Center for the Study  
of World Languages' plan to incorporate electronic  
technology into two language classes . . . . . 75,000

To support the development of a new Five College media  
studies center . . . . . 45,000

Foundation for Library and Information  
Service Development Ltd.,  
Pretoria, South Africa:

To support a feasibility study by the National Library  
of South Africa for resource sharing among South  
Africa's legal deposit libraries . . . . . 25,000

Gallaudet University,  
Washington, DC:

To support curriculum enhancement . . . . . 500,000

Gettysburg College,  
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania:

To support planning efforts for Gettysburg,  
Dickinson, and Franklin and Marshall Colleges to  
build a collaborative program for faculty development . . . . . 50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Graduate School and University Center,  
City University of New York,  
New York, New York:

To support a fund for the recruitment and retention of humanities faculty . . . . .	1,000,000
To plan an online archive of moving images documenting dance history and performance . . . . .	166,000
To support a study comparing the outcomes of open admission at CUNY with national data on the effects of college education . . . . .	50,000

Grinnell College,  
Grinnell, Iowa:

To support faculty career enhancement . . . . .	600,000
To support postdoctoral fellowship programs . . . . .	500,000

Hampshire College,  
Amherst, Massachusetts:

To support new curricular initiatives for undergraduate students . . . . .	250,000
---	---------

Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts:

To support a Distinguished Achievement Award . . . . .	1,500,000
To support the International Seminar on the History of the Atlantic World, 1500–1825, and related activities . . .	725,000
To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . .	235,000
To support research on market changes for higher education . . . . .	225,000
To support the completion of a project to digitize and catalog a collection of photographs documenting American women's history . . . . .	140,000
To support the development of a standard document type definition that would facilitate the exchange of elec- tronic journals from publishers to digital archives . . . .	41,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Historical Society of Pennsylvania,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To improve access to library special collections . . . . . 490,000

Howard University,  
Washington, DC:

To support the completion of a research project to document the influence and involvement of African Americans in the South African struggle against racial discrimination . . . . . 260,000

Indiana University,  
Bloomington, Indiana:

To support the development of an archive of ethnomusicological moving image recordings . . . . . 875,000

Institute for Advanced Study,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To support a revitalized economics program, a new art history program, and a scholarship for active professors emeriti . . . . . 1,200,000

To support an assessment of information technology needs of Vietnamese institutions of higher education, a study of the feasibility of creating a Digital Resource Center in Ho Chi Minh City, and the delivery of JSTOR to the Fulbright Economics Teaching Program . . . . . 48,000

International House,  
New York, New York:

To recruit and provide scholarships for South African students, interns, and trainees . . . . . 150,000

Ithaca Harbors, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To provide funds for startup and initial operating activities, to be paid after Ithaca achieves tax-exempt status . . . . . 5,000,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland:

To support testing of the usability of a metadata  
harvester system for sheet music . . . . . 11,000

Johnson C. Smith University,  
Charlotte, North Carolina:

To support two libraries serving private, historically  
black colleges and universities . . . . . 250,000

To support strengthening selected aspects of its  
programs . . . . . 75,000

JSTOR,  
New York, New York:

To support the initial stage of development of a  
centralized digital archive that would preserve  
electronic journals . . . . . 1,285,000

King's College London,  
London, United Kingdom:

To support a study on the use of computational  
linguistics methods for the extraction of keyword  
information from digital library content . . . . . 50,000

Knox College,  
Galesburg, Illinois:

To support efforts to restructure the academic  
program . . . . . 50,000

Lake Forest College,  
Lake Forest, Illinois:

To strengthen the college's educational and cultural  
ties with the city of Chicago . . . . . 250,000

Lehigh University,  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania:

To support the continuation of a program offering  
Web-based introductory classes . . . . . 370,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

To support new curricular projects . . . . .	90,000
Library Information Network Consortium, Rīga, Latvia:	
To support the purchase of a new library automation server . . . . .	35,000
To support Latvian librarian participation at the Tallinn Conference and an upgrade of the Library Information Network Consortium's servers . . . . .	32,000
Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota:	
To support research projects on higher education and a conference series . . . . .	370,000
To support president-led initiatives geared to influence future directions . . . . .	180,000
Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts:	
To support an online system that indexes and organizes taxonomic information about biological organisms . . .	500,000
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts:	
To support the implementation of a digital repository system at several research institutions . . . . .	300,000
Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Foerderung der Wissenschaften e.V., Munich, Germany:	
To improve access to library special collections . . . . .	375,000
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan:	
To assist the National Archives in its planning to accession, organize, catalog, and provide public access to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's records	50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Missouri Botanical Garden,  
St. Louis, Missouri:

To support the purchase and implementation of an  
online library system to be shared by three research  
institutions . . . . . 279,000

Modern Language Association of America,  
New York, New York:

To support the development of a book on electronic  
textual editing for scholarly publications . . . . . 40,000

Morehouse College,  
Atlanta, Georgia:

To support the learning resource center . . . . . 1,000,000

Mount Holyoke College,  
South Hadley, Massachusetts:

To support research on the consequences of adopting  
a new admissions policy in which the submission of  
Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) results are optional . . . 290,000

To support the establishment of a research and  
development program at the National Library of  
the Czech Republic for the preservation of  
water-damaged materials . . . . . 100,000

To support a working conference of institutions in  
the Academic Community Program . . . . . 46,000

To support a planning process focused on the  
academic programs of the college . . . . . 40,000

To support librarians' attendance of the Foundation-  
sponsored Tallinn Conference on Union Catalogs . . . . 15,000

National Academy of Sciences,  
Washington, DC:

To support the Board on Science, Technology, and  
Economic Policy's initiative to make public various  
reports from its Committee on Intellectual Property  
Rights in the Knowledge-Based Economy . . . . . 50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

The National and University Library of Iceland,  
Reykjavik, Iceland:

To support the planning of a common Web interface  
for searching across the collections of digitized  
historical newspapers in seven Nordic countries . . . . . 28,000

National Film Preservation Foundation,  
San Francisco, California:

To support the development, testing, and publication  
of reference tools for film preservation . . . . . 165,000

National Humanities Center,  
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina:

To support a series of summer institutes focused on  
the intensive study of selected literary works for junior  
faculty members in departments of literature . . . . . 693,000

To support a program of transatlantic summer institutes,  
based in the United States and Europe, for recent PhDs  
in the humanities and related social sciences . . . . . 570,000

New School University,  
New York, New York:

To support seminars that examine the historical and  
cultural sources of significant contemporary  
developments . . . . . 110,000

To support a plan to include a concentration on the city  
in the undergraduate curriculum . . . . . 24,000

New York Public Library,  
New York, New York:

To support the development of a plan to process and  
catalog the archives of Cuban scholar Fernando Ortiz . . . 9,700

The New-York Historical Society,  
New York, New York:

To support the development of a policy for  
collecting documents and objects relating to  
contemporary history . . . . . 50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Northwestern University,  
Evanston, Illinois:

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities and related social sciences . . . . .	930,000
To support the completion of the digital photography, image processing, and cataloging of the cave art in Dunhuang, China, as part of the development of the Mellon International Dunhuang Archive . . . . .	550,000
To support the Dunhuang Research Academy's efforts to use the digital photography of Dunhuang cave art to develop a virtual cave tour . . . . .	145,000
To support seminars that examine the historical and cultural sources of significant contemporary developments . . . . .	110,000
To support the planning of a project in which the Dunhuang Research Academy would use coverage and Quick-Time Virtual Reality photography to create a virtual cave experience in a new visitor education center . . . . .	21,000

Oberlin College,  
Oberlin, Ohio:

To support the appointment of new junior or intermediate-level faculty members in the humanities and social sciences in advance of faculty retirements . . . . .	795,000
To support pilot projects to improve the academic support and research skills of students within institutions participating in the Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program . . . . .	250,000
To support the planning of a collaborative project among head librarians at Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Occidental, Swarthmore, and Wellesley Colleges and the Atlanta University Center institutions that would attract students from diverse backgrounds to the library profession . . . . .	20,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

PEN American Center, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support a series of long-range planning meetings  
for the leadership of International PEN . . . . . 50,000

Philander Smith College,  
Little Rock, Arkansas:

To support strengthening selected aspects of its  
programs . . . . . 350,000

To support increased faculty involvement in the  
design of an honors program . . . . . 11,000

Phillips Academy–Andover,  
Andover, Massachusetts:

To support the Institute for the Recruitment of  
Teachers' recruitment of outstanding minority  
undergraduates . . . . . 750,000

Pomona College,  
Claremont, California:

To support postdoctoral fellowship programs . . . . . 500,000

To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . . 176,000

Princeton University,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To support a survey of students on the effects of the  
Foundation's Graduate Education Initiative, and a  
subsequent analysis of the data that will be collected . . 2,166,000

To support a Distinguished Achievement Award . . . . . 1,500,000

To support a Distinguished Achievement Award . . . . . 1,500,000

To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . . 270,000

To support pilot projects to improve the academic  
support and research skills of students within  
institutions participating in the Mellon Minority  
Undergraduate Fellowship Program . . . . . 250,000

To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . . 172,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

To support a feasibility study for creating a medieval module for ARTstor . . . . .	41,100
To support the investigation into the possibility of creating an online archive of university lectures and to address technical challenges related to Web-based audio, video, and other digital media . . . . .	25,000
To support a study of public research universities in the United States . . . . .	25,000
To support an investigation into the desirability and feasibility of examining the governance of public and private universities . . . . .	25,000
Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey:	
To provide additional support for planning the development of the Electronic Enlightenment project . . . . .	10,000
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia:	
To support new curricular initiatives for undergraduate students . . . . .	200,000
Reed College, Portland, Oregon:	
To support faculty career enhancement . . . . .	730,000
The Regents of the University of California, Oakland, California:	
To support planning for the systematic preservation of Web-based documents of interest to scholarly researchers . . . . .	150,000
Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale, Inc., New York, New York:	
To support the Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale, Inc. in its efforts to enhance its database of music bibliography . . . . .	71,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

The Research Collections and Preservation  
Consortium, Inc.,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To support a feasibility study of a repository for  
artifactual collections . . . . . 30,500

Research Libraries Group, Inc.,  
Mountain View, California:

To support the implementation of the Union Catalog  
on the Web . . . . . 680,000

Rhodes University,  
Grahamstown, South Africa:

To support honors-year fellowships for students from  
disadvantaged backgrounds and to encourage such  
students to pursue graduate degrees . . . . . 418,000

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities . . . 125,000

To support a visit and study of Canadian and Amer-  
ican universities to further the development of higher  
education and education policy in South Africa . . . . . 10,500

Rice University,  
Houston, Texas:

To support a workshop in which members of the  
project team and advisory committee for the Visual  
Resources Association's guide to visual resource  
cataloging would review and revise the contents  
of the draft guide . . . . . 10,000

Rochester Institute of Technology,  
Rochester, New York:

To develop and implement a spectral digital  
imaging system . . . . . 874,000

Royal Holloway and Bedford New College,  
Egham, United Kingdom:

To support the development of online scholarly  
editions of major literary and musical works . . . . . 110,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Saint Augustine's College,  
Raleigh, North Carolina:

To support strengthening selected aspects of its  
programs . . . . . 75,000

School of Oriental and African Studies,  
London, United Kingdom:

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities  
and related social sciences . . . . . 683,000

To support a half-time position to work with scholars  
on new activities at the School's Centre of  
Contemporary Central Asia and the Caucasus . . . . . 16,300

Scripps College,  
Claremont, California:

To support a program of importance to the institution 250,000

Skidmore College,  
Saratoga Springs, New York:

To support faculty career enhancement . . . . . 80,000

Smith College,  
Northampton, Massachusetts:

To support faculty career enhancement . . . . . 2,500,000

To support postdoctoral fellowship programs . . . . . 500,000

To support foreign study programs . . . . . 165,000

Social Science Research Council,  
New York, New York:

To support the International Dissertation Field  
Research Program . . . . . 4,050,000

To support the administration of the Mellon Minority  
Undergraduate Fellowship Conferences for graduate  
students and recent PhDs . . . . . 1,500,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

To administer the Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship's Predoctoral Research Program for graduate students . . . . .	1,000,000
South African Bibliographic and Information Network, Centurion, South Africa:	
To support costs associated with the South African delegation to the Mellon Foundation Conference on Union Catalogs in Tallinn, Estonia . . . . .	11,000
Southern Education Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia:	
To support the expansion of the Instructional Technology Assistance Project . . . . .	640,000
To support the libraries at private, historically black colleges and universities . . . . .	175,000
To support the design of a leadership program for presidents of historically black colleges and universities . . . . .	125,000
To support strategic planning activities instituted by a new president . . . . .	50,000
Spelman College, Atlanta, Georgia:	
To support strengthening selected aspects of its programs	123,000
St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York:	
To support planning for the Connect New York Library consortium for independent colleges . . . . .	40,000
St. Mary's College of Maryland, St. Mary's City, Maryland:	
To support international student exchange . . . . .	35,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Stanford University,  
Stanford, California:

To support further development and implementation  
of a distributed system for the long-term archiving  
of electronic journals . . . . . 1,000,000

To support the development of an “Assignment and  
Assessment manager,” an open-source, modular,  
learning support tool that would operate within the  
Foundation-supported Open Knowledge Initiative  
framework . . . . . 560,000

To support the evaluation of a program for the  
delivery of instruction in political science to  
classrooms in Russian universities . . . . . 275,000

State University of New York at Buffalo,  
Buffalo, New York:

To support the development of online scholarly  
editions of major literary and musical works . . . . . 170,000

Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz,  
Berlin, Germany:

To support a meeting of German and American  
art historians and curators to explore the need for  
and feasibility of building shared image databases . . . . 39,000

Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation,  
Los Angeles, California:

To support a pilot project that would explore the  
scholarly uses of a large and important digital video  
archive in the research and instructional programs  
of three research universities . . . . . 1,000,000

To support a meeting at which representatives from  
the Shoah Foundation and three research universities  
would identify the technical requirements for making  
Shoah’s online video oral history database accessible  
at the three institutions . . . . . 9,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Teachers College—Columbia University,  
New York, New York:

To establish and support a Visiting Minority Scholars  
Program . . . . . 300,000

Temple University,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To support a history of the Higher Education  
Resources Service . . . . . 320,000

To support research on the history of the Higher  
Education Resources Service program . . . . . 43,455

Tougaloo College,  
Tougaloo, Mississippi:

To support strengthening selected aspects of its programs 85,000

Trinity College,  
Hartford, Connecticut:

To support a six-month data collection and analysis  
project concerning the costs of athletic expenditures  
in New England Small College Athletic Conference  
programs . . . . . 30,000

Trust for African Rock Art,  
Chicago, Illinois:

To support the digitization of a collection of  
photographs of African rock art . . . . . 243,000

Tufts University,  
Medford, Massachusetts:

To support the exploration of digital materials  
within and among collections . . . . . 470,000

Tuskegee University,  
Tuskegee, Alabama:

To support planning and evaluation for integrating  
technology into the liberal arts curriculum . . . . . 50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Union College,  
Schenectady, New York:

To support the second phase of the College Retirement Project . . . . .	795,000
To support the faculty retirement project . . . . .	47,000

Union Institute,  
Cincinnati, Ohio:

To support a strategic planning process instituted by a new president . . . . .	20,000
---	--------

University Library Bratislava,  
Bratislava, Slovakia:

To support the software license needed for the Slovak union catalog . . . . .	34,000
---	--------

University of Aberdeen,  
Aberdeen, United Kingdom:

For seminars that examine the historical and cultural sources of significant contemporary developments . . .	107,000
--	---------

University of California at Berkeley,  
Berkeley, California:

To support research on pricing and the nature of competition in the scholarly journals industry . . . . .	395,000
To support initiatives aimed at strengthening the role university humanities centers play in the instructional and scholarly activities of their home institutions . . . . .	300,000
To support doctoral training in Latin American sociology . . . . .	250,000
To support research and teaching focused on the structure and performance of the US scientific research system . . . . .	197,000
To support the development of a program to enhance undergraduate student research and information skills	138,000
To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . .	131,000
To support a New Directions Fellowship . . . . .	121,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of California at Irvine,  
Irvine, California:

To support seminars that examine the historical  
and cultural sources of significant contemporary  
developments . . . . . 110,000

University of California at Los Angeles,  
Los Angeles, California:

To support the creation and study of three-  
dimensional, virtual reality computer models of  
buildings and monuments in ancient Rome . . . . . 750,000

To support a summer program in the humanities  
and social sciences . . . . . 370,000

To support doctoral training in Latin American sociology . . . . . 250,000

To support the California Medieval History Seminar . . . . . 90,000

University of California at Riverside,  
Riverside, California:

To support graduate research workshops in the  
humanities . . . . . 166,000

University of California at San Diego,  
La Jolla, California:

To create a prototype union catalog for art images . . . . . 750,000

To support the selection, documentation, and  
digitization of images for ARTstor's Image Gallery . . . . . 98,000

University of California at Santa Barbara,  
Santa Barbara, California:

To support initiatives by research libraries to develop  
new models for assisting scholars, and for managing  
and disseminating scholarly information . . . . . 40,000

University of Cape Town,  
Cape Town, South Africa:

To support an eight-month study of strategies employed  
by the University of Cape Town to enhance racial and  
socioeconomic equity in enrollment and completion . . . . . 44,300

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of Cape Town Fund, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support a fellowship program for black students at the University of Cape Town Opera School and support for the Opera School . . . . .	500,000
To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities	125,000
To support the development and strengthening of the Academy of Science of South Africa . . . . .	75,000
To support the professional development needs of women in leadership positions in universities and technikons in South Africa . . . . .	39,500

University of Chicago,  
Chicago, Illinois:

To support a Distinguished Achievement Award . . . . .	1,500,000
To support initiatives aimed at strengthening the role university humanities centers play in the instructional and scholarly activities of their home institutions . . . . .	300,000
To support dissertation seminars in the humanities . . . . .	191,000

University of Colorado Foundation, Inc.,  
Boulder, Colorado:

To support the American Economic Association Summer Minority Program . . . . .	85,000
--	--------

University of Denver,  
Denver, Colorado:

To support the professional development needs of women in leadership positions in universities and technikons in South Africa . . . . .	550,500
To support research on the history of the Higher Education Resources Service program . . . . .	50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of Hertfordshire,  
Hatfield, United Kingdom:

To support an analysis of the policies, organization,  
and costs associated with the digital and print-based  
reproduction services of art museums . . . . . 200,000

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,  
Champaign, Illinois:

To support an initiative to strengthen the humanities . . . 1,250,000

To support the retrospective conversion of library  
card catalog records to a standard electronic format . . . 1,000,000

To support the development of requirements for  
standardized databases of digitized music that  
researchers would use to test the effectiveness of  
computer-assisted methods of retrieving musical  
information . . . . . 47,000

University of Kentucky,  
Lexington, Kentucky:

To support the production of an electronic edition  
of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* . . . . . 20,000

University of London,  
London, United Kingdom:

To support a planning and pilot study for an online  
library of scholarly resources for the study of British  
history and access to JSTOR . . . . . 235,000

University of Massachusetts at Boston,  
Boston, Massachusetts:

To support a new president . . . . . 48,000

University of Michigan,  
Ann Arbor, Michigan:

To support a Distinguished Achievement Award . . . . . 1,500,000

To support initiatives aimed at strengthening the role  
university humanities centers play in the instructional  
and scholarly activities of their home institutions . . . . . 300,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of Natal,

Durban, South Africa:

To support the creation of a digital archive of  
South African scholarly materials . . . . . 240,000

To provide discretionary institutional support for  
vice-chancellors . . . . . 150,000

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities 125,000

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,

Chapel Hill, North Carolina:

To support efforts to encourage minority students to  
consider academic careers in the humanities, social  
sciences, and fine arts . . . . . 650,000

University of Oxford,

Oxford, United Kingdom:

To support the purchase of equipment for a conservation  
laboratory . . . . . 1,000,000

To support the further development of an online  
database of correspondence that formed the basis of  
18th-century philosophical, political, economic, and  
scientific debates . . . . . 391,000

To support seminars that examine the historical and  
cultural sources of significant contemporary  
developments . . . . . 102,000

University of Pennsylvania,

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To support initiatives aimed at strengthening the  
role university humanities centers play in the  
instructional and scholarly activities of their home  
institutions . . . . . 300,000

To support the development of an Internet-based  
format conversion service that would facilitate the  
long-term preservation of digital information . . . . . 150,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of Puget Sound,  
Tacoma, Washington:

To support the development of a campus life  
master plan . . . . . 48,500

University of Southern California,  
Los Angeles, California:

To catalog, digitize, and expand the photographic  
archive of ancient Near Eastern inscriptions . . . . . 750,000

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the  
humanities and humanistic social sciences . . . . . 649,000

Stellenbosch University,  
Matieland, South Africa:

To provide discretionary support for vice-chancellors . . . 150,000

University of Texas at Austin,  
Austin, Texas:

To support doctoral training in Latin American sociology 250,000

To support research on the economic returns of  
different college majors . . . . . 40,000

University of Texas at Dallas,  
Richardson, Texas:

To support research on factors affecting Texas high  
school students decisions to attend college and the  
effects of recent rulings barring the use of race in  
college admissions . . . . . 350,000

University of the South,  
Sewanee, Tennessee:

To support programs designed to increase faculty  
involvement in residential campus life . . . . . 125,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of the Western Cape,  
Bellville, South Africa:

To provide discretionary support for the vice-chancellor 150,000

University of the Witwatersrand,  
Johannesburg, South Africa:

To prepare students for academic careers and to help  
retain leading faculty members . . . . . 1,000,000

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities 125,000

To support the University of the Witwatersrand's  
Rock Art Research Institute meeting to plan a  
South African Rock Art Digital Archive . . . . . 20,500

University of Toronto,  
Toronto, Canada:

To support postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities  
and related social sciences . . . . . 792,000

To support research expenses associated with the  
preparation of a major paper for the Mellon Foundation  
Conference on Union Catalogs in Tallinn, Estonia . . . 8,000

University of Virginia,  
Charlottesville, Virginia:

To support improved access to library special collections 265,000

To support seminars that examine the historical and  
cultural sources of significant contemporary developments 110,000

To support a survey of scholarly needs and resources in  
preparation for the development of virtual collections  
in American Studie . . . . . 47,000

University of Warsaw,  
Warsaw, Poland:

To support the participation of Polish librarians in  
the Tallinn Conference on Union Catalogs . . . . . 12,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

University of Washington,  
Seattle, Washington:

To support plans to develop new models of academic  
support by the libraries of research universities . . . . . 40,000

Ursinus College,  
Collegeville, Pennsylvania:

To support faculty career enhancement . . . . . 170,000

Vassar College,  
Poughkeepsie, New York:

To support the planning of an archive of digital  
images related to Dante and his works . . . . . 41,300

Virginia Historical Society,  
Richmond, Virginia:

To improve access to library special collections . . . . . 196,000

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,  
Blacksburg, Virginia:

To support a plan for developing a virtual collection  
of scholarly resources for the study of the history of  
Jamestown, Virginia . . . . . 219,000

Voorhees College,  
Denmark, South Carolina:

To strengthen selected aspects of its programs . . . . . 250,000

Washington and Jefferson College,  
Washington, Pennsylvania:

To support the implementation of a new curriculum . . . . . 25,000

Washington College,  
Chestertown, Maryland:

To support new curricular projects . . . . . 123,000

Wellesley College,  
Wellesley, Massachusetts:

To support foreign study programs . . . . . 165,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Wesleyan University,  
Middletown, Connecticut:

To support faculty career enhancement . . . . . 610,000

Western Cape Tertiary Institutions Trust,  
Cape Town, South Africa:

To implement regional academic program  
collaboration in the Western Cape of South Africa . . . 100,000

Wheaton College,  
Norton, Massachusetts:

To support new curricular projects . . . . . 250,000

Whittier College,  
Whittier, California:

To support curriculum enhancement . . . . . 89,000

Willamette University,  
Salem, Oregon:

To support foreign study programs . . . . . 480,000

Williams College,  
Williamstown, Massachusetts:

To support faculty career enhancement . . . . . 690,000

To support research and training in the economics  
of higher education . . . . . 463,000

To support the new president's efforts to initiate  
collaborative projects between the college and  
Williamstown . . . . . 50,000

Wofford College,  
Spartanburg, South Carolina:

To support the new president . . . . . 50,000

HIGHER EDUCATION  
AND SCHOLARSHIP

*Appropriated*

(continued)

Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To support The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation  
Fellowships in Humanistic Studies . . . . . 3,600,000

To support a survey of major national programs  
that provide support for graduate study and that  
are specifically available to members of under-  
represented minority groups . . . . . 25,000

Yale University,  
New Haven, Connecticut:

To support postdoctoral fellowships associated with  
its libraries' special collections . . . . . 500,000

To support improved access to library special  
collections . . . . . 330,000

To support improved access to library special  
collections . . . . . 175,000

To support dissertation seminars in the humanities . . . 103,000

Total—Higher Education and Scholarship \$109,405,205

## POPULATION

*Appropriated*Alan Guttmacher Institute,  
New York, New York:

To support key organizations that conduct population policy research and analysis . . . . .	\$ 1,650,000
---	--------------

American University in Cairo,  
New York, New York:

To support regional research and training programs in demography and population studies . . . . .	400,000
---	---------

American University of Beirut,  
New York, New York:

To support regional research and training programs in demography and population studies . . . . .	260,000
---	---------

Australian National University,  
Acton, Australia:

To support research and training programs related to urbanization in developing countries . . . . .	150,000
---	---------

Baylor College of Medicine,  
Houston, Texas:

To support junior investigators and contraceptive research . . . . .	420,000
--	---------

To support junior investigators, contraceptive research, and a minority program . . . . .	150,000
---	---------

Brown University,  
Providence, Rhode Island:

To support research and training programs related to urbanization and migration in developing countries . . . . .	500,000
---	---------

To support advanced training of demographers from developing countries . . . . .	270,000
--	---------

To support research and training programs related to urbanization in developing countries . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

Christian Children's Fund,  
Richmond, Virginia:

To support research and training activities related to social and psychological programs for populations in crisis . . . . .	40,000
--	--------

## POPULATION

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Cooperative for Assistance and  
Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE),  
Atlanta, Georgia:

To support initiatives to increase minority representa-  
tion in the field of humanitarian assistance . . . . . 250,000

Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support public education and policy analysis in  
the field of forced migration . . . . . 90,000

Duke University,  
Durham, North Carolina:

To support applied research on refugee children  
and adolescents . . . . . 60,000

Georgetown University,  
Washington, DC:

To support professional associations in the fields  
of population and forced migration . . . . . 25,000

Graduate School and University Center,  
City University of New York,  
New York, New York:

To support research and training programs in the  
field of forced migration . . . . . 450,000

Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts:

To support a research cluster on immigrant incorpora-  
tion into the United States and western Europe . . . . . 400,000

To support a demographic study of the partition  
of India . . . . . 250,000

Immigration and Refugee Services of America,  
Washington, DC:

To support public education and policy analysis in  
the field of forced migration . . . . . 180,000

## POPULATION

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Interaction American Council for Voluntary  
International Action, Inc.,  
Washington, DC:

To support initiatives to increase minority representation in the field of humanitarian assistance . . . . . 300,000

International Center for Research on Women,  
Washington, DC:

To support the completion of an evaluation on the  
“Participatory Project on Adolescent Reproductive  
Health in Nepal” . . . . . 25,000

International Rescue Committee, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support public education and policy analysis in  
the field of forced migration . . . . . 180,000

To support research and training activities related to  
social and psychological programs for populations  
in crisis . . . . . 40,000

Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland:

To support regional research and training programs  
in demography and population studies . . . . . 75,000

Lawyers Committee for Human Rights,  
New York, New York:

To support public education and policy analysis in  
the field of forced migration . . . . . 150,000

Massachusetts General Hospital,  
Boston, Massachusetts:

To support research and training activities related to  
social and psychological programs for populations  
in crisis . . . . . 40,000

Medical College of Hampton Roads,  
Arlington, Virginia:

To support CONRAD and CICCR in the area of  
contraceptive development . . . . . 1,500,000

To support CONRAD in research collaboration  
between US reproductive biology centers and similar  
centers in developing countries . . . . . 1,000,000

## POPULATION

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Mercy Corps International,  
Portland, Oregon:

To support research and training activities related to  
social and psychological programs for populations  
in crisis . . . . . 40,000

Migration Policy Institute,  
Washington, DC:

To support public education and policy analysis in  
the field of forced migration . . . . . 200,000

National Academy of Sciences,  
Washington, DC:

To support key organizations that conduct population  
policy research and analysis . . . . . 450,000

To support public education and policy analysis in  
the field of forced migration . . . . . 40,000

Population Association of America, Inc.,  
Silver Spring, Maryland:

To support professional associations in the fields of  
population and forced migration . . . . . 180,000

Population Council,  
New York, New York:

To support key organizations that conduct population  
policy research and analysis . . . . . 1,500,000

To support advanced training of demographers from  
developing countries . . . . . 250,000

Princeton University,  
Princeton, New Jersey:

To support research and training programs related to  
urbanization and migration in developing countries . . . 500,000

Queen Margaret University College, Edinburgh,  
Edinburgh, United Kingdom:

To support research and training activities related to  
social and psychological programs for populations  
in crisis . . . . . 750,000

## POPULATION

(continued)

*Appropriated*Refugees International,  
Washington, DC:

To support public education and policy analysis in the field of forced migration . . . . .	180,000
--	---------

Research Foundation of State University of New York,  
Albany, New York:

To support research and training programs related to urbanization and migration in developing countries . . .	440,000
---	---------

To support research and training programs related to urbanization in developing countries . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

Save the Children Federation, Inc.,  
Westport, Connecticut:

To support initiatives to increase minority representation in the field of humanitarian assistance . . . . .	250,000
--	---------

To support research and training activities related to social and psychological programs for populations in crisis . . . . .	40,000
--	--------

Social Science Research Council,  
New York, New York:

To support a conference on forced migration and human rights . . . . .	20,000
--	--------

Tufts University,  
Medford, Massachusetts:

To support research and training programs in the field of forced migration . . . . .	680,000
--	---------

Universidad de Costa Rica,  
San Jose, Costa Rica:

To support regional research and training programs in demography and population studies . . . . .	260,000
---	---------

Université de Montréal,  
Montreal, Canada:

To support research and training programs related to urbanization and migration in developing countries . . .	375,000
---	---------

## POPULATION

(continued)

*Appropriated*

University of Kansas Medical Center  
 Research Institute, Inc.,  
 Kansas City, Kansas:

To support junior investigators and contraceptive  
 research . . . . . 150,000

University of Michigan,  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan:

To support research and training programs related to  
 urbanization and migration in developing countries . . . 500,000

To support a major assessment of research on changes  
 in family systems worldwide . . . . . 115,000

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,  
 Chapel Hill, North Carolina:

To support research and training programs related to  
 urbanization and migration in developing countries . . . 500,000

To support junior investigators and contraceptive  
 research . . . . . 420,000

To support junior investigators and contraceptive  
 research . . . . . 420,000

To support junior investigators and contraceptive  
 research . . . . . 150,000

To support research and training programs related  
 to urbanization in developing countries . . . . . 100,000

University of Oxford,  
 Oxford, United Kingdom:

To support research and training programs in the field  
 of forced migration . . . . . 750,000

To support applied research on refugee children and  
 adolescents . . . . . 750,000

To support professional associations in the fields of  
 population and forced migration . . . . . 100,000

## POPULATION

(continued)

*Appropriated*University of Pennsylvania,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

To support research and training programs related to urbanization and migration in developing countries . . . .	600,000
To support junior investigators and contraceptive research . . . . .	420,000
To support junior investigators and contraceptive research . . . . .	420,000
To encourage talented minority students to enroll in doctoral programs in demography . . . . .	300,000
To support advanced training of demographers from developing countries . . . . .	170,000
To support junior investigators and contraceptive research . . . . .	150,000
To support research and training programs related to urbanization in developing countries . . . . .	100,000
To support efforts to increase the number of minority students enrolling in graduate study in demography . . .	20,000

University of Texas at Austin,  
Austin, Texas:

To support research and training programs related to urbanization and migration in developing countries . .	450,000
To support research and training programs related to urbanization in developing countries . . . . .	340,000
To support research and training programs related to urbanization in developing countries . . . . .	100,000

University of Virginia,  
Charlottesville, Virginia:

To support junior investigators, contraceptive research, and a minority program . . . . .	250,000
---	---------

Total—Population

\$22,485,000

## PUBLIC AFFAIRS

*Appropriated*

Vera Institute of Justice, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support postdoctoral fellowships for the study of  
race, crime, and justice . . . . . \$ 775,000

Total—Public Affairs \$ 775,000

## OTHER

*Appropriated*

Aaron Davis Hall, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . \$ 50,000

The Actors' Fund of America,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . 100,000

Alley Pond Environmental Center, Inc.  
Douglaston, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . . 75,000

Alliance of Resident Theatres,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . 35,000

Alvin Ailey Dance Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . 350,000

American Craft Museum,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . 100,000

American Federation of Arts, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . 150,000

American Folk Art Museum,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 275,000

To assist further the institution in compensating for  
the losses it incurred as a result of the events of  
September 11, 2001 . . . . . 200,000

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

American Museum of Natural History,  
New York, New York:

To cover the losses the institution incurred as a result of September 11, 2001, and to support feasibility studies and planning for major forthcoming exhibitions and associated educational programs . . . . 1,750,000

American Museum of the Moving Image,  
Astoria, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 200,000

American Music Center, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 35,000

American Symphony Orchestra League,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 100,000

Amigos Del Museo Del Barrio, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 600,000

To further assist you in compensating for the losses your institution incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 200,000

The Apollo Theater Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 100,000

Asia Society,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 450,000

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

To assist further in compensating for the losses the institution incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

Ballet Theatre Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	1,000,000
--	-----------

The Vivian Beaumont Theater, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	675,000
--	---------

Big Apple Circus, Ltd.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	200,000
--	---------

Bronx Museum of the Arts,  
Bronx, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	275,000
--	---------

To assist further in compensating for the losses the institution incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	50,000
---	--------

Brooklyn Academy of Music, Inc.,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	1,000,000
--	-----------

Brooklyn Botanic Garden Corporation,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	300,000
--	---------

Brooklyn Children's Museum Corp.,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	225,000
--	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Brooklyn Information & Culture, Inc.,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 100,000

Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To help compensate for the losses the institution  
incurred as a result of September 11, 2001, and to  
preserve staff positions and important educational  
programs while also maintaining momentum in  
fundraising to gain greater financial stability . . . . . 1,500,000

Brooklyn Public Library,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To cover the losses New York City's three public  
branchlibrary systems have incurred from the  
reduction in government support of core operations  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 867,000

The Carnegie Hall Corporation,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 500,000

Central Park Conservancy, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . . 300,000

Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 50,000

Children's Museum of Manhattan Growth Through  
Art & Museum Experience, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 225,000

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*City Center 55th Street Theater Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	35,000
---	--------

City Parks Foundation,  
New York, New York:

To provide grants to small parks organizations and projects in New York City . . . . .	1,000,000
---	-----------

To provide grants to mid-sized parks organizations in New York City . . . . .	750,000
--	---------

To provide general operating support . . . . .	300,000
--	---------

College Art Association of America, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	50,000
---	--------

College Community Services, Inc.,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	25,000
---	--------

Conservancy for Historic Battery Park, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . .	400,000
--	---------

Council on the Arts & Humanities for Staten Island,  
Staten Island, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	20,000
---	--------

Cunningham Dance Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	25,000
---	--------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Dahesh Museum, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	50,000
---	--------

Dance Theatre of Harlem, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	700,000
---	---------

Dia Center for the Arts, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To assist the institution in compensating for the losses it incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and in particular to enable it to embark on a program of research to document and publish its collections . . . . .	275,000
---	---------

Discalced, Inc.,

Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	175,000
---	---------

Drawing Center, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	185,000
---	---------

To assist further in compensating for the losses the institution incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	40,000
---	--------

Educational Broadcasting Corporation,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	500,000
---	---------

Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center/

Lucy Moses School for Music and Dance,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	75,000
---	--------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

## Eldridge Street Project, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	15,000
---	--------

## Frick Collection,

New York, New York:

To help compensate for the losses the institution incurred as a result of September 11, 2001, and to reschedule the Toledo exhibition and support the costs of a one-year pilot program of evening hours . . .	270,000
---	---------

## The Graduate School of Figurative Art of the

New York Academy of Art,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	125,000
---	---------

## Greenbelt Conservancy, Inc.,

Staten Island, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . .	60,000
--	--------

## Green Guerillas, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . .	80,000
--	--------

## The Harlem School of the Arts, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

## Henry Street Settlement,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	150,000
---	---------

## International Center of Photography,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	200,000
---	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*International Print Center New York,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	50,000
---	--------

Intrepid Museum Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

Isabel O'Neil Foundation for the Art  
of the Painted Finish, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	50,000
---	--------

Jacques Marchais Museum of Tibetan Art, Inc.,  
Staten Island, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	130,000
---	---------

Jazz at Lincoln Center, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	300,000
---	---------

Jewish Museum,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and to help help meet the costs of enhanced and expanded security	740,000
---	---------

Joyce Theater Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

Kings Majestic Corporation,  
Brooklyn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	240,000
---	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Lehman College Center for the Performing Arts, Inc.,  
Bronx, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 50,000

Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 500,000

A Living Memorial to the Holocaust:  
Museum of Jewish Heritage,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 140,000

Lower East Side Tenement Museum,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 300,000

Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 1,000,000

Manhattan Theatre Club, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 450,000

Metropolitan Museum of Art,  
New York, New York:

To cover the losses the institution incurred as a result  
of the events of September 11, 2001, to support  
maintenance of the Museum's Education Program,  
and to assist in meeting the costs of security and  
gallery access . . . . . 1,750,000

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

## Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.,

## New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	250,000
---	---------

## The Museum for African Art,

## New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	250,000
---	---------

## Museum of American Financial History,

## New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	30,000
---	--------

## Museum of Modern Art,

## New York, New York:

To cover a portion of the losses the institution incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and to facilitate its efforts to expand its visitor base in the five New York City boroughs . . . . .	1,750,000
---	-----------

## Museum of the City of New York,

## New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and to restore staff positions . . . . .	600,000
--	---------

## National Academy of Design,

## New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	300,000
---	---------

## The New 42nd Street, Inc,

## New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	825,000
---	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*New Museum of Contemporary Art,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	650,000
---	---------

New York Botanical Garden,  
Bronx, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	650,000
---	---------

New York City Ballet, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	400,000
---	---------

New York City Opera, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	400,000
---	---------

New York Foundation for the Arts, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	35,000
---	--------

New York Hall of Science,  
Corona, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	200,000
---	---------

New York Public Library,  
New York, New York:

To cover the losses New York City's three public branch library systems have incurred from the reduction in government support of core operations as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	1,185,000
--	-----------

To help cover the losses the New York Public Library's Research Libraries incurred from the reduction in New York City support as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	732,500
---	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

New York Restoration Project, New York, New York:		
To provide general operating support . . . . .	300,000	
New York Shakespeare Festival, New York, New York:		
To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	200,000	
New York Studio School of Drawing, Painting and Sculpture, Inc., New York, New York:		
To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	85,000	
New York University Medical Center Foundation, New York, New York:		
To support the Enid Haupt Glass Garden at the Rusk Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, to help cover the losses that the institution incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	25,000	
Parks Council, Inc., New York, New York:		
To provide general operating support . . . . .	300,000	
Paul Taylor Dance Foundation, Inc., New York, New York:		
To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	125,000	
Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York, Inc., New York, New York:		
To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	250,000	
The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, New York:		
To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and to contribute to its insurance costs . . . . .	225,000	

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Playwrights Horizons, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	175,000
---	---------

Poets House, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	25,000
---	--------

Prospect Park Alliance, Inc.,

Brooklyn, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . .	300,000
--	---------

Queens Borough Public Library,

Jamaica, New York:

To cover the losses New York City's three public branch library systems incurred from the reduction in government support of core operations as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	838,000
---	---------

Queens Botanical Garden Society, Inc.,

Flushing, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	150,000
---	---------

Queens Council on the Arts, Inc.,

Woodlawn, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	40,000
---	--------

Queens Museum of Art,

Queens, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and to enable it to rehire essential staff and maintain program stability while planning for the future . . . . .	150,000
--	---------

Randall's Island Sports Foundation, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . .	100,000
--	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Riverside Park Fund, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To provide general operating support . . . . .	85,000
--	--------

Roundabout Theatre Company, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	675,000
---	---------

Second Stage Theatre, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

Smithsonian Institution,

Washington, DC:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	750,000
---	---------

To compensate for the losses the institution incurred as a result of September 11, 2001, and to help sustain its exhibition and educational programs . . . . .	750,000
--	---------

Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	150,000
---	---------

Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, Inc.,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	150,000
---	---------

South Street Seaport Museum,

New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	350,000
---	---------

Staten Island Botanical Garden, Inc.,

Staten Island, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	100,000
---	---------

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*

Staten Island Children's Museum,  
Staten Island, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 225,000

Staten Island Historical Society, Inc.,  
Staten Island, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 150,000

Staten Island Zoological Society, Inc.,  
Staten Island, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 25,000

The Studio Museum in Harlem, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001,  
to meet its most urgent security needs, and to  
contribute to stabilization . . . . . 600,000

Symphony Space, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 150,000

Theatre Development Fund, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 200,000

Theatreworks/USA Corp.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 150,000

Town Hall Foundation, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred  
as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . . 75,000

## OTHER

(continued)

*Appropriated*Wave Hill, Inc.,  
Riverdale, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	200,000
---	---------

Whitney Museum of American Art,  
New York, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001, and to preserve and develop scholarly, conservation, and educational activities . . . . .	1,500,000
--	-----------

Wildlife Conservation Society,  
Bronx, New York:

To support the institution following losses incurred as a result of the events of September 11, 2001 . . . . .	300,000
---	---------

Total—Other

<u>\$41,872,500</u>
---------------------

## CONTRIBUTIONS

*Appropriated*

Association of Governing Boards of Universities  
and Colleges,  
Washington, DC:

To provide general support . . . . . \$ 35,000

Council on the Environment, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To support its Waste Prevention and Recycling Service 30,000

Doe Fund, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To provide general support . . . . . 30,000

Eviction Intervention Services,  
New York, New York:

To provide general support . . . . . 40,000

Foundation Center,  
New York, New York:

To provide general support . . . . . 30,000

Marymount Manhattan College,  
New York, New York:

To support the introduction of a new first-year  
program for entering students . . . . . 40,000

Nonprofit Coordinating Committee  
of New York, Inc.,  
New York, New York:

To provide general support . . . . . 35,000

Total—Contributions

\$ 240,000

Grand Totals

\$223,642,448

*Financial Statements*



## REPORT OF INDEPENDENT AUDITORS

To the Board of Trustees of  
The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

In our opinion, the accompanying balance sheets and the related statements of activities and cash flows present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (the "Foundation") at December 31, 2002 and 2001 and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Foundation's management; our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits on these statements in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatements. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, and evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

*PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP*

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP  
New York, New York  
May 9, 2003

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## *Balance Sheets*

*At December 31, 2002 and 2001*

	<i>December 31,</i>	
	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Investments:		
Marketable securities . . . . .	\$2,532,039	\$3,067,215
Limited liquidity investments . . . . .	935,119	938,199
Other . . . . .	<u>73,500</u>	<u>66,000</u>
	3,540,658	4,071,414
Cash . . . . .	2,764	7,842
Investment and other income receivable . . . . .	6,370	11,630
Receivable from unsettled securities sales . . . . .	10,067	27,491
Tax refunds receivable . . . . .	7,805	6,201
Other assets . . . . .	225	—
Property, at cost less accumulated depreciation of \$4,457 and \$3,974 at December 31, 2002 and 2001, respectively . . . . .	<u>32,731</u>	<u>10,989</u>
Total assets . . . . .	<u>\$3,600,620</u>	<u>\$4,135,567</u>
<b>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</b>		
Grants payable . . . . .	\$ 8,130	\$ 15,877
Payable from unsettled securities purchases . . . . .	23,598	85,566
Accrued expenses . . . . .	2,710	2,710
Deferred federal excise tax . . . . .	—	1,365
Long term debt . . . . .	<u>28,500</u>	<u>          </u>
Total liabilities . . . . .	62,938	105,518
Net assets (unrestricted) . . . . .	<u>3,537,682</u>	<u>4,030,049</u>
Total liabilities and net assets . . . . .	<u>\$3,600,620</u>	<u>\$4,135,567</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## Statements of Activities

For the years ended December 31, 2002 and 2001

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
<b>INVESTMENT RETURN:</b>		
Loss on investments:		
Realized . . . . .	(\$ 74,975)	(\$ 50,554)
Unrealized, net . . . . .	(258,761)	(464,386)
Interest . . . . .	26,268	32,088
Dividends . . . . .	48,940	56,629
Other income . . . . .	13,253	9,684
	<u>(245,275)</u>	<u>(416,539)</u>
Less: Investment expenses . . . . .	(12,848)	(13,444)
Net investment return . . . . .	<u>(258,123)</u>	<u>(429,983)</u>
<b>EXPENSES:</b>		
Program grants and contributions, net . . . . .	213,912	189,063
Grantmaking operations . . . . .	8,507	9,281
Direct charitable activities: . . . . .		
Digital initiatives—ARTstor and Ithaka . . . . .	6,486	2,053
Research . . . . .	1,401	942
Investment operations . . . . .	2,672	2,215
Current provision for taxes . . . . .	689	3,950
Other expenses . . . . .	577	294
	<u>234,244</u>	<u>207,798</u>
Change in net assets . . . . .	(492,367)	(637,781)
Net assets (unrestricted) at beginning of year . . . . .	<u>4,030,049</u>	<u>4,667,830</u>
Net assets (unrestricted) at end of year . . . . .	<u>\$3,537,682</u>	<u>\$4,030,049</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## Statements of Cash Flows

For the years ended December 31, 2002 and 2001

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Cash flow from investment income and operations:		
Interest and dividends received . . . . .	\$ 80,297	\$ 102,155
Other income received . . . . .	13,203	9,204
Grant refunds received . . . . .	1,004	429
Federal tax refund received . . . . .	8	2,948
Grants and contributions paid . . . . .	(222,663)	(182,322)
Investment expenses paid . . . . .	(13,157)	(13,874)
Salaries and other operating expenses paid . . . . .	(18,843)	(14,177)
Taxes paid . . . . .	<u>(2,300)</u>	<u>(9,317)</u>
Net cash used by investment income and operations . . . . .	<u>(162,451)</u>	<u>(104,954)</u>
Cash flow from investing activities:		
Proceeds from sales of marketable securities:		
Short-term . . . . .	2,739,529	4,086,445
Other . . . . .	3,212,604	3,637,608
Receipts from limited liquidity investments . . . . .	86,364	72,664
Capital gain distributions received . . . . .	16,874	9,006
Net returns on financial instruments . . . . .	5,307	2,610
Purchases of marketable securities:		
Short-term . . . . .	(2,626,398)	(3,983,773)
Other . . . . .	(3,127,357)	(3,578,099)
Purchases of limited liquidity investments . . . . .	(155,594)	(153,680)
Additions to property and other assets . . . . .	<u>(22,456)</u>	<u>( 223)</u>
Net cash provided by investing activities . . . . .	<u>128,873</u>	<u>92,558</u>
Cash flow from financing activities:		
Bond proceeds . . . . .	28,500	—
Net decrease in cash . . . . .	(5,078)	(12,396)
Cash at beginning of year . . . . .	<u>7,842</u>	<u>20,238</u>
Cash at end of year . . . . .	<u>\$ 2,764</u>	<u>\$ 7,842</u>
<i>Supplemental Disclosure of Noncash Investing Activities:</i>		
Distributions of securities received from limited liquidity investments . . . . .	<u>\$ 7,949</u>	<u>\$ 142,654</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## Statements of Cash Flows (continued)

For the years ended December 31, 2002 and 2001

### Reconciliation of Change in Net Assets to Net Cash Used by Investment Income and Operations

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Change in net assets . . . . .	(\$492,367)	(\$637,781)
Adjustments to reconcile change in unrestricted net assets to net cash used by investment income and operations:		
Realized loss on investments . . . . .	74,975	50,554
Decrease in unrealized appreciation of investments . . . .	260,126	474,086
Decrease in income receivable . . . . .	5,260	13,217
(Decrease) increase in grants payable . . . . .	(7,747)	7,170
Decrease in accrued expenses . . . . .	—	(245)
Depreciation and amortization expense . . . . .	491	425
Decrease in deferred federal excise tax payable . . . . .	(1,365)	(9,700)
Increase in tax refunds receivable . . . . .	(1,604)	(2,421)
Net effect of bond amortization/accretion . . . . .	(220)	(259)
Total adjustments . . . . .	<u>329,916</u>	<u>532,827</u>
Net cash used by investment income and operations . . . . .	<u>(\$162,451)</u>	<u>(\$104,954)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

# The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

## NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

### NOTE 1—ORGANIZATION AND SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES:

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (the “Foundation”), a not-for-profit corporation under the laws of the State of New York, is the result of the consolidation on June 30, 1969 of the Old Dominion Foundation into the Avalon Foundation with the name of the Avalon Foundation being changed to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The Avalon Foundation had been founded by Ailsa Mellon Bruce, Andrew W. Mellon’s daughter. The Old Dominion Foundation had been established in 1941 by Paul Mellon, Andrew W. Mellon’s son. The Foundation makes grants in four core program areas: higher education; museums and art conservation; performing arts; and conservation and the environment.

In addition to grantmaking activities, Foundation staff engage in research in areas that inform the Foundation’s mission, principally in issues that relate to higher education. In 2002, the Foundation provided major start-up support for two digital initiatives (ARTstor Inc. and Ithaka Harbors, Inc.) that are expected to become independent not-for-profit entities in 2003.

The financial statements of the Foundation have been prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. The significant accounting policies followed are described below.

#### *Investments:*

Investments in marketable securities are stated at market value. Market value is determined using daily closing last trade prices, where available, for all tradeable instruments on any global stock exchange. Realized gains and losses on investments in securities are calculated based on the first-in, first-out identification method.

Limited liquidity investments are stated at estimated fair value. Limited liquidity investments are primarily made under agreements to participate in limited partnerships and are generally subject to certain withdrawal restrictions. These investments are valued on the basis of the Foundation’s equity in the net assets of such partnerships. Values for these partnerships, which may include investments in both nonmarketable and market-traded securities, are provided by the general partner and may be based on historical cost, appraisals, market values discounted for concentration of ownership, or other estimates. Because of the inherent uncertainty of valuing the investments in such partnerships and certain of the underlying investments held by the partnerships, the Foundation’s estimate of fair value may differ significantly from the values that would have been used had a ready market for the investments existed. The financial statements of the limited partnerships are audited annually by independent auditing firms.

The other investment is the Foundation’s 100% interest in a trust which owns property from which the Foundation receives the net income. Other income is principally the income

from this trust, derived from royalties from coal mining, with minor amounts of income from timbering and oil and gas wells. The value of the Foundation's investment is determined based on an estimate of the discounted value of the anticipated future income from the remaining mineral reserves and of the value of the standing timber. The properties are recorded at an estimated current value of \$73.5 million at December 31, 2002 and \$66 million at December 31, 2001.

*Grants:*

Grant appropriations include both conditional and unconditional grants. Unconditional grants are expensed when appropriated. Certain grants are approved by the Trustees subject to the grantee fulfilling specific conditions, most frequently that all or a portion of the grant funds be matched in a specified ratio. Such conditional grants are considered commitments and are not recorded as expense until the conditions of the grant are met. Substantially all grants payable are due within one year and are recorded at face value.

*Taxes:*

The Foundation qualifies as a tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and, accordingly, is generally not subject to federal income taxes. However, the Foundation is subject to a federal excise tax. The Foundation follows the policy of providing for federal excise tax on the net appreciation (both realized and unrealized) of investments. The deferred federal excise tax in the accompanying financial statements represents tax provided on the net unrealized appreciation of investments. The Foundation is subject to income tax at corporate rates on certain income that is considered unrelated business income under the Internal Revenue Code.

*Property:*

Property primarily consists of land, buildings, and their improvements, located in New York City. These buildings are depreciated on a straight-line basis over their useful lives, generally twenty-five to twenty-eight years.

*Investment Return:*

Investment return includes income and realized and unrealized gains or losses on all investments. Unrealized gain or loss comprises the change in unrealized appreciation on marketable securities and the limited liquidity investments, net of deferred federal excise tax provided on such unrealized appreciation. Realized gain or loss includes gains or losses realized on the sale of marketable securities and the Foundation's share of the operating results of the partnership investments, whether distributed or undistributed.

*Expenses:*

The Foundation has changed its method of reporting expenses on the Statement of Activities to show functional expense categories that more closely correspond to those required for reporting on the Foundation's 990PF, the federal excise tax return. This change will provide greater consistency and transparency in reporting the purposes for which Foundation funds are spent. However, the amounts for grants, grantmaking operations, and direct charitable activities shown here will not agree with the amounts on the 990PF because a cash basis is required for reporting the expenses of distribution for tax purposes as contrasted with the accrual basis used in preparing these financial statements.

"Grantmaking operations" include all costs related to appropriating, paying and administering grants. "Direct charitable activities" are the active programs conducted by the Foundation. "Investment operations" include the costs of supervising the Foundation's investment portfolio. "Current provision for taxes" includes federal and state taxes. "Other expenses" include certain expenses that the Foundation is not permitted to report either as an expense of distribution or an expense of earning income.

Salaries and benefits are allocated to each activity listed above, and also to “core administration,” based on estimates of the time each staff member devoted to that activity. “Core administration” expenses are then prorated among the activities listed above on the basis of the direct salary allocations. Identifiable costs, such as consultants, are charged directly to each activity.

The administrative expenses of distribution, including direct charitable activities, of \$16.4 million were 7.7% of grants made in 2002. In 2001, expenses of distribution were 6.5% of grants made. The increase in this percentage between 2001 and 2002 is due entirely to increases in expenditures for “direct charitable activities,” and especially to increases in expenditures for the Foundation’s digital initiatives (ARTstor and Ithaka).

“Investment expenses” are the costs of portfolio management, including fees for investment management, custody, and advisory services.

The Foundation’s expenses by natural classification are as follows for 2002 and 2001:

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Program grants and contributions, net	\$213,912	\$189,063
Salaries, pensions and benefits . . . . .	11,134	8,834
Other operating expenses . . . . .	8,509	5,951
Taxes . . . . .	689	3,950
	<u>\$234,244</u>	<u>\$207,798</u>

*Use of Estimates:*

The preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reported period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

**NOTE 2—INVESTMENTS:**

Marketable securities held at December 31, 2002 and 2001 are summarized as follows:

	<u>December 31, 2002</u>		<u>December 31, 2001</u>	
	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market Value</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>		<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Equities . . . . .	\$1,680,824	\$1,851,523	\$2,045,670	\$2,006,891
Fixed income . . . . .	634,799	636,306	749,361	751,300
Short-term . . . . .	217,702	217,720	273,098	272,967
Derivative financial instruments . . . . .	<u>(1,286)</u>	<u>(1,500)</u>	<u>(914)</u>	<u>(584)</u>
Total . . . . .	<u>\$2,532,039</u>	<u>\$2,704,049</u>	<u>\$3,067,215</u>	<u>\$3,030,574</u>

As a result of its investing strategies, the Foundation is a party to a variety of financial instruments. These financial instruments may include equity, fixed income, and foreign currency futures and options contracts, foreign currency forwards, and interest rate cap and floor contracts. Much of the Foundation’s off-balance-sheet exposure represents strategies that are designed to reduce the interest rate and market risk inherent in portions of the Foundation’s investment program. Changes in the market values of these financial instruments are recognized currently in the Statement of Activities.

Through certain investment managers, the Foundation purchases and sells forward currency contracts whereby the Foundation agrees to exchange one currency for another on an agreed-upon date at an agreed-upon exchange rate to minimize the exposure of certain of its marketable securities to adverse fluctuations in financial and currency markets. As of

December 31, 2002 and 2001, the Foundation had forward currency contracts with notional amounts totaling \$5.9 million and \$4.3 million, respectively. At December 31, 2002, approximately \$5.9 million in assets and \$5.9 million in liabilities related to open foreign currency contracts, at market value, are included in derivative financial instruments.

Through a securities lending program managed by its investment custodian, the Foundation loans certain stocks and bonds included in its investment portfolio to qualified investors. These investors are required to deposit cash of a like amount with the investment custodian as collateral on such loans. The Foundation's investment custodian has indemnified the program against counterparty risk. The Foundation's gross securities loaned to certain investors at December 31, 2002 and 2001 amounted to approximately \$271 million and \$279 million, respectively.

Financial instruments such as those described above involve, to varying degrees, elements of market risk and credit risk in excess of the amounts recorded on the balance sheet. Market risk represents the potential loss the Foundation faces due to the decrease in the value of financial instruments. Credit risk represents the maximum potential loss the Foundation faces due to possible non-performance by obligors and counterparties of the terms of their contracts.

Management does not anticipate that losses, if any, resulting from its market or credit risks would materially affect the financial position and operations of the Foundation.

Pursuant to its limited partnership agreements, the Foundation is committed to contribute approximately \$470 million as of December 31, 2002 in additional capital over the next ten years. Unpaid commitments at December 31, 2001 were \$462 million.

#### NOTE 3—BONDS PAYABLE:

In December 2002, the Foundation issued \$28.5 million in taxable term bonds with a final maturity of December 1, 2032 (The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Series 2002 Bonds [the "Bonds"]). The Bonds bear interest, payable monthly, based upon results of monthly auction procedures. The initial interest rate applicable in 2002, determined by the Foundation, was 1.45%. At December 31, 2002, accrued interest on these Bonds was \$25 thousand. The Bonds represent an unsecured general obligation of the Foundation. The Bonds are rated Aaa by Moody's Investor Services and AAA by Standard & Poor's Rating Services.

The proceeds from the Bonds are being used for the acquisition, construction, expansion, improvement, rehabilitation, furnishing and equipping of facilities owned by the Foundation in New York City.

#### NOTE 4—TAXES:

The Internal Revenue Code imposes an excise tax on private foundations equal to 2 percent of net investment income (principally interest, dividends, and net realized capital gains, less expenses incurred in the production of investment income). This tax is reduced to 1 percent when a foundation meets certain distribution requirements under Section 4940(e) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Foundation qualified for the 1% tax rate in 2002. Certain income defined as unrelated business income by the Code may be subject to tax at ordinary corporate rates.

The provision for taxes consists of a current provision for the federal excise taxes on net investment income and federal and state taxes on unrelated business income and a deferred provision on the change in unrealized appreciation of investments. The current tax provision for 2002 comprises \$203 thousand of federal excise tax on net investment income and \$486 thousand in federal and state taxes on unrelated business income. The current provision in 2001 was \$2.9 million of federal excise tax and \$1.0 million in federal and state taxes on unrelated business income. The change in unrealized appreciation reflected on the Statement of Activities includes a provision for deferred taxes based on net unrealized appreciation of investments at 2 percent. The decrease in unrealized appreciation in 2002 resulted in a decrease of the deferred federal excise tax liability of \$1.4 million. In 2001, the deferred tax liability decreased by \$9.7 million.

## NOTE 5—GRANTS, CONTRIBUTIONS, AND COMMITMENTS:

The following table of grant activity by major program area includes all grant appropriations approved during 2002. "Other" grants are those grants made in response to the events of September 11, 2001. The grants payable and committed at December 31, 2001 have been restated to reflect cancellations of \$250 thousand.

	<i>Payable and Committed</i> <u>Dec. 31, 2001</u>	<i>2002</i> <i>Grants and Commitments</i>		<i>Payable and Committed</i> <u>Dec. 31, 2002</u>
		<i>Appropriated</i>	<i>Paid</i>	
		<i>(in thousands)</i>		
Conservation and the Environment . . . . .	\$ 1,999	\$ 16,851	\$ 18,600	\$ 250
Museums and Art Conservation . . . . .	11,128	15,714	13,069	13,773
Performing Arts . . . . .	2,418	16,299	16,524	2,193
Higher Education and Scholarship . . . . .	35,131	109,405	108,529	36,007
Population . . . . .	3,653	22,485	22,510	3,628
Public Affairs . . . . .	840	775	1,323	292
Other . . . . .	—	41,873	41,873	—
Program Grants & Commitments—Totals	\$55,169	\$223,402	\$222,428	\$56,143
Contributions . . . . .	—	240	235	5
Totals . . . . .	<u>\$55,169</u>	<u>\$223,642</u>	<u>\$222,663</u>	<u>\$56,148</u>

A special \$50 million fund was approved in 2001 primarily to assist New York City cultural and performing arts organizations that were directly affected by the events of September 11. A portion of the fund was also used to benefit more broadly the people of the City by supporting the public parks. Grants of \$41.9 million were made from this fund in 2002.

Grant and grant commitment activity is summarized below.

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
	<i>(in thousands)</i>	
Grants Payable:		
Grants payable at January 1 . . . . .	\$ 15,877	\$ 8,707
Grant expense . . . . .	214,916	189,492
Less grants paid . . . . .	<u>(222,663)</u>	<u>(182,322)</u>
Grants payable at December 31 . . . . .	<u>\$ 8,130</u>	<u>\$ 15,877</u>
Net Grant Expense:		
Unconditional grants . . . . .	\$192,703	\$165,674
Conditional grants . . . . .	<u>22,213</u>	<u>23,818</u>
	214,916	189,492
Less grant refunds . . . . .	<u>(1,004)</u>	<u>(429)</u>
	<u>\$213,912</u>	<u>\$189,063</u>
Grant Commitments:		
Grant commitments at January 1 . . . . .	\$ 39,542	\$ 45,335
Less commitments cancelled . . . . .	(250)	—
Conditional grants appropriated . . . . .	30,939	18,025
Less grants meeting conditions for payment . . . . .	<u>(22,213)</u>	<u>(23,818)</u>
Grant commitments at December 31 . . . . .	<u>\$ 48,018</u>	<u>\$ 39,542</u>



