

III GRANTMAKING ACCOUNTABILITY TEMPLATE:
The California Endowment Case Study

This paper was prepared for the West Coast Regional Office of Consumers Union of U.S., Inc.

Consumers Union is a not-for-profit membership organization chartered in 1936 under the laws of the State of New York to provide consumers with information, education, and counsel about goods, services, health and personal finance; and to initiate and cooperate with individual and group efforts to maintain and enhance the quality of life for consumers. Consumers Union's income is solely derived from the sale of *Consumer Reports*, its other publications and services, and from non-commercial contributions, grants, and fees. Consumers Union's publications and services carry no outside advertising and receive no commercial support. Consumers Union advocates on behalf of consumers in legislatures, administrative agencies, and the courts, and regularly works in coalition with other groups in public education campaigns.

© 2003 Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. Permission to copy, disseminate, or otherwise use this work is normally granted as long as ownership is properly attributed to Consumers Union.

III ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was made possible by a generous grant from the Ford Foundation. Since 1997, the Ford Foundation has supported the national efforts of the Community Health Assets Project (CHAP), a joint effort of Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. and Community Catalyst in Boston, Massachusetts. CHAP seeks to protect nonprofit charitable assets, to foster creation of health foundations accountable to the communities they are designed to serve, and to ensure that health needs are addressed in the change of nonprofit health care institutions to for-profit status, transactions referred to as “conversions.”

Many individuals who embrace the importance of philanthropic accountability lent key support for this undertaking. The commitment of Christopher Harris, Program Officer at the Ford Foundation, to the important role of philanthropy in society provided us with inspiration and steadfast support. We are grateful for his vision and thoughtful contributions to our overall work on philanthropy. Dr. Robert Ross, President and CEO of the California Endowment (TCE), opened the door for this project by his ready agreement to have TCE cooperate with Consumers Union on it. TCE’s Alicia Lara, Julie Tugend and Becky Martin each spent countless hours describing to us TCE’s grantmaking data and practices, helping us struggle through conceptual framing, and reviewing drafts. Mitchell Singer of TCE as well provided invaluable support. Our deep appreciation to all at TCE who helped with this endeavor.

Our data maven Josh Senyak, played a critical role in compiling the TCE Case Study’s supporting data. At Consumers Union, Scott Benbow joined in our initial foray into the world of grantmaking data, and Laurie Sobel provided thoughtful comments on drafts and conceptual framing. Carolina Rivas Pollard, Josephine De los Reyes, Evaluz Barrameda, and Minerva Novoa patiently brought the written work to fruition in printed and web site documents. Their skill and good cheer form a strong foundation for our work. We are most grateful for their contributions.

III TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODOLOGY.....	2
LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA	3
THE CALIFORNIA ENDOWMENT GRANTMAKING FY 2000 and FY 2001	5
A. Foundation Profile.....	5
B. Proposals Received, Funded, Withdrawn, Declined by Rationale	8
C. Spending by Grantmaking Programs	8
D. Grants by Size	9
E. Grants by Term	10
F. Grantmaking Method	11
G. Grantmaking Process	11
H. Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries	12
I. Foundation Goals	13
J. Primary Sector of Impact	14
K. Subject Area	15
L. Role of Foundation Support	15
M. Type of Activity of Grantees.....	16
N. Grantee Profiles.....	16
O. Target Population Profiles.....	17
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
APPENDIX	
Supporting TCE Grantmaking Data for FY 2000 and FY 2001	A-1
COMPANION PAPER @ www.consumersunion.org	
<i>Advancing Accountability: A Tool for Transparent Foundation Grantmaking</i>	

III INTRODUCTION

Consumers Union conducted this Case Study with the aid of The California Endowment (TCE) to develop and test the Grantmaking Accountability Template (the “Template”)--a tool we developed for categorizing a foundation’s grantmaking to provide an objective basis on which communities and foundations can engage in conversation about meeting community needs. For more on the generic Template, see “Advancing Accountability: A Tool for Transparent Foundation Grantmaking” at www.consumersunion.org. We selected TCE for this pilot because it is the largest conversion foundation¹ in the country and because, from its inception, it has had an articulated commitment to community accountability. Also, its leadership enthusiastically agreed to participate in this endeavor.

The California Endowment was established in 1996 as a result of Blue Cross of California’s conversion from a nonprofit health insurance plan to WellPoint Health Networks, a for-profit corporation. TCE is a private foundation, a non-profit 501(c)(3), established to:

“promote the availability of and access to quality and affordable health care and related services to the people of the State of California, including, without limitation (i) to improve the availability of and access to such care and services to the uninsured, underinsured and other underserved populations and to improve the health status of all Californians, (ii) to develop and maintain initiatives to address short term and long term health care needs and concerns, (iii) to provide grants and establish programs to carry out such purposes and (iv) otherwise to serve the health care needs of the people of the State of California.”²

TCE’s mission is “to expand access to affordable, quality health care for underserved individuals and communities, and to promote fundamental improvements in the health status of all Californians.”³ TCE has its headquarters in Woodland Hills and maintains regional offices in Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Francisco, Fresno and San Diego with program staff working throughout the state.

TCE’s commitment of resources to tracking information about its grantmaking is impressive, particularly for a relatively young foundation. TCE’s grantmaking database is a concrete manifestation of its belief in the value of data in helping determine what grantmaking is working and what is not. Besides providing complete and open access to its grantmaking database, TCE provided our principal investigator, Debbie Greiff, with access to requested information that was contained in grant files. TCE staff eagerly participated in the process and demonstrated a remarkable interest in improving their

¹ These foundations are created from the assets of a charity, such as a nonprofit hospital, when it converts to a profit-seeking business.

² The California Endowment’s Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws.

³ The California Endowment’s annual reports, program guidelines, web site.

data systems to better inform themselves and others about where the foundation's resources are going and the process by which community groups access them.

III METHODOLOGY

In the summer of 2001, we began gathering quantitative data from TCE's grants management database program and from other internal TCE sources for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 (March 1, 1999–February 29, 2000 and March 1, 2000–February 28, 2001, hereinafter "FY 00 and FY 01"). We then converted TCE's quantitative data into a database using Access software, sorting the information into categories to fit a draft Template we had composed drawing upon multiple philanthropy sources.

Concurrently, extensive interviews with key management staff at TCE about its formal and informal grantmaking processes supplemented the quantitative information from TCE's database program. We also conducted a review of key corporate documents including articles of incorporation, by-laws, annual reports, IRS 990-PFs, and published and unpublished strategic and program plans.

The grants analyzed for the TCE Case Study are those that were made in the two chosen fiscal years, not grants expended or activities carried out in those years. (Many of TCE's grants are multi-year and grant activities often extend into subsequent fiscal years.) We compiled and classified the TCE data according to our data fields to the extent possible. Set forth below is our analysis of what the data indicate and how they reflect on TCE's stated mission and goals for FY 00 and FY 01. For the data upon which this analysis is based, see the Appendix , "Supporting TCE Grantmaking Data for FY 2000 and FY 2001."

Based on our learnings from the TCE Case Study and the feedback of many experts and practitioners, we subsequently refined the Template. We clarified definitions, added and significantly changed several data fields, and refined some of the recommended categories within data fields. The final Grantmaking Accountability Template is described in our companion paper *Advancing Accountability: A Tool for Transparent Foundation Grantmaking*, at www.consumersunion.org.

This Case Study uses the final Grantmaking Accountability Template to the extent possible. In some instances, however, certain data fields were not part of the Template at the time of the TCE Case Study. So, information for those data fields was not gathered from TCE. In other instances where data fields in the final Template changed significantly from the version tested in this Case Study, the TCE data is provided in the original data format. In all cases, data fields that differ from those recommended in the final Template are identified as such.

Except where TCE had formal policies in place or where issues were referenced in TCE's by-laws or articles of incorporation, the information in this Case Study is not corroborated and the summaries are in no way exhaustive. Also, it is important to keep

in mind that the Case Study reflects TCE's policies and practices in effect in FY 00 and FY 01. TCE has refined and changed many strategies, policies and practices since this Case Study was conducted.

III LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA AND THE TEMPLATE

In developing a tool to standardize data collection, we fully expected complexities relating to incomplete data, lack of common definitions, differing and duplicative categories within data fields, and lack of consistent coding. Our expectations were borne out in conducting this Case Study.

Specifically, the data presented are limited due to the following reasons:

- In some instances, TCE collected data in different fields or used coding categories within each data field different from those suggested in the Template. Where data were not in the fields contained in the Template, the principal investigator "interpreted" the TCE data into the Template's fields--not always a perfect fit.
- In some instances, TCE did not collect the information for a Template data field in its grants management database. Where that information was available from a combination of other TCE sources, formal or informal, again we "interpreted" it into the Template data fields and categories. Where data were available in the Template's data fields but not using the same categories as the Template, they are reported using TCE's categories.
- In some instances, TCE collected information in similar data fields as suggested in the Template, but defined it in a different way than in the Template. Where possible, again we "interpreted" TCE data into the Template data fields and categories. However, in many cases, TCE's categories were used because there was no systematic way to translate between their coding system and that recommended in the Template.

- All information available through TCE's grants management system was prospective. That is, it was information collected at the time of the grant approval based on the grantseekers' stated intentions. At the time of this Case Study, TCE did not, in most cases, collect parallel information at the back-end of a grant that was collected during the grant application process, i.e., whether the target population was reached, the planned activities and strategies were used or altered, etc.

The Case Study was a laboratory for developing and testing the usefulness of the Template. What we have learned is that the Template can be a valuable tool to provide objective, albeit self-reported, information about where the resources of a foundation are going and whether the foundation's grantmaking generally reflects its mission and goals. As with the introduction of any data analysis tool, we have also learned about some of the shortcomings of utilizing it:

- **Potential Data Weaknesses:** Because of the novelty of the endeavor and because the data we sought are not frequently analyzed, there are some difficulties with their reliability. Some of the reliability issues include duplication or overlap between data fields and lack of consistent coding or definitions.
- **Need for Longer Period of Review:** Analyzing the information over a one or two year period is useful simply to learn where the money went. However, in order to understand trends and strategic direction, four to five years of grantmaking data should be analyzed. Two years is too short a period, relative to the time it takes to make a grant. From inquiry to award, many foundations' average time to make grants is between three and six months, depending upon the complexity and amount of the grant. In addition to reviewing yearly data for a close-up picture of grantmaking, analyzing four to five years of such data would allow the reviewer to identify trends and patterns and to get a feel for the priorities of the foundation in practice.
- **Lack of "Industry" Standards:** Because generally accepted philanthropic accountability standards or norms do not exist, no bases of comparison currently exist for the information from the Template. Nonetheless, our hope is that this tool, along with other accountability efforts underway, will help jumpstart development of such standards. In any case, the data alone should prompt dialogue among all stakeholders dedicated to community-responsive and accountable philanthropy.

III TCE GRANTMAKING FY 2000 AND FY 2001

What follows is a summary of The California Endowment's (TCE) grantmaking for FY 00 and FY 01 based on analysis using the "Template." See the Appendix, "Supporting TCE Grantmaking Data for FY 2000 and FY 2001," for more detailed TCE data upon which this summary is based.

A. FOUNDATION PROFILE

These data fields were not part of the draft Template used to conduct this Case Study. The information provided below is primarily derived from published or publicly available documents, i.e., IRS 990-PF, annual reports, etc. In some cases, TCE provided additional information.

- 1. Age of Foundation:** TCE was founded in 1996. Thus, it is a relatively new institution. According to Grantmakers in Health's (GIH) 2003 report A Profile of New Health Foundations, 59% of all health conversion foundations were formed in the six years from 1994–1999.
- 2. IRS Foundation Classification:** TCE is a private, conversion foundation with 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status. According to the GIH 2003 report cited above, 52% of conversion foundations had a public charity tax status; 43% were private foundations; 4% were social welfare organizations; and 1% were other.
- 3. Asset Size:** FY 00: \$3,684,524,453 FY 01: \$3,490,256,407

According to the GIH 2003 report cited above, The California Endowment (TCE) is the largest health conversion foundation in the country. According to The Foundation Center, among all foundations, TCE is ranked 13th in asset size and 15th in total giving based on 2001 information.

- 4. Payout Percentage:** FY 00: 7.05% FY 01: 5.9%

Besides the IRS payout minimum requirement of 5 percent, there are no industry standards for what a foundation's payout should be. In lieu of that, the foundation's performance can only be compared to other similar foundations and monitored against its own performance over time and the goals set out by the Board of Directors.

5. Financial Management

There are no industry standards for these ratios and investment-related inquiries. The foundation's performance, therefore, can only be compared to other similar foundations and monitored against its own performance over time and the goals set out by the Board of Directors. Comparative analyses should be done in the context of the size, age, audience, location, numbers of proposals received/grants made and types of program activities of the differing institutions.

TCE's expense ratios are constant for the two years studied. Given the large number of proposals received and grants made, as well as the geographic range targeted by TCE's grantmaking, these expense ratios for FY 00 and FY 01 appear in the normal range.

a. Administrative Expenses Ratio:

FY 00: 8.92%

FY 01: 8.92%

The administrative expense ratio reflects administrative expenses as a percentage of total grants, other charitable activities, and administrative expenses. According to a May 29, 2003 Chronicle of Philanthropy article ("Pressing Foundations to Give More"), the 25 wealthiest private foundations have administrative expense ratios that range from .5% to 24.4%, with the median at 8%. This places TCE's administrative expense ratios for the period under study squarely in line with other large private foundations. Viewed in context of the proposals/grants ratios below, for the two years studied TCE's administrative expenses appear to be somewhat on the lower side, meaning it was efficiently administering its operations. (The article cited also reports that TCE's administrative expense ratio was 18% for the following fiscal year, FY 02.)

b. Ratios of Staff to Proposals Received and Grants Made

Staff to Proposals Received:

FY 00: 1:11

FY 01: 1:11

Staff to Grants Made:

FY 00: 1:6

FY 01: 1:5

With 1,320 and 1,467 proposals received, and 683 and 696 grants made in FY 00 and FY 01 respectively, TCE staff appear to have had a relatively heavy workload. That is, per staff person approximately 11 proposals were received and 5-6 grants were made during the period studied. (All paid staff are used in this ratio in the Template because most paid staff are in some significant way supporting grantmaking and because foundations vary so greatly in how they

classify "grantmaking staff.") Because there are no industry standards for proposals received/grants made to staff size, it is not possible to evaluate these ratios.

c. Investment Expense Ratio

FY 00: .35%

FY 01: .36%

These ratios, which reflect investment-related expenses as a percentage of fair market value of total assets, are constant over the time period of the study. Because there are no industry standards for this ratio, it is not possible to determine if TCE's handling of its investments is efficient or not.

d. Investment Management Policies

TCE's investment policies appear to support the mission and strategic plan of the organization.

6. Board Profile

- a. Size:** TCE is required by their by-laws to have not less than 15 and not more than 25 Board members. TCE Board members serve in 3-year terms, eligible for a maximum of 3 terms or nine years. In both FY 00 and FY 01, it had 16 Board members.
- b. Gender:** In FY 00 and FY 01, 75% of TCE's Board members were male; 25% were female. Given that California is evenly divided between males and females and those in poverty are disproportionately female (56% of Californians at or below the federal poverty level are female according to the California Health Interview Survey 2001), TCE's Board in FY 00 and FY 01 had an underrepresentation of women.
- c. Age:** For both years, the great majority of TCE's Board members were between 41 and 60 years of age; Board members 61 or older comprised approximately one-third of the Board. There were no Board members under the age of 41.
- d. Ethnicity/Race:** For both years, TCE's Board was ethnically/racially diverse, with approximately 43% of its members Caucasian, 19% African American, 19% Latino; 13% Asian; and, 6% Native American. The representation of ethnic/racial minorities relative to Caucasians exceeds the percentages found in the California population. However, the representation of Latinos is lower than found in the general population.
- e. Experience:** The TCE Board has a diverse range of experience represented, including nonprofit executives, hospital administrators, foundation executives, finance executives an academic, a business owner, and a public sector leader.

Nonprofit executives comprised the largest experience category on TCE's Board, more than one-third of the Board members (6 of 16).

- f. Geographic Diversity. This data is not publicly available.

7. Staff Profile

At each year's end, TCE had 117 staff in FY 00 and 130 staff in FY 01.

The balance of the data fields under Staff Profile--gender, age, ethnicity/race, experience, and geographic diversity--were not available from public documents.

B. PROPOSALS RECEIVED, FUNDED, WITHDRAWN, DECLINED BY RATIONALE

This data field was not part of the draft Template used to conduct the Case Study. TCE subsequently provided the numbers of proposals received/funded/denied and the decline rationale for each.

Approximately half of the proposals submitted to TCE were funded. For every dollar TCE had available for grantmaking, approximately two dollars of applicant requests were not funded. The top reasons given for declining a proposal were: meritorious proposal but limited TCE resources; program approach not clearly demonstrated; outside funding program guidelines; need for services not demonstrated; inadequate sustainability; community involvement not demonstrated; and lacks definitive health outcomes. For a breakdown of decline rationales, see the Appendix.

C. SPENDING BY GRANTMAKING PROGRAMS

In both years of grantmaking, close to 5% of all grant dollars was spent in TCE's discretionary programs (CEO and Board Discretionary.) In addition to discretionary programs, TCE has two other broad grantmaking programs: "Responsive" (issues/strategies generated by applicants within broad goal categories) and "Strategic" (issues/strategies generated by the Foundation, usually by invited proposals.)

In FY 00, TCE spent 43% of its grant dollars in its "Responsive" (community-driven) and 52% in its "Strategic" (foundation-driven) Grantmaking Programs. In FY 01, the percentages are reversed--52% spent in Responsive and 43% spent in the Strategic Grantmaking Programs. Thus, taken together, a similar amount was spent over the two years in TCE's two primary grantmaking programs.

When asked about the spending patterns, TCE senior staff indicated that the larger expenditure under the Strategic Grantmaking Program in FY 00 was probably due to the huge demand for payout in the early years of the foundation's existence, resulting in a larger amount of commissioned work. By FY 01, it appears that a stronger infrastructure was in place to support the increased expenditure under the Responsive Grantmaking

Program and that the grantmaking review process was refined to make it more accessible.

At the time of the Case Study, there were no specific Board-directed goals regarding the split between Responsive and Strategic spending. TCE senior staff indicated that since that time the Board has set a goal of an approximate 50/50 split between community-driven (Responsive) and foundation-driven (Strategic) grantmaking.

D. GRANTS BY SIZE

The median size of grants made by TCE was \$50,000 for FY 00 and \$40,000 for FY 01. Within the smallest grant category (\$0–99,999), the median grant size was \$25,000 for FY 00 and FY 01.

Of the combined resources for FY 00 and FY 01 given directly by TCE, about 12% were in the range of \$0-250,000; close to 49% ranged between \$250,000-999,999; 22% were between \$1 million-4,999,999; and close to 17% were allocated in grants of \$5 million or more.

Nineteen percent of total grantmaking dollars for FY 00 and almost 23% of FY 01 went to re-granting intermediaries (hereinafter “intermediaries”)⁴. The size of grants to intermediaries are weighted towards the larger size with 3 grants in FY 00 representing 71% of the monies given to intermediaries and 2 grants in FY 01 representing 77% of the monies given to intermediaries. Of the total grants made by TCE for \$5 million or more in both years (\$64 million), 92% (or \$59.1 million) went to intermediaries. Therefore, the size of the re-grants made by these intermediaries must be considered when assessing the actual size of grants generated by TCE dollars.

To understand the impact of such intermediaries on the “reach” of the Foundation to smaller and possibly more grassroots organizations, we analyzed the size of the re-grants made by the intermediaries to which TCE awarded funds in FY 00 and FY 01.

Of the resources that had been allocated by these intermediaries to other organizations at the time of this study, about 87% were in the range of \$0-250,000; 9% ranged between \$250,000-999,999; 4% were between \$1 million-2,499,999; and there were no grants made for \$2.5 million or more. The median grant size was \$70,000 for FY 00 re-grants and \$80,000 for FY 01 re-grants. Within the smallest grant category (\$0–99,999), the median grant size was \$47,000 in FY 00 and close to \$60,000 in FY 01. The median size of grants made directly by TCE, therefore, is smaller than those given by intermediaries.

Nonetheless, because size of grants is one indicator of being able to reach smaller, potentially more grassroots organizations, and responding to emerging needs within

⁴ An intermediary is an organization that carries out a programmatic function that a foundation would otherwise have to perform itself. Some intermediaries are funded by foundations to provide services only, such as evaluation or technical assistance to grantees. Others re-grant funds. Many do both. This Case Study deals only with those whose sole or partial purpose was to make re-grants to nonprofits for TCE.

communities, it appears that the strategy of using intermediaries contributed to distributing more of TCE's resources in smaller grants in the time period under study.

In sum, although TCE is a very large foundation, it was able to make grants of a wide range of sizes. Further, inasmuch as the CEO Discretionary Program functioned in part as a small grants program, it facilitated a diversity of grant sizes as well.

E. GRANTS BY TERM

In both years, the greatest number of grants made were for one year or less (57% in FY 00; 60% in FY 01), although this represented a disproportionately small amount of the grant dollars (11% in FY 00; 20% in FY 01). According to the Foundation Center, the majority of grants made by foundations are for one year or less. So, TCE's practice for the years studied fits that overall pattern.

On the other end of the grant term spectrum, a small number of grants were made for 37 - 60 months (2% in FY 00, 1% in FY 01). However, these multi-year grants represented a disproportionately large amount of the grant dollars awarded (20% in FY 00; 9% in FY 01). The median grant term for FY 00 and FY 01 was 12 months. Grants termed for between 13 and 36 months comprised 40% of the grants made, representing 70% of the dollars awarded. This pattern bears out a correlation between grant term and the size of grant, with the longer-term grants being larger in size than the shorter-term grants.

F. GRANTMAKING METHOD

The data in this field indicate that approximately 82% of grants in both years were made directly by TCE, and approximately 18% were made by intermediaries. The data also indicate that of the grants made directly, approximately 1% were made to intermediaries. This 1%, or 17 grants, made to intermediaries, generated 293 re-grants. Therefore, the great majority of TCE's resources are distributed directly by the Foundation.

G. GRANTMAKING PROCESS

This data field was designed to describe the openness to the public of a foundation's grantmaking, e.g., whether there are published guidelines, accessibility to all who want to apply, significant set asides for invited proposals, etc. Grantmaking processes span the continuum from more open, accessible and transparent to less open and more discretionary on the part of the foundation. Because this information is not ordinarily collected or reported and because defining it required extensive original research, this data field of the Template evolved substantially after the Case Study was conducted. For the Template's final Grantmaking Process data fields, see the Appendix to *Advancing Accountability: A Tool for Transparent Foundation Grantmaking* at www.consumersunion.org.

TCE, like most foundations, did not collect data based on accessibility of the grantmaking process. TCE staff, however, provided conceptual information about how TCE's different programs work, and we translated TCE's information into the data field used at the time of the Case Study.

In FY 00 and FY 01 combined, TCE allocated approximately 41% of its resources through competitive, open processes--those with published guidelines and for which organizations applied in a competitive process. For the period studied, TCE made these types of grants through its Responsive Grantmaking Program and an open Request for Proposal⁵ (RFP) process. In the same period, TCE allocated 54% of its resources through "Invited Proposals" under which specific organizations were called upon to submit proposals on foundation-identified strategic issues. Invited Proposals had no published guidelines, the public did not have open access and, in most cases, invitees were not in competition with others for funding. About 5% of grant dollars for FY 00 and FY 01 were allocated by Board or CEO Discretionary Processes for which there were no published guidelines or clear public access to the resources.

⁵ Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are announcements for applications in a particular area or for a particular type of intervention. An RFP that is not very prescriptive can function like an open program to allow a foundation to compare proposals in a particular issue area or to stimulate demand in an area that the foundation has prioritized. On the other end of the continuum, RFPs can function in a more closed fashion by limiting the invitation to a certain group of applicants to carry out already determined interventions or activities. In the period studied, TCE's Requests for Proposals met the more open definition.

It may be that the non-public, non-competitive grantmaking programs were, nonetheless, developed with community input. This was unclear from our review. It is notable, however, that roughly 59% of TCE's resources were allocated in this way during the period of the Case Study. As always with non-public processes for grantmaking, it is important to consider whether the benefits that accrue from such a process outweigh the potential loss of community accessibility and transparency.

In both FY 00 and FY 01, all grants made to intermediaries were made by Invited Proposals, representing 21% of the total grant dollars awarded and 38% of the monies granted by invited proposal. Of the re-grants awarded by intermediaries as of the date of this study, 82% were awarded by open RFP processes; 5% by closed RFP processes; and 13% by Invited Proposals. Therefore, it appears that when re-grants made by intermediaries are factored in, the percentage of dollars distributed through more competitive processes increases. For example, \$79 million was allocated to intermediaries by Invited Proposal; however, of the dollars awarded by intermediaries to date, 82% were allocated by competitive processes.

As there are no industry standards or generally-accepted norms about public access to foundation resources, it is difficult to assess how TCE is doing relative to others in the field.

H. GRANTS MADE TO RE-GRANTING INTERMEDIARIES

This data field addresses the sub-set of grants made by TCE to re-granting intermediaries. These data fields are in addition to the information presented in the data fields for grants in general. Of the 1,379 grants TCE made over the two year period under study, 17 intermediary projects received funding.

In order to assess the effectiveness of using intermediaries as well as to compare grantmaking by intermediaries to direct foundation grantmaking, TCE would have needed to collect similar types of information about re-grants as it did about grants made directly by the foundation. The Grantmaking Accountability Template suggests that as many of the data fields as possible should be collected about re-grants as grants made directly by the foundation. In FY 00 and FY 01, TCE's re-grants data were very limited.

1. Reason for Using Re-Granting Intermediary

These data were not available. TCE staff indicated that the primary reasons for employing intermediaries at the time were to get resources to the community in a timely fashion and to increase the “reach” of the foundation into a diverse range of communities in a geographically dispersed area. Because only data on the re-grantee organization and amount of the re-grant were collected, it is not possible to reflect on whether these purposes were served by using re-granting intermediaries.

2. Grants Broken Out by Function

Of the total dollars awarded to intermediaries during the period studied, about 6% were for the intermediaries' administrative costs; 14% for program-related services that intermediaries provided to recipient organizations (e.g., capacity building); and 79% for re-grants.

The intermediaries' administrative costs of distributing grant dollars are in line with TCE's overall administrative percentages, and are relatively low compared to the usual rates for nonprofits. One could argue, however, that for an accurate assessment of a foundation's overhead, intermediaries' administrative costs should be included in the foundation's overall administrative costs.

As of summer 2001 when we collected the data for this Case Study, only 42% of re-granting dollars from FY 00 were expended, whereas almost 45% of re-granting dollars from FY 01 had already been expended. Generally, the timing of distribution of re-granting dollars should be monitored closely by foundations so that the use of intermediaries does not result in unnecessary delays in getting resources into the community.

Additional information would be needed about re-grants and the re-granting process in order to assess whether sufficient value was added by TCE's use of intermediaries to offset the impact of the extra organizational level between the community and the foundation, and the additional administrative costs incurred.

I. FOUNDATION GOALS

Quantifying grantmaking by TCE's grantmaking goals cannot be clear-cut as TCE's goals are very broad and general, and applicants often indicate that their efforts support more than one foundation goal. In this data field, the primary goal only was used.

Of the dollars awarded in both years, approximately 42% went primarily to support Access; 32% supported Health & Well-Being; and 26% supported Multicultural Health. Over the two years, spending by goal area was consistent.

In terms of community responsiveness, TCE's spending by goal area is difficult to assess by using information from the Template alone. Critical questions--such as how the

community participates in identifying needs and choosing its goals and strategies, how the foundation researches and confirms the identified needs and strategies, how clearly the goals and strategies are communicated to the public, and how effective the goals are in guiding the Foundation's grantmaking in service of its mission-- are outside the purview of this Case Study.

J. PRIMARY SECTOR OF IMPACT

The primary sector of impact identifies the main sector the grant seeks to affect. TCE's data indicates that roughly one-third of grant dollars in both years were directed at each of its primary sectors of impact: families & individuals, communities and systems.

The categories and definitions of categories in this data field are TCE's, not those recommended in the Template. It is difficult to assess TCE's strategies relative to grantmaking by sector of impact due to the way this information was coded at the time the Case Study was conducted. At the time, the definition TCE used for "systems" encompassed both "systems" and "organizations." For example, a grant that focused on changing a grantee's organizational structure and one that aimed at changing a county health system were both coded "systems."

Although it appears that TCE spends roughly one-third of its resources on efforts designed to impact systems, the "Type of Activity of Grantees" field shows that only 5% of the combined resources from both years went to policy and advocacy work, a strategy that one would expect to be prioritized under systems work. The largest allocations of resources meant to impact systems were in the areas of re-granting, information and education, and capacity building.

From the information available, it appears that TCE gave funding priority during the study period to certain types of activities across the three sectors: capacity building, re-granting, training & mentoring (and, to a slightly lesser degree, expansion.) Other activities appear to be prioritized depending upon the primary sector targeted, i.e., direct services in the category of "families & individuals", core operating support for efforts targeting "communities", information/education for efforts targeting "systems."

K. SUBJECT AREA

Using TCE's coding categories, for FY 00 and FY 01 combined, the following are the Subject Area categories that received the most funding:

- Approximately 10% went to each of the following: access to care and chronic disease;
- Approximately 8% went to each of the following: information technology, mental health, and workforce health; and,
- Between 5 – 6% went to each of the following: children & youth and health policy.
- Approximately 4% went to each of the following: dental, organizational development, and outreach/information & education/promotores.

Fully assessing TCE's spending by subject area relative to community responsiveness is outside the purview of this inquiry, as it involves assessing whether the subjects and relative priorities they represent mirror and effectively address community need. Absent a statewide needs assessment against which this spending information could be compared, it is difficult to draw conclusions about whether these allocations are community-responsive. In addition, there were significant coding problems in this data field due to duplication of coding categories in two or more data fields, e.g., health policy and health education in Subject Area and policy & advocacy and information/education in Type of Activity of Grantee (see Section M below); and, children & youth in Subject Area and children, youth & families in Target Population (see Section O below) and children & youth in Target Population Age Group.

L. ROLE OF FOUNDATION SUPPORT

"Role of Foundation Support" is defined in the Grantmaking Accountability Template to include categories such as general operating support, project support, technical assistance, media communications, etc. This information was not available for TCE for FY 00 and FY 01. TCE's grants management system contained a field for "Primary Type of Support," but the categories provided there were a combination of the Template's "Type of Activity of Grantee" and "Role of Foundation Support." In this Case Study, information from TCE's "Primary Type of Support" field is reported under "Type of Activity of Grantee" in Section M, as most of the TCE categories fit within that Template data field.

M. TYPE OF ACTIVITY OF GRANTEE

For FY 00 and FY 01 combined, the following categories received the most funding from TCE:

- 17% went to making re-grants;
- 12-13% went to each of these categories: capacity building, direct services and expansion;
- 7-8% went to each of these categories: information/education, and training and mentoring; and,
- 4-5% went to each of these categories: capital, core operating support, and policy and advocacy.

As discussed above, we could not fully analyze whether the types of activity being funded correlate with TCE's goals and mission due to the way this information was coded at the time the Case Study was conducted.

Fully assessing TCE's spending by type of activity relative to community responsiveness is outside the purview of this Case Study. Such an assessment would involve analyzing whether the types of activities engaged in by grant recipients aligned with an assessment of community needs as well as evaluating the success of those strategies in actually meeting those needs.

N. GRANTEE PROFILES

The key consideration for community responsiveness regarding these data fields is whether grantees are representative of, attuned to, and effective in meeting the needs of the ultimate beneficiaries of its resources. Much of the information recommended for collection in the Grantmaking Accountability Template was not collected by TCE at the time of this Case Study, so the picture is incomplete.

1. Age of Organizations

This information was not available.

2. Type of Organizations

Of the TCE grant dollars for FY 00 and FY 01, the greatest amount went to private, non-profit community-based organizations (CBOs) (49%). The next largest category was foundations/re-granting organizations (17%), followed by colleges/universities or their agents (10%), other health care providers (6%), and community clinics (6%). As with other data fields, because at the time of the Case Study some of TCE's categories were unclear, these percentages may not be accurate.

Of the combined resources awarded to re-granting intermediaries, 39% were foundations/re-granting organizations; 21% were private/non-profits (CBO); 13% were public agencies; 11% were colleges/universities or their agents; 6% were other health care providers; and 1% were community clinics.

3. Size of Organizations by Annual Budget

This information was not available.

4. Board Profiles

This information was not available.

5. Staff Profiles

This information was not available.

O. TARGET POPULATION PROFILES

The key consideration for community-responsiveness regarding these data fields is whether a foundation's funds are being directed to the beneficiaries articulated in the foundation's articles of incorporation, mission and strategic plan. However, again, fully assessing TCE's spending by target population relative to community responsiveness is outside the purview of this inquiry. Such an assessment would involve determining whether the populations targeted by TCE's resources align with the needs of the intended beneficiaries in the community, as well as evaluating the success of the strategies employed in actually meeting those needs.

Wherever possible, TCE's spending is compared against available demographic data for the State of California as found in the 2000 Census (www.census.gov), UCLA's Center for Health Policy Research California Health Interview Survey 2001 (www.chis.ucla.edu) or the California Current Population Survey Report (March 2001), conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. (available from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit,

1. Target Populations

Of the combined TCE resources for FY 00 and FY 01, the greatest amount of resources went to children, youth and families (36%), followed by the general underserved population (21%), rural populations (13%), and those affected by a specific disease (6%). Similar to other data fields, some TCE Target Population categories were unclear, resulting in inconsistent coding.

2. Gender

In both years, TCE allocated most of its resources to projects that focused their activities on the general underserved population regardless of gender (93%), with a

small amount (6%) going to projects targeting females only and a very small amount (1%) going to projects targeting males.

The 2000 Census shows the California population as nearly evenly divided between males (49.82%) and females (50.18%). This suggests that spending equally on males and females would be appropriate in order to reflect the demographics of California's population.

Since TCE's mission is to reach the underserved, and since that population is likely to be poor, comparing TCE's spending by gender to data showing California's low-income population by gender is important in order to place TCE's spending in context. According to the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) 2001, women are disproportionately poor, e.g. 56% of those at 99% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) or below are female. This validates TCE providing special support for strategies targeting underserved women, as was the case in the period studied.

3. Age

In both years studied, more than half (59%) of TCE grant dollars went to efforts targeting the general population regardless of age, with sizeable dollars also going to programs focused on children and youth (20%) and adults in general (13%). Three percent of TCE's grant dollars for the two years were allocated for seniors only, and another 5% were given to a category called "Adults and Seniors."

According to the 2000 Census, the majority of California's population are adults between the ages of 18 and 64, with significant numbers of children and youth under 18 and a relatively smaller number of seniors who are 65 and older. Since the underserved are likely to be poor, comparing TCE spending by age to data showing California's low-income population by age is important to place TCE's spending in context. The 2001 CHIS shows that children are disproportionately poor--38% of those at 99% FPL or below are under age 18 years of age. This validates TCE providing special support for strategies targeting underserved and poor children and youth, as was the case in the period studied.

4. Ethnicity/Race

The data in this field of inquiry indicate that in both years studied more than half of TCE grant dollars (53-58%) went to efforts directed at the general underserved population, with a sizeable percentage to programs focused on specific ethnicities/races (36 - 38%) and a small percentage to programs focused on serving multi-ethnic populations (6-9%).

TCE's grant dollars to the general underserved population--53-58% of its expenditures in FY 00 and FY 01--of course encompassed projects benefiting, though not focused on, multiple ethnic and racial groups. So, if it could be quantified, some portion of that 53-58% covering people of color would have to be added to the dollars focused on specific ethnicities and multi-ethnic populations to ascertain the total TCE dollars benefiting particular ethnic/racial populations during the period studied.

From the data available on TCE grantmaking targeted solely or primarily at specific ethnicities, for the combined years approximately 21% of TCE's grant dollars went to projects focused on the Latino population, 10% to projects focused on the African American/Black population, 4% to projects focused on the Asian population, 3% to projects focused on the Native American population and less than 1% each to projects primarily focused on the Pacific Islander and White populations.

Comparing TCE's spending to general demographic data available from the 2000 Census is difficult because the Census data do not consider "Hispanic" or "Latino" a racial category. The Census Bureau breaks out the racial population of California by Hispanic/Latino and non-Hispanic/Latino. This makes it impossible to determine the self-identified percentage of the California population that is Hispanic or Latino. We, therefore, rely on the 2001 CHIS, which separates out Latinos as a group, for comparative statewide demographic and poverty data.

Since the underserved are likely to be poor, comparing TCE's spending by ethnicity/race to data showing California's low-income population by ethnicity/race is important to place TCE's spending in context. This table from the 2001 CHIS presents both the statewide demographic and poverty data by ethnicity/race.

Population by Ethnicity/Race and Poverty Level Status (CHIS 2001)

Ethnicity/ Race	# of People at or below 99% FPL*		# of People 100 - 199%FPL*		Total # of People at 0 – 199 % FPL*		Total # of People in California	
		%		%		%		%
White	1,175,000	21	2,523,000	37	3,698,000	30	17,304,000	52
Latino	3,197,000	59	2,904,000	43	6,101,000	50	9,060,000	27
Asian	467,000	9	610,000	9	1,077,000	9	3,479,000	11
African American	426,000	8	451,000	7	877,000	7	1,998,000	6
American Indian/Alaska Native	24,000	<1	35,000	<1	59,000	<1	128,000	<1
Other single/2 or more races	164,000	3	225,000	3	389,000	3	1,082,000	3
Total	5,454,000	100	6,748,000	100	12,202,000	100	33,051,000	100

* FPL is the Federal Poverty Level.

These data show that Latinos and African Americans are disproportionately poor. Latinos comprise 27% of the California population and 59% of those living in poverty; and African Americans comprise 6% of the California population and 8% of those living in poverty. This validates TCE providing special support for strategies targeting these communities of color, as the Foundation did during the period studied. Comparing TCE's funding strategies targeting specific ethnicities to data showing poverty rates in California by ethnicity/race for FY 00 and FY 01:

- TCE allocated 21% of its overall resources to projects solely or primarily targeting Latinos, slightly less than Latino representation in California's general population (27%). However, since Latinos comprised 59% of the California population below poverty, one could argue that TCE underspent on Latino health needs.
- TCE allocated 10% of its grant dollars to projects solely or primarily targeting African Americans, while this group comprised only 6% of California's population. However, African Americans living in poverty comprise 8% of the California population below poverty, closer to TCE's allocation of resources.
- TCE allocated 4% of its grant dollars solely or primarily to projects targeting Asian populations and less than 1% to Pacific Islanders, while these groups comprise roughly 11% of California's population. These groups comprise approximately 9% of the California population below poverty.

Besides the bare data on poverty rates, well documented disparities in health amongst ethnic/racial groups may warrant additional allocations to specific groups. That is, along with population and poverty data, one would need to consider data

about the health needs in differing ethnic/racial groups and whether targeted strategies are more or less effective in particular ethnic/racial communities. That information, unfortunately, was not readily available.

5. Income Level

This data was not available.

TCE's articles of incorporation and by-laws reflect a focus on serving "uninsured, underinsured and other underserved populations," not solely low-income people and communities. Its mission, as well, indicates a focus on underserved individuals and communities.

According to staff, TCE makes grants primarily to organizations focused on underserved and/or low-income people and communities. According to interviews with senior TCE staff, program officers must certify that the target population is an "underserved" group as part of grantmaking due diligence. Because studies show an inverse relationship between poverty and health status, it is reasonable to rely on income or poverty level as one indicator of being underserved in terms of access to quality health care. TCE's reliance on this information, however, was not documented in its grants management system or in the program officer grant write-up document.

6. Rural/Urban

These data were not available.

7. Geographic Diversity

The following chart consolidates TCE's Geographic Diversity categories by Central, North, South, and Statewide:

Geographic Diversity	FY 00		FY 01	
	%	Dollars	%	Dollars
Central	5	\$10,645,370	9	\$16,300,616
North	24	\$46,024,137	33	\$60,992,035
South	27	\$53,071,232	26	\$48,191,672
Statewide	44	\$86,520,751	32	\$58,393,156
Total	100%	\$196,261,490	100%	\$183,877,479

By way of comparison, using the same counties TCE places in "Central," "North," and "South" categories, the 2000 Census data indicate the following for the general population and for those Californians who are below poverty:

Geographic Diversity	%	# of People	%	# of People from 0 – 99% FPL*
Central	14	4,804,446	17	820,277
North	31	10,490,560	23	1,076,203
South	55	18,576,642	60	2,809,650
Total	100%	33,871,648	100%	4,706,130

* FPL is the Federal Poverty Level.

Reviewing TCE's spending in FY 00 and FY 01 against data about the geography of California's low-income population, it appears that TCE underspent in the southern and central parts of the state compared to the northern part of the state, relative to numbers of people in poverty in those areas. A more thorough and meaningful analysis, however, would require data about California's low-income population by geographic area *and* health disparities. However, these data were not readily available.

III ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The information contained in the Grantmaking Accountability Template provides a picture of a foundation's grantmaking, including information about the accessibility and transparency of the grantmaking process. One of the main indicators of community accountability is whether and how a foundation's grantmaking supports its mission, goals and strategic plan.

From the available data in this Case Study, TCE's grantmaking for FY 00 and FY 01 supported its mission, goals and strategic plans. As with any complicated endeavor, however, there is always room for improvement. Subsequent to the completion of the data gathering portion of the Case Study, TCE senior management staff requested feedback about the effectiveness of its grantmaking database and requested suggestions for improvements. The principal investigator prepared a detailed memo summarizing many of the data issues. Over the next several months, TCE convened a group of staff to work on its data system. TCE subsequently made significant revisions to the system, incorporating many of the suggestions outlined in the memo from the principal investigator. Many of the data reliability, definitional and coding problems that surfaced in the process of conducting this Case Study have been addressed. The following are some of the areas that may need further thought, investigation or clarification.

1. Community Input on Grantmaking Priorities and Strategies

In setting broad overarching goals, guidelines, strategies, and priorities for its grantmaking, TCE should have a published process for community input followed by a process to verify the input (i.e., data, research, etc.). It would also be helpful for TCE to publish the process used to determine the Foundation's goals and strategies. The community input received, as well as the data and research that led to the final goals and strategies, should be made available to the public for review and discussion.

2. Verifying Alignment of Grantmaking and Goals

In analyzing the data in the Template, the following areas merited further investigation.

- a. **Ethnicity/Race and Geographic Diversity.** It appears that TCE's spending during the period covered by the Case Study was not aligned exactly with its target population in terms of ethnicity/race and geographic diversity. The available data suggest that TCE should investigate whether more resources should be focused on the Latino population and on the southern and central parts of California. TCE senior management staff indicated that for the first five years of the foundation's existence, grantmaking was focused on meeting payout

requirements by making grants where there was existing capacity and demand. Since that time, we understand that TCE has become more strategic in its grantmaking, focusing on building capacity where there is need.

- b. **Policy/Advocacy.** Another area that may warrant clarification is spending on policy/advocacy strategies. TCE strategic planning documents we reviewed for the period studied contained an explicit commitment to effecting change through policy and advocacy work. However, the data do not totally bear out that intention. It is unclear, however, whether this is due to a mismatch between TCE's goals and spending, or whether it is due to definitional and data coding problems.

3. Data Gathering and Disclosure

Prior to addressing specific issues about the current data gathering system, it may be helpful for TCE to revisit the purpose of and assumptions about its data gathering system to accommodate the issue of community accountability (i.e., access, transparency, etc.). Some of the recommended steps to consider are:

- defining the purposes and audiences for data gathering and their relationship to community accountability and responsiveness;
- defining the TCE data fields and how they relate to the goals and strategies of grantmaking;
- collecting the additional data outlined in the Grantmaking Accountability Template, particularly those data fields that speak most to community accountability issues -- grantmaking method, grantmaking process and additional grantee profile data fields; and
- outlining an ongoing communications strategy to publish, disseminate and discuss grantmaking data with the community.

4. Selected Specific Data Issues

a. Clarification of Current Data Fields

In several instances, there seemed to be inconsistencies within and among TCE data categories that ultimately diluted the usefulness of the data. For example, in some cases, the categories that appeared in a data field did not consistently describe the same concept; there were categories in one data field that belonged in another; and there were multi-level concepts embedded within a data field that were not broken out as such, resulting in inconsistent and compromised data. We recommend that TCE clarify the intent of each of its data fields and refine the data categories in each to avoid duplicative categories, if possible.

b. Consistency of Coding

In many cases, we found that data were being coded differently by different staff. We suggest that, to ensure consistency, once the data fields are clarified and refined, training be offered for all staff responsible for coding. In addition, we recommend that TCE provide "prompts" to cue staff on when and how to code grantmaking data.

c. "Actuals" versus "Projections"

For FY 00 and FY 01, only prospective data--i.e., applicants' intentions, for example, on target population and activities, at the time of application -- were recorded in TCE's grants management database. To show what the grants actually funded, comparable data should be collected and recorded about what happened in practice. We recommend comparable data be collected and recorded in TCE's grantmaking database on the front end from grant applications and other grantmaking due diligence and on the back end from grantee monitoring and final reports.

5. Re-Granting

Grantmaking via re-granting intermediaries was a major strategy employed by TCE during FY 00 and FY 01. If successful, re-granting through intermediaries can provide community groups with enhanced access to TCE resources; if unsuccessful, intermediaries can place an unnecessary barrier to accessing Foundation resources. TCE collected little data consistently on the purpose for selecting and on the allocations of grants made to intermediaries, as well as the process by which intermediaries made grant dollars available to the community. In addition, little information was collected on the re-grants made by the intermediaries. It is, therefore, difficult to analyze the grantmaking carried out by TCE's intermediaries during the period studied.

We recommend that TCE add the data fields contained in "Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries," as well as collect for re-grants data comparable to that collected for grants made directly by the Foundation. In addition, we recommend that TCE establish and use common terminology relative to intermediaries, i.e., "re-granting intermediaries," and "other intermediaries" (that provide value-added services but do not re-grant.)

In terms of transparency, as part of its communication to the public, TCE should articulate its goals for using re-granting intermediaries and the method by which it will monitor whether these goals have been achieved.

6. Board and CEO Discretionary Grants Programs

During FY 00 and FY 01, TCE distributed close to 5% of its resources in non-public, unpublished grantmaking processes. Clearly, foundations, like private businesses, need some discretionary monies. But this percentage seems high, especially

considering the total dollar amount involved. In particular, no clear programmatic purpose for the Board Discretionary Grants Program was apparent. That is, it was unclear what value it added to TCE's grantmaking, particularly in light of the lack of public access and transparency.

Adjustments to the CEO Discretionary Grants Program, as structured in FY 00 and FY 01, appear warranted, as well. We understand that there have been significant, positive changes to the CEO Discretionary Grants Program since this Case Study was conducted. For example, a public, small grants program has been carved out of the CEO Discretionary Program.

TCE should inform the public about the existence, purposes and amounts of monies allocated for its discretionary programs.

7. Other Non-Public, Non-Competitive Grantmaking Processes

A large amount of TCE's resources in FY 00 (\$102.4 million) and FY 01 (\$78.6 million) were allocated through other non-public, non-competitive processes, primarily through Invited Proposals. TCE senior management staff indicated that this was primarily due to the initial pressure on the foundation to meet a large payout in the early years of the foundation. They indicated that since the time of this Case Study, additional infrastructure has been put in place to increase their capacity to do more accessible and transparent grantmaking.

We recommend that TCE monitor this development to ensure that when proposals are commissioned outside of a published, competitive process, the reasons truly merit the decrease in public access. Where commissioned work is deemed appropriate, it should be informed by community input, research and independent verification. In addition, as recommended for discretionary programs above, the public should be informed about the existence, purposes and amounts of monies allocated for commissioned, non-public grantmaking.

**GRANTMAKING ACCOUNTABILITY TEMPLATE:
CALIFORNIA CASE STUDY**

SUPPORTING TCE GRANTMAKING DATA FOR FY 2000 AND FY 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. FOUNDATION PROFILE	PAGE A - 1
1. Age of Foundation	A - 1
2. IRS Foundation Classification	A - 1
3. Asset Size	A - 1
4. Payout Percentage	A - 1
5. Financial Management	A - 1
a. Administrative Expense Ratio	A - 1
b. Ratios of Staff to Proposals Received and Grants Made	A - 1
c. Investment Expense Ratio	A - 1
d. Investment Management Policies	A - 1
6. Board Profile	Page A - 2
a. Size	A - 2
b. Gender	A - 2
c. Age	A - 2
d. Ethnicity/Race	A - 2
e. Experience	A - 2
f. Geographic Diversity	A - 2
7. Staff Profile	Page A - 2
a. Size	A - 2
b. Gender	A - 2
c. Age	A - 2
d. Ethnicity/Race	A - 2
e. Experience	A - 2
f. Geographic Diversity	A - 2
B. PROPOSALS RECEIVED, FUNDED, WITHDRAWN, DECLINED BY RATIONALE	PAGE A - 3
C. SPENDING BY GRANTMAKING PROGRAMS	PAGE A - 3
D. GRANTS BY SIZE	PAGE A - 3
1. Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries	A - 4
2. Re-Grants Made by Re-Granting Intermediaries	A - 4
E. GRANTS BY TERM	PAGE A - 4
F. GRANTMAKING METHOD	PAGE A - 4
G. GRANTMAKING PROCESS	PAGE A - 5
1. Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries	A - 5
2. Re-Grants Made by Re-Granting Intermediaries	A - 5
H. GRANTS MADE TO RE-GRANTING INTERMEDIARIES	PAGE A - 5
1. Reason for Using Re-Granting Intermediary	A - 5
2. Grants Broken Out by Function	A - 5

I. FOUNDATION GOALS	PAGE A - 6
J. PRIMARY SECTOR OF IMPACT	PAGE A - 6
1. Categories Further Analyzed by Type of Activity	A - 6
K. SUBJECT AREA	PAGE A - 7
1. Categories Further Analyzed by Target Population	A - 8
2. Categories Further Analyzed by Ethnicity/Race	A - 9
L. ROLE OF FOUNDATION SUPPORT	PAGE A -11
M. TYPE OF ACTIVITY OF GRANTEES	PAGE A -11
1. Categories Further Analyzed by Target Population	A -12
2. Categories Further Analyzed by Ethnicity/Race	A - 13
N. GRANTEE PROFILES	PAGE A -15
1. Age of Organizations	A - 15
2. Type of Organizations	A - 15
3. Size of Organizations by Annual Budget	A - 15
4. Board Profiles	A - 15
5. Staff Profiles	A - 15
O. TARGET POPULATION PROFILES	PAGE A -15
1. Target Populations	A - 15
Categories Further Analyzed by Subject Area	A - 16
2. Gender	A - 19
3. Age	A - 19
4. Ethnicity/Race	A - 19
a. Categories Further Analyzed by Subject Area	A - 20
b. Categories Further Analyzed by Type of Activity	A - 22
5. Income Level	A - 24
6. Rural/Urban	A - 24
7. Geographic Diversity	A - 24

SUPPORTING TCE GRANTMAKING DATA FOR FY 2000 AND FY 2001

This is a summary of The California Endowment's (TCE) grantmaking for fiscal year 2000 (March 1, 1999 - February 29, 2000) and 2001 (March 1, 2000 - February 28, 2001) using a facsimile of the Grantmaking Accountability Template (the Template). For a full description of the Template, see *Advancing Accountability: A Tool for Transparent Foundation Grantmaking* at www.consumersunion.org.

A. FOUNDATION PROFILE

These data fields were not part of the draft Template used to conduct this Case Study. Much of the data that is provided below is that which was available from published or publicly available documents, i.e., 990-PF, annual reports, etc. Some data was provided by TCE.

- 1. **Age of Foundation:** TCE was founded in 1996.
- 2. **IRS Foundation Classification** TCE is a private, independent/non-operating, conversion foundation with a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status.

3. **Asset Size** FY 00: \$3,684,524,453 FY 01: \$3,490,256,407

	FY 00	FY 01
Adjusted Qualifying Distributions	\$192,439,252	\$208,272,811
Net Value Noncharitable-Use Assets	\$2,730,102,129	\$3,529,629,290
Payout Percentage	7.05%	5.90%

5. Financial Management

a. Administrative Expense Ratio

	FY 00	FY 01
Administrative Expenses	\$17,167,418	\$18,576,462
Adjusted Qualifying Distributions	\$192,439,252	\$208,272,811
Ratio	8.92%	8.92%

b. Ratios of All Staff to Proposal Received and Grants Made

	FY 00	FY 01
Proposals Received	1,320	1,467
Staff	117	130
Ratio	1:11	1:11
Grants Made	683	696
Staff	117	130
Ratio	1:6	1:5

c. Investment Expense Ratio

	FY 00	FY 01
Investment Expenses/Disbursements	\$10,496,849	\$12,903,823
Avg. End of Year Fair Market Value of Total Assets	\$2,996,982,923	\$3,587,385,430
Ratio	0.35%	0.36%

d. Investment Management Policies

(1) Investment policy objectives:

TCE's investment objectives are: to provide long-term financial support to TCE's grantmaking and to manage the assets on a total return basis that is consistent with its risk tolerance.

(2) How investment policies further foundation's mission, goals and objectives:

TCE's mission is to expand access to affordable, quality health care for underserved individuals and communities, and to promote the fundamental improvements in the health status of Californians. TCE's investment goal is to perpetually provide long-term financial support to its grantmaking community. To do so, the portfolio objective is to produce a sustainable total return targeted for long-term capital appreciation within an acceptable risk tolerance level.

(3) Strategic asset allocation:

U.S. Equity: 43%; International Equity: 18%; Alternatives: 15%; and Fixed Income: 24%

(4) How asset allocation supports investment objectives:

Same as answers to questions (1) and (2).

(5) For the last year, performance of investments compared to market performance for like investments:

For fiscal year-end 1999 and 2000, TCE total fund return was 29.4% and -6.5% respectively.

6. Board Profile

a. Size	FY 00	FY 01
Minimum Required	15	15

Maximum Required	25		25	
Current Board Members	16		16	
b. Gender	FY 00		FY 01	
Male	12	75.00%	12	75.00%
Female	4	25.00%	4	25.00%
Total	16	100.00%	16	100.00%
c. Age	FY 00		FY 01	
Less than 21 years of age	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
21 - 30 years of age	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
31 - 40 years of age	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
41 - 50 years of age	7	43.75%	7	43.75%
51 - 60 years of age	4	25.00%	3	18.75%
61 - 70 years of age	4	25.00%	4	25.00%
More than 70 years of age	1	6.25%	2	12.50%
Total	16	100.00%	16	100.00%
d. Ethnicity/Race	FY 00		FY 01	
African American/Black	3	18.75%	3	18.75%
Asian/Asian American	2	12.50%	2	12.50%
Caucasian/White	7	43.75%	7	43.75%
Latino	3	18.75%	3	18.75%
Native American/Alaska Native	1	6.25%	1	6.25%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other Ethnicity/Racial Minority	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Two or more races	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	16	100.00%	16	100.00%
e. Experience	FY 00		FY 01	
Hospital Administrator	3	18.75%	2	12.50%
Nonprofit Executive	6	37.50%	6	37.50%
Academic	1	6.25%	1	6.25%
Attorney	0	0.00%	1	6.25%
Foundation Executive	2	12.50%	2	12.50%
Finance Executive	2	12.50%	2	12.50%
Business Owner	1	6.25%	1	6.25%
Public Sector Leader	1	6.25%	1	6.25%
Total	16	100.00%	16	100.00%

f. Geographic Diversity

This data field was not part of the draft Template used to conduct this Case Study; data were not available from public documents.

7. Staff Profile

These data fields were not part of the draft Template used to conduct this Case Study. Size of Staff was provided by TCE subsequently.

a. Size

TCE was growing its staff in the two years under study. In FY 2000, it started the year with 83 employees and ended the year with 117 employees. FY 2001 began with 117 employees and ended with 130 employees. The breakdown between finance/administration and program/grantmaking was not available.

b - f: The balance of the data fields under Staff Profile -- gender, age, ethnicity/race, experience, and geographic diversity -- were not available from

B. PROPOSALS RECEIVED, FUNDED, WITHDRAWN, DECLINED BY RATIONALE

This data field was not part of the draft Template used to conduct this Case Study. TCE subsequently provided the numbers of proposals received/funded/denied and the decline rationale. Please note that additional decline rationale categories were added in FY 01.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Proposals Funded:	683	51.74%	\$196,261,493.23	30.36%	696	47.44%	\$183,877,467.37	31.72%
Proposals Withdrawn by Applicant:	57	4.32%	\$40,918,247.00	6.33%	110	7.50%	\$76,679,942.49	13.23%
Proposals Declined:								
Ineligible: Health-Link not demonstrated	51	3.86%	\$19,401,000.51	3.00%	39	2.66%	\$11,093,215.50	1.91%
Eligible--Not Meritorious								
Community Involvement not Demonstrated		0.00%		0.00%	107	7.29%	\$57,522,444.56	9.92%
Duplication of Services		0.00%		0.00%	4	0.27%	\$1,534,523.00	0.26%
Inadequate Sustainability		0.00%		0.00%	63	4.29%	\$38,894,189.94	6.71%
Incomplete Proposal		0.00%		0.00%	54	3.68%	\$25,397,499.48	4.38%
Lacks Cultural Competency		0.00%		0.00%	53	3.61%	\$25,839,113.00	4.46%
Lacks Definitive Health Outcomes		0.00%		0.00%	73	4.98%	\$24,504,172.00	4.23%
Lacks Organizational Capacity	4	0.30%	\$1,433,350.00	0.22%	44	3.00%	\$24,769,282.00	4.27%
Limited Impact on Target Population	13	0.98%	\$8,239,689.00	1.27%	9	0.61%	\$4,261,936.00	0.74%

Need for Services not Demonstrated	91	6.89%	\$59,812,035.19	9.25%	18	1.23%	\$8,624,425.00	1.49%
Outside Funding Program Guidelines	77	5.83%	\$54,205,166.00	8.39%	60	4.09%	\$29,107,994.68	5.02%
Program Approach not Clearly Demonstrated	167	12.65%	\$149,257,636.00	23.09%	56	3.82%	\$30,883,805.81	5.33%
Eligible-Meritorious: Limited Resources	177	13.41%	\$116,878,852.47	18.08%	81	5.52%	\$36,622,111.00	6.32%
Subtotal Proposals Declined	580	43.94%	\$409,227,729.17	63.31%	661	45.06%	\$319,054,711.97	55.05%
Total Proposals Received	1,320	100.00%	\$646,407,469.40	100.00%	1,467	100.00%	\$579,612,121.83	100.00%

C. SPENDING BY GRANTMAKING PROGRAMS

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Board Discretionary Grants	193	28.26%	\$6,245,153.48	3.18%	110	15.80%	\$3,150,000.00	1.71%
CEO Grants	156	22.84%	\$3,314,054.00	1.69%	268	38.51%	\$5,891,635.00	3.20%
Responsive Grants*	234	34.26%	\$84,322,344.00	42.96%	245	35.20%	\$96,239,410.00	52.34%
Strategic Grants**	100	14.64%	\$102,379,941.75	52.17%	73	10.49%	\$78,596,422.37	42.74%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

* Responsive Grants is comprised of one or more of the following grants programs and special initiatives: CommunitiesFirst, Funding Partnerships, League of Community Foundations, the Mental Health RFP, Special Opportunities and Technical Assistance.

** Strategic Grants is comprised of one or more of the following strategic initiatives: Access to Health, Agricultural Workers, Border Health, California Breast Cancer Treatment, California Indians, Disaster Relief/Preparedness, Fluoridation, Health Consumer Advocates, Implementation of Prop 10, Level 1: Community Clinics, Level I: Disparities in Health, Level 1: Workforce & Leadership Development, Level II: At Risk Children & Youth, Level III: Technology & Health, Partnership for the Public's Health, Persons with Disabilities, Prenatal Care for Immigrant Families, Recipients all Foundations.

D. GRANTS BY SIZE

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
\$0 - 99,999	391	57.25%	\$11,357,760.36	5.79%	406	58.33%	\$10,880,125.37	5.92%
\$100,000 - 249,999	80	11.71%	\$13,485,589.87	6.87%	66	9.48%	\$10,806,679.00	5.88%
\$250,000 - 499,999	114	16.69%	\$40,248,723.00	20.51%	126	18.10%	\$45,110,412.00	24.53%
\$500,000 - 999,999	72	10.54%	\$47,383,313.00	24.14%	76	10.92%	\$51,680,922.00	28.11%
\$1,000,000 - 2,499,999	17	2.49%	\$28,586,107.00	14.57%	13	1.87%	\$20,408,191.00	11.10%
\$2,500,000 - 4,999,999	4	0.59%	\$12,900,000.00	6.57%	7	1.01%	\$23,222,682.00	12.63%
\$5,000,000 - 9,999,999	3	0.44%	\$16,800,000.00	8.56%	1	0.14%	\$9,268,456.00	5.04%
\$10,000,000 and over	2	0.29%	\$25,500,000.00	12.99%	1	0.14%	\$12,500,000.00	6.80%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

As recommended in the Template, we have highlighted information about grants made to and by re-granting intermediaries.

1. Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries*

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
\$250,000 - 499,999	3	25.00%	\$1,100,000.00	2.94%		0.00%		0.00%
\$500,000 - 999,999	3	25.00%	\$2,000,000.00	5.34%		0.00%		0.00%
\$1,000,000 - 2,499,999	2	16.67%	\$3,116,600.00	8.32%	1	20.00%	\$1,278,000.00	3.08%
\$2,500,000 - 4,999,999	1	8.33%	\$4,460,000.00	11.90%	2	40.00%	\$7,982,275.00	19.22%
\$5,000,000 - 9,999,999	2	16.67%	\$11,800,000.00	31.49%	1	20.00%	\$9,268,456.00	22.32%
\$10,000,000 and over	1	8.33%	\$15,000,000.00	40.02%	1	20.00%	\$23,000,000.00	55.38%
Total*	12	100.00%	\$37,476,600.00	100.00%	5	100.00%	\$41,528,731.00	100.00%
% of Total Grantmaking Dollars			19.10%				22.59%	

2. Re-Grants Made by Re-Granting Intermediaries**

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
\$0 - 99,999	118	79.73%	\$6,431,851.00	52.90%	77	53.10%	\$4,533,763.00	30.09%
\$100,000 - 249,999	25	16.89%	\$3,839,664.00	31.58%	66	45.52%	\$8,911,134.00	59.14%
\$250,000 - 499,999	4	2.70%	\$1,182,210.00	9.72%	0	0.00%		0.00%
\$500,000 - 999,999	1	0.68%	\$705,526.00	5.80%	1	0.69%	\$621,979.00	4.13%
\$1,000,000 - 2,499,999		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.69%	\$1,000,000.00	6.64%
Total	148	100.00%	\$12,159,251.00	100.00%	145	100.00%	\$15,066,876.00	100.00%

* In the two year period under study, there were 20 grants to 17 intermediary projects. For the purposes of this analysis, these will be considered 17 grants -- 12 in FY 00 and 5 in FY 01, as follows: Fifteen of the 20 grants were made in FY 00 & 5 were made in FY 01. Of the three projects that received two grants, one pair was made in FY 00 and will appear in FY 00 as 1 grant instead of two. Of the other two projects that received two grants, each received one grant in FY 00 and one in FY 01. For the sake of this analysis, they will appear in FY 01 as two grants, instead of four. Therefore, 12 grants will appear under FY 00 instead of 15.

** Categorizes that portion of Re-Granting Dollars that has been re-granted by intermediaries to date. Of FY 00 total re-granting dollars (\$29,017,280), \$16,858,029 remained to be allocated at the time of this Case Study; of FY 01 total re-granting dollars (\$33,687,916), \$18,621,040 remained to be allocated.

E. GRANTS BY TERM

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
0 - 6 months	103	15.08%	\$3,448,790.88	1.76%	181	26.01%	\$5,033,326.37	2.74%
7 - 12 months	284	41.58%	\$18,236,764.48	9.29%	235	33.76%	\$30,872,350.00	16.79%
13 - 24 months	166	24.30%	\$61,264,291.87	31.22%	145	20.83%	\$52,079,030.00	28.32%
25 - 36 months	115	16.84%	\$73,150,553.00	37.27%	130	18.68%	\$79,426,086.00	43.20%
37 - 48 months	9	1.32%	\$31,723,992.00	16.16%	4	0.57%	\$13,466,675.00	7.32%
49 - 60 months	6	0.88%	\$8,437,101.00	4.30%	1	0.14%	\$3,000,000.00	1.63%
61 months or more	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

F. GRANTMAKING METHOD

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Grants Made by Foundation*								
Grants to Provider of Goods/Services	668	80.68%	\$146,284,893.23	79.61%	691	82.16%	\$154,848,736.37	78.85%
Grants to Re-Granting Intermediaries**	12	1.45%	\$8,459,320.00	4.60%	5	0.59%	\$7,840,815.00	3.99%
Sub-Total Grants Made by Foundation	680	82.13%	\$154,744,213.23	84.21%	696	82.76%	\$162,689,551.37	82.85%
Re-Grants Made by Re-Granting Intermediaries**								
Re-Grants Made/Allocated to Date	148	17.87%	\$12,159,251.00	6.62%	145	17.24%	\$15,066,876.00	7.67%
Re-Grant Dollars to be Allocated		0.00%	\$16,858,029.00	9.17%		0.00%	\$18,621,040.00	9.48%
Sub-Total Re-Grants Made	148	17.87%	\$29,017,280.00	15.79%	145	17.24%	\$33,687,916.00	17.15%
Total Grants by Foundation**	828	100.00%	\$183,761,493.23	100.00%	841	100.00%	\$196,377,467.37	100.00%

* Because of the re-ordering of grants to intermediaries described in the footnote above, the "# of Grants" that appear here is 680 for FY00 instead of 683. The dollar totals for each year also differ from elsewhere in this Template. Taking both years together, however, total grant dollars shown here equal the actual total dollars, as shown in other data fields in this Template.

** Only that portion of the grant that goes to and remains with the Re-Granting Intermediary (i.e., administration and value-added services) is coded in the "Grants to Re-Granting Intermediaries" category. The portion of the grant that goes to the Re-Granting Intermediary that is restricted for re-granting is accounted for in the "Re-Grants Made by Re-Granting Intermediaries" category. For definitions of these categories and a breakdown of dollars to re-granting intermediaries by function, see data field H.2. below.)

G. GRANTMAKING PROCESS

This data field was totally changed after conducting this Case Study. For the final data field, see the Template attached to *Advancing Accountability: A Tool for Transparent Foundation Grantmaking* at www.consumersunion.org. What follows are the data field and categories used to conduct the TCE case study. Definitions for these coding categories can be found in the main TCE Case Study document to which this is attached.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Competitive	190	27.82%	\$74,114,344.00	37.76%	179	25.72%	\$57,582,567.00	31.32%
RFP:								
Open		0.00%		0.00%	46	6.61%	\$23,824,424.00	12.96%
Closed		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Invited Proposal	144	21.08%	\$112,587,941.75	57.37%	93	13.36%	\$93,428,841.37	50.81%
Discretionary	349	51.10%	\$9,559,207.48	4.87%	378	54.31%	\$9,041,635.00	4.92%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%
1. Grants Made to Re-Granting Intermediaries*								
	# of Grants	%	FY 00 Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	FY 01 Dollars	%
Competitive		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
RFP:								
Open		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Closed		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Invited Proposal	12	100.00%	\$37,476,600.00	100.00%	5	100.00%	\$41,528,731.00	100.00%
Discretionary		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	12	100.00%	\$37,476,600.00	100.00%	5	100.00%	\$41,528,731.00	100.00%
2. Re-Grants Made by Re-Granting Intermediaries**								
	# of Grants	%	FY 00 Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	FY 01 Dollars	%
Competitive		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
RFP:								
Open	85	57.43%	\$7,388,135.00	60.76%	145	100.00%	\$15,066,876.00	100.00%
Closed	24	16.22%	\$1,336,205.00	10.99%		0.00%		0.00%
Invited Proposal	39	26.35%	\$3,434,911.00	28.25%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Discretionary		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	148	100.00%	\$12,159,251.00	100.00%	145	100.00%	\$15,066,876.00	100.00%

* In the two year period under study, there were 20 grants to 17 intermediary projects. For the purposes of this analysis, these will be considered 17 grants -- 12 in FY 00 and 5 in FY 01, as follows: Fifteen of the 20 grants were made in FY 00 & 5 were made in FY 01. Of the three projects that received two grants, one pair was made in FY 00 and will appear in FY 00 as 1 grant instead of two. Of the other two projects that received two grants, each received one grant in FY 00 and one in FY 01. For the sake of this analysis, they will appear in FY 01 as two grants, instead of four. Therefore, 12 grants will appear under FY 00 instead of 15.

** Categorizes "Re-Grants Made" portion of Re-Granting Dollars given out by Re-Granting intermediaries.

H. GRANTS MADE TO RE-GRANTING INTERMEDIARIES*

1. Reason for Using Re-Granting Intermediary

This information was not available.

2. Grants Broken Out by Function**

	# of Grants	%	FY 00 Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	FY 01 Dollars	%
Administration			\$1,935,075.00	5.16%			\$3,121,030.00	7.52%
Program-related/Value-added Services			\$6,524,245.00	17.41%			\$4,719,785.00	11.37%
Re-Granting Dollars			\$29,017,280.00	77.43%			\$33,687,916.00	81.12%
Re-Grants Made			\$12,159,251.00	32.44%			\$15,066,876.00	36.28%
Re-Granting Dollars Remaining			\$16,858,029.00	44.98%			\$18,621,040.00	44.84%
Total	12	0.00%	\$37,476,600.00	100.00%	5	0.00%	\$41,528,731.00	100.00%

* The grants analyzed in this data field are a sub-group of the total grants.

** In the two year period under study, there were 20 grants to 17 intermediary projects. For the purposes of this analysis, these will be considered 17 grants -- 12 in FY 00 and 5 in FY 01, as follows: Fifteen of the 20 grants were made in FY 00 & 5 were made in FY 01. Of the three projects that received two grants, one pair was made in FY 00 and will appear in FY 00 as 1 grant instead of two. Of the other two projects that received two grants, each received one grant in FY 00 and one in FY 01. For the sake of this analysis, they will appear in FY 01 as two grants, instead of four. Therefore, 12 grants will appear under FY 00 instead of 15.

I. FOUNDATION GOALS

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Access	187	27.38%	\$81,110,391.00	41.33%	228	32.76%	\$77,323,089.00	42.05%
Health & Well-Being	268	39.24%	\$65,744,513.89	33.50%	265	38.07%	\$54,624,712.00	29.71%
Multicultural Health	228	33.38%	\$49,406,588.34	25.17%	103	14.80%	\$49,064,666.37	26.68%
Not Specified		0.00%		0.00%	100	14.37%	\$2,865,000.00	1.56%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

J. PRIMARY SECTOR OF IMPACT

The data categories found below are TCE's. Although some of them are similar to those recommended in the Template, the definitions are not necessarily the same.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Families & Individuals	165	24.16%	\$66,387,849.00	33.83%	316	45.40%	\$53,923,232.00	29.33%
Communities	108	15.81%	\$67,854,056.88	34.57%	233	33.48%	\$63,405,200.00	34.48%
Systems	61	8.93%	\$52,460,379.87	26.73%	136	19.54%	\$62,687,874.00	34.09%
None Specified	349	51.10%	\$9,559,207.48	4.87%	11	1.58%	\$3,861,161.37	2.10%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

1. Primary Sector of Impact Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Type of Activity of Grantee

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Families & Individuals								
Applied Research	1	0.61%	\$154,037.00	0.23%	1	0.32%	\$25,000.00	0.05%
Capacity Building	14	8.48%	\$4,842,695.00	7.29%	26	8.23%	\$5,677,551.00	10.53%
Capital	13	7.88%	\$2,848,353.00	4.29%	33	10.44%	\$3,242,900.00	6.01%
Community Organizing	2	1.21%	\$2,244,596.00	3.38%	0	0.00%		0.00%
Core Operating Support	5	3.03%	\$1,357,701.00	2.05%	32	10.13%	\$2,094,205.00	3.88%
Direct Services	47	28.48%	\$23,273,356.00	35.06%	49	15.51%	\$12,088,650.00	22.42%
Evaluation	1	0.61%	\$15,000.00	0.02%	3	0.95%	\$553,774.00	1.03%
Expansion	32	19.39%	\$11,047,172.00	16.64%	62	19.62%	\$13,627,007.00	25.27%
Information/Education	6	3.64%	\$963,350.00	1.45%	55	17.41%	\$3,749,222.00	6.95%
Media	4	2.42%	\$1,687,880.00	2.54%	4	1.27%	\$2,327,147.00	4.32%
Planning	6	3.64%	\$1,537,553.00	2.32%	13	4.11%	\$983,453.00	1.82%
Policy & Advocacy		0.00%		0.00%	9	2.85%	\$1,822,252.00	3.38%
Promotores	4	2.42%	\$2,148,126.00	3.24%	2	0.63%	\$520,000.00	0.96%
Re-Granting	12	7.27%	\$5,488,095.00	8.27%	2	0.63%	\$75,000.00	0.14%
Technical Assistance	2	1.21%	\$585,424.00	0.88%	4	1.27%	\$810,877.00	1.50%
Technology	2	1.21%	\$2,450,000.00	3.69%		0.00%		0.00%
Training & Mentoring	14	8.48%	\$5,744,511.00	8.65%	21	6.65%	\$6,326,194.00	11.73%
Total	165	100.00%	\$66,387,849.00	100.00%	316	100.00%	\$53,923,232.00	100.00%
Communities								
Applied Research		0.00%		0.00%	5	2.15%	\$878,311.00	1.39%
Capacity Building	33	30.56%	\$22,354,747.00	32.95%	17	7.30%	\$4,222,950.00	6.66%
Capital	6	5.56%	\$2,245,239.00	3.31%	11	4.72%	\$1,363,635.00	2.15%
Community Organizing	12	11.11%	\$4,221,250.00	6.22%	22	9.44%	\$3,225,629.00	5.09%
Core Operating Support	4	3.70%	\$6,245,223.00	9.20%	12	5.15%	\$437,000.00	0.69%
Direct Services	8	7.41%	\$2,704,477.88	3.99%	11	4.72%	\$4,804,410.00	7.58%
Evaluation		0.00%		0.00%	3	1.29%	\$578,219.00	0.91%
Expansion	5	4.63%	\$10,413,267.00	15.35%	31	13.30%	\$8,658,703.00	13.66%
Information/Education	4	3.70%	\$2,138,097.00	3.15%	46	19.74%	\$7,426,779.00	11.71%
Media	5	4.63%	\$3,068,495.00	4.52%	5	2.15%	\$500,000.00	0.79%
Planning	6	5.56%	\$1,723,323.00	2.54%	33	14.16%	\$2,205,951.00	3.48%
Policy & Advocacy	2	1.85%	\$128,255.00	0.19%	12	5.15%	\$11,516,411.00	18.16%
Promotores	3	2.78%	\$1,611,353.00	2.37%	5	2.15%	\$2,155,944.00	3.40%
Re-Granting	11	10.19%	\$7,671,020.00	11.31%	4	1.72%	\$10,643,456.00	16.79%
Technical Assistance	2	1.85%	\$521,805.00	0.77%	4	1.72%	\$1,371,500.00	2.16%
Technology	1	0.93%	\$436,567.00	0.64%	3	1.29%	\$125,000.00	0.20%
Training & Mentoring	6	5.56%	\$2,370,938.00	3.49%	9	3.86%	\$3,291,302.00	5.19%
Total	108	100.00%	\$67,854,056.88	100.00%	233	100.00%	\$63,405,200.00	100.00%
Systems								
Applied Research	6	9.84%	\$2,147,630.87	4.09%	6	4.41%	\$499,909.00	0.80%
Capacity Building	7	11.48%	\$4,200,832.00	8.01%	19	13.97%	\$4,662,935.00	7.44%
Capital		0.00%		0.00%	3	2.21%	\$4,101,645.00	6.54%
Community Organizing	1	1.64%	\$193,000.00	0.37%	10	7.35%	\$1,377,222.00	2.20%

Core Operating Support	2	3.28%	\$1,781,311.00	3.40%	2	1.47%	\$173,843.00	0.28%
Direct Services	1	1.64%	\$50,000.00	0.10%	4	2.94%	\$2,456,782.00	3.92%
Evaluation	2	3.28%	\$3,387,331.00	6.46%	6	4.41%	\$647,500.00	1.03%
Expansion	1	1.64%	\$2,000,000.00	3.81%	6	4.41%	\$1,746,439.00	2.79%
Information/Education	1	1.64%	\$500,000.00	0.95%	26	19.12%	\$10,272,714.00	16.39%
Media		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.74%	\$506,000.00	0.81%
Planning	2	3.28%	\$1,175,562.00	2.24%	20	14.71%	\$3,143,926.00	5.02%
Policy & Advocacy	9	14.75%	\$5,181,269.00	9.88%	8	5.88%	\$1,939,150.00	3.09%
Promotores		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.74%	\$2,637,000.00	4.21%
Re-Granting	17	27.87%	\$21,979,250.00	41.90%	4	2.94%	\$18,778,000.00	29.95%
Technical Assistance	1	1.64%	\$870,000.00	1.66%	8	5.88%	\$4,322,663.00	6.90%
Technology	3	4.92%	\$2,604,194.00	4.96%	6	4.41%	\$1,233,187.00	1.97%
Training & Mentoring	8	13.11%	\$6,390,000.00	12.18%	6	4.41%	\$4,188,959.00	6.68%
Total	61	100.00%	\$52,460,379.87	100.00%	136	100.00%	\$62,687,874.00	100.00%

K. SUBJECT AREA

The data categories found below are TCE's. Although some of them are similar to those recommended in the Template, the definitions are not necessarily the same.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Access to Care	62	9.08%	\$25,035,864.00	12.76%	55	7.90%	\$11,976,921.00	6.51%
Aging/Senior Issues	19	2.78%	\$6,131,845.00	3.12%	30	4.31%	\$3,806,589.00	2.07%
AIDS/HIV	23	3.37%	\$2,270,818.00	1.16%	19	2.73%	\$3,150,852.00	1.71%
Cancer	14	2.05%	\$1,866,687.00	0.95%	21	3.02%	\$5,498,085.00	2.99%
Census	8	1.17%	\$1,625,125.00	0.83%	3	0.43%	\$50,000.00	0.03%
Children & Youth	60	8.78%	\$12,015,791.00	6.12%	58	8.33%	\$10,746,378.00	5.84%
Chronic Disease	19	2.78%	\$10,886,890.00	5.55%	28	4.02%	\$28,802,689.00	15.66%
Dental	25	3.66%	\$11,856,545.00	6.04%	7	1.01%	\$2,074,325.00	1.13%
Disabilities	21	3.07%	\$5,248,058.00	2.67%	26	3.74%	\$2,579,139.00	1.40%
Disaster Relief	10	1.46%	\$169,350.88	0.09%	4	0.57%	\$706,345.00	0.38%
Domestic Violence	10	1.46%	\$4,301,096.00	2.19%	13	1.87%	\$4,390,459.00	2.39%
Education	5	0.73%	\$411,274.00	0.21%	4	0.57%	\$686,560.00	0.37%
Employment	3	0.44%	\$682,567.00	0.35%	6	0.86%	\$593,795.00	0.32%
Environmental Health	12	1.76%	\$1,539,629.00	0.78%	10	1.44%	\$1,233,038.00	0.67%
Health and Human Services	49	7.17%	\$1,327,693.01	0.68%	20	2.87%	\$2,116,255.00	1.15%
Health Coverage	19	2.78%	\$7,646,660.00	3.90%	13	1.87%	\$3,861,296.00	2.10%
Health Education	32	4.69%	\$4,731,981.00	2.41%	17	2.44%	\$1,406,331.00	0.76%
Health Policy	21	3.07%	\$19,075,644.47	9.72%	13	1.87%	\$1,335,000.00	0.73%
Homeless	14	2.05%	\$1,927,765.00	0.98%	17	2.44%	\$3,485,068.00	1.90%
Hospice/Bereavement	3	0.44%	\$371,250.00	0.19%	5	0.72%	\$613,072.00	0.33%
Housing	5	0.73%	\$3,214,425.00	1.64%	5	0.72%	\$498,745.00	0.27%
Information Technology	6	0.88%	\$16,810,194.00	8.57%	6	0.86%	\$12,634,997.00	6.87%
Injury Prevention	2	0.29%	\$1,079,510.00	0.55%	1	0.14%	\$219,080.00	0.12%
Institutionalized/Incarcerated	2	0.29%	\$308,790.00	0.16%	4	0.57%	\$267,239.00	0.15%
Leadership Development	3	0.44%	\$1,055,324.00	0.54%	5	0.72%	\$504,500.00	0.27%
Mental Health	33	4.83%	\$5,091,442.00	2.59%	73	10.49%	\$24,520,346.00	13.34%
Nutrition	5	0.73%	\$2,209,680.00	1.13%	10	1.44%	\$1,184,795.00	0.64%
Organizational Development	41	6.00%	\$11,357,299.00	5.79%	28	4.02%	\$4,196,037.00	2.28%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	19	2.78%	\$4,051,228.00	2.06%	54	7.76%	\$11,781,505.37	6.41%
Physical Activity	3	0.44%	\$265,000.00	0.14%	4	0.57%	\$103,000.00	0.06%
PICO/Faith Based	1	0.15%	\$40,000.00	0.02%	10	1.44%	\$2,354,688.00	1.28%
Primary Care	26	3.81%	\$4,015,772.00	2.05%	40	5.75%	\$8,679,503.00	4.72%
Reproductive Health	16	2.34%	\$4,198,831.00	2.14%	8	1.15%	\$935,418.00	0.51%
Rural Health	7	1.02%	\$344,037.00	0.18%	4	0.57%	\$3,298,885.00	1.79%
Substance Abuse	18	2.64%	\$3,181,164.00	1.62%	16	2.30%	\$2,080,422.00	1.13%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	18	2.64%	\$2,688,521.00	1.37%	16	2.30%	\$3,472,329.00	1.89%
Vision	2	0.29%	\$75,000.00	0.04%	6	0.86%	\$766,713.00	0.42%
Welfare Reform	5	0.73%	\$810,246.00	0.41%	1	0.14%	\$15,000.00	0.01%
Wellness/Health Promotion	14	2.05%	\$2,135,000.00	1.09%	10	1.44%	\$1,203,655.00	0.65%
Workforce (health)	28	4.10%	\$14,207,496.87	7.24%	26	3.74%	\$16,048,413.00	8.73%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

1. Subject Area Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Target Population

Please note that some categories do not have spending that ≥\$10 million in both years of funding.

Access to Care	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%

Agricultural/Seasonal Workers	1	1.61%	\$50,000.00	0.20%		0.00%		0.00%
Children, Youth & Families	10	16.13%	\$3,864,141.00	15.43%	15	27.27%	\$5,512,000.00	46.02%
Disabled	1	1.61%	\$50,000.00	0.20%	1	1.82%	\$24,620.00	0.21%
Disease Specific	2	3.23%	\$278,500.00	1.11%		0.00%		0.00%
Elderly	1	1.61%	\$460,000.00	1.84%		0.00%		0.00%
General (All Underserved Populations)	28	45.16%	\$12,929,786.00	51.65%	25	45.45%	\$4,266,162.00	35.62%
Immigrants	5	8.06%	\$677,900.00	2.71%	4	7.27%	\$455,809.00	3.81%
Rural Populations	10	16.13%	\$5,467,069.00	21.84%	9	16.36%	\$1,693,330.00	14.14%
Substance Abusers		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.82%	\$25,000.00	0.21%
Urban Populations	4	6.45%	\$1,258,468.00	5.03%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	62	100.00%	\$25,035,864.00	100.00%	55	100.00%	\$11,976,921.00	100.00%
Children & Youth								
Children, Youth & Families	36	60.00%	\$9,906,491.00	82.45%	36	62.07%	\$8,172,109.00	76.05%
Disabled	2	3.33%	\$165,000.00	1.37%	1	1.72%	\$359,294.00	3.34%
Disease Specific	2	3.33%	\$30,000.00	0.25%	1	1.72%	\$15,000.00	0.14%
Gays & Lesbians	1	1.67%	\$55,000.00	0.46%		0.00%		0.00%
General (All Underserved Populations)	12	20.00%	\$410,000.00	3.41%	16	27.59%	\$1,803,552.00	16.78%
Homeless		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.72%	\$25,000.00	0.23%
Immigrants	1	1.67%	\$30,000.00	0.25%		0.00%		0.00%
Rural Populations		0.00%		0.00%	3	5.17%	\$371,423.00	3.46%
Urban Populations	6	10.00%	\$1,419,300.00	11.81%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	60	100.00%	\$12,015,791.00	100.00%	58	100.00%	\$10,746,378.00	100.00%
Chronic Disease								
Children, Youth & Families	5	26.32%	\$4,555,521.00	41.84%	3	10.71%	\$13,146,675.00	45.64%
Disabled	1	5.26%	\$25,000.00	0.23%		0.00%		0.00%
Disease Specific	8	42.11%	\$4,068,024.00	37.37%	17	60.71%	\$10,253,519.00	35.60%
General (All Underserved Populations)	3	15.79%	\$891,391.00	8.19%	6	21.43%	\$5,328,495.00	18.50%
Rural Populations	1	5.26%	\$405,000.00	3.72%	1	3.57%	\$24,000.00	0.08%
Urban Populations	1	5.26%	\$941,954.00	8.65%	1	3.57%	\$50,000.00	0.17%
Total	19	100.00%	\$10,886,890.00	100.00%	28	100.00%	\$28,802,689.00	100.00%
Dental								
Children, Youth & Families	15	60.00%	\$7,484,482.00	63.13%				
Disabled	1	4.00%	\$2,027,986.00	17.10%				
Disease Specific	1	4.00%	\$461,810.00	3.89%				
General (All Underserved Populations)	5	20.00%	\$964,989.00	8.14%				
Rural Populations	3	12.00%	\$917,278.00	7.74%				
Total	25	100.00%	\$11,856,545.00	100.00%				
Health Policy								
Agricultural/Seasonal Workers	1	4.76%	\$20,000.00	0.10%				
Children, Youth & Families	4	19.05%	\$18,040,000.00	94.57%				
General (All Underserved Populations)	15	71.43%	\$995,644.47	5.22%				
Urban Populations	1	4.76%	\$20,000.00	0.10%				
Total	21	100.00%	\$19,075,644.47	100.00%				
Information Technology								
Children, Youth & Families	1	16.67%	\$304,194.00	1.81%	2	33.33%	\$49,997.00	0.40%
General (All Underserved Populations)		0.00%		0.00%	2	33.33%	\$75,000.00	0.59%
Rural Populations	3	50.00%	\$16,000,000.00	95.18%	2	33.33%	\$12,510,000.00	99.01%
Urban Populations	2	33.33%	\$506,000.00	3.01%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	6	100.00%	\$16,810,194.00	100.00%	6	100.00%	\$12,634,997.00	100.00%
Mental Health								
Children, Youth & Families					29	39.73%	\$11,401,249.00	46.50%
Disabled					1	1.37%	\$25,000.00	0.10%
Disease Specific					1	1.37%	\$162,740.00	0.66%
Elderly					5	6.85%	\$2,291,613.00	9.35%
Gays & Lesbians					1	1.37%	\$325,159.00	1.33%
General (All Underserved Populations)					16	21.92%	\$4,680,046.00	19.09%
Health Professionals					1	1.37%	\$30,000.00	0.12%
Homeless					6	8.22%	\$1,400,718.00	5.71%
Immigrants					7	9.59%	\$2,690,700.00	10.97%
Rural Populations					2	2.74%	\$423,340.00	1.73%
Substance Abusers					2	2.74%	\$439,781.00	1.79%
Urban Populations					2	2.74%	\$650,000.00	2.65%
Total					73	100.00%	\$24,520,346.00	100.00%
Organizational Development								
Children, Youth & Families	19	46.34%	\$3,546,168.00	31.22%				
Gays & Lesbians	2	4.88%	\$520,000.00	4.58%				
General (All Underserved Populations)	14	34.15%	\$4,788,526.00	42.16%				

Immigrants	1	2.44%	\$350,000.00	3.08%				
Rural Populations	3	7.32%	\$1,577,125.00	13.89%				
Urban Populations	2	4.88%	\$575,480.00	5.07%				
Total	41	100.00%	\$11,357,299.00	100.00%				
Outreach/Information & Education/Promotores								
Children, Youth & Families					7	12.96%	\$1,379,800.00	11.71%
Disease Specific					1	1.85%	\$25,000.00	0.21%
Elderly					1	1.85%	\$112,947.00	0.96%
Gays & Lesbians					2	3.70%	\$35,000.00	0.30%
General (All Underserved Populations)					25	46.30%	\$5,552,007.00	47.12%
Health Professionals					4	7.41%	\$3,171,353.00	26.92%
Immigrants					7	12.96%	\$508,592.37	4.32%
Rural Populations					3	5.56%	\$846,896.00	7.19%
Urban Populations					4	7.41%	\$149,910.00	1.27%
Total	54	100.00%	\$11,781,505.37	100.00%				
Workforce (health)								
Children, Youth & Families	7	25.00%	\$6,040,000.00	42.51%	3	12.00%	\$3,241,287.00	20.95%
Disabled	1	3.57%	\$203,236.00	1.43%		0.00%		0.00%
Disease Specific	2	7.14%	\$798,639.87	5.62%		0.00%		0.00%
General (All Underserved Populations)	6	21.43%	\$589,000.00	4.15%	8	32.00%	\$618,000.00	4.00%
Health Professionals		0.00%		0.00%	7	28.00%	\$8,187,077.00	52.93%
Homeless	1	3.57%	\$511,621.00	3.60%		0.00%		0.00%
Immigrants	7	25.00%	\$3,600,000.00	25.34%	7	28.00%	\$3,422,049.00	22.12%
Rural Populations	1	3.57%	\$1,000,000.00	7.04%		0.00%		0.00%
Urban Populations	3	10.71%	\$1,465,000.00	10.31%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	28	100.00%	\$14,207,496.87	100.00%	25	100.00%	\$15,468,413.00	100.00%

2. Subject Area Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Ethnicity/Race

Please note that some categories do not have spending that ≥\$10 million in both years of funding.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Access to Care								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	32	51.61%	\$15,710,610.00	62.75%	28	50.91%	\$6,600,839.00	55.11%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	9	14.52%	\$4,528,900.00	18.09%	8	14.55%	\$1,028,223.00	8.59%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	4	6.45%	\$1,949,230.00	7.79%	2	3.64%	\$205,809.00	1.72%
Asian		0.00%		0.00%	3	5.45%	\$380,000.00	3.17%
Latino	15	24.19%	\$2,812,124.00	11.23%	11	20.00%	\$2,887,050.00	24.11%
Native American		0.00%		0.00%	3	5.45%	\$875,000.00	7.31%
White	2	3.23%	\$35,000.00	0.14%		0.00%		0.00%
Sub-Total	21	33.87%	\$4,796,354.00	19.16%	19	34.55%	\$4,347,859.00	36.30%
Total	62	100.00%	\$25,035,864.00	100.00%	55	100.00%	\$11,976,921.00	100.00%
Children & Youth								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	38	63.33%	\$8,348,662.00	69.48%	40	68.97%	\$7,780,889.00	72.40%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	7	11.67%	\$665,000.00	5.53%	6	10.34%	\$471,000.00	4.38%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	4	6.67%	\$1,249,300.00	10.40%	3	5.17%	\$879,434.00	8.18%
Asian	3	5.00%	\$65,000.00	0.54%		0.00%		0.00%
Latino	6	10.00%	\$1,622,929.00	13.51%	7	12.07%	\$1,580,055.00	14.70%
Native American	2	3.33%	\$64,900.00	0.54%		0.00%		0.00%
Pacific Islander		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.72%	\$25,000.00	0.23%
White		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.72%	\$10,000.00	0.09%
Sub-Total	15	25.00%	\$3,002,129.00	24.98%	12	20.69%	\$2,494,489.00	23.21%
Total	60	100.00%	\$12,015,791.00	100.00%	58	100.00%	\$10,746,378.00	100.00%
Chronic Disease								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	8	42.11%	\$5,356,954.00	49.21%	9	32.14%	\$5,470,457.00	18.99%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	1	5.26%	\$25,000.00	0.23%		0.00%		0.00%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	2	10.53%	\$1,169,890.00	10.75%	5	17.86%	\$14,173,559.00	49.21%
Latino	4	21.05%	\$1,481,306.00	13.61%	12	42.86%	\$7,637,475.00	26.52%
Native American	4	21.05%	\$2,853,740.00	26.21%	2	7.14%	\$1,521,198.00	5.28%
Sub-Total	10	52.63%	\$5,504,936.00	50.56%	19	67.86%	\$23,332,232.00	81.01%
Total	19	100.00%	\$10,886,890.00	100.00%	28	100.00%	\$28,802,689.00	100.00%
Dental								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	14	56.00%	\$6,580,607.00	55.50%				
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	3	12.00%	\$184,989.00	1.56%				
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	1	4.00%	\$750,000.00	6.33%				
Latino	7	28.00%	\$4,340,949.00	36.61%				
Sub-Total	8	32.00%	\$5,090,949.00	42.94%				

Total	25	100.00%	\$11,856,545.00	100.00%				
Health Policy								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	7	33.33%	\$15,104,000.00	79.18%				
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	3	14.29%	\$3,045,000.00	15.96%				
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	3	14.29%	\$94,650.00	0.50%				
Asian	2	9.52%	\$621,948.00	3.26%				
Latino	4	19.05%	\$130,046.47	0.68%				
Native American	2	9.52%	\$80,000.00	0.42%				
Sub-Total	11	52.38%	\$926,644.47	4.86%				
Total	21	100.00%	\$19,075,644.47	100.00%				
Information Technology								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	4	66.67%	\$11,604,194.00	69.03%	6	100.00%	\$12,634,997.00	100.00%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	1	16.67%	\$5,000,000.00	29.74%		0.00%		0.00%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	1	16.67%	\$206,000.00	1.23%		0.00%		0.00%
Sub-Total	1	16.67%	\$206,000.00	1.23%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Total	6	100.00%	\$16,810,194.00	100.00%	6	100.00%	\$12,634,997.00	100.00%
Mental Health								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)					33	45.21%	\$10,357,671.00	42.24%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)					10	13.70%	\$3,115,940.00	12.71%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black					7	9.59%	\$2,456,634.00	10.02%
Asian					7	9.59%	\$2,114,855.00	8.62%
Latino					12	16.44%	\$4,667,664.00	19.04%
Native American					4	5.48%	\$1,807,582.00	7.37%
Sub-Total					30	41.10%	\$11,046,735.00	45.05%
Total					73	100.00%	\$24,520,346.00	100.00%
Organizational Development								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	16	39.02%	\$5,806,960.00	51.13%				
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)		0.00%		0.00%				
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	8	32.00%	\$1,613,938.00	14.21%				
Asian	6	24.00%	\$1,060,000.00	9.33%				
Latino	8	32.00%	\$1,606,401.00	14.14%				
Native American	3	12.00%	\$1,270,000.00	11.18%				
Sub-Total	25	60.98%	\$5,550,339.00	48.87%				
Total	41	100.00%	\$11,357,299.00	100.00%				
Outreach/Information & Education/Promotores								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)					31	57.41%	\$9,325,807.37	79.16%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)					2	3.70%	\$50,000.00	0.42%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black					4	7.41%	\$387,670.00	3.29%
Asian					5	9.26%	\$618,326.00	5.25%
Latino					11	20.37%	\$1,389,702.00	11.80%
Pacific Islander					1	1.85%	\$10,000.00	0.08%
Sub-Total					21	38.89%	\$2,405,698.00	20.42%
Total					54	100.00%	\$11,781,505.37	100.00%
Workforce (health)								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	11	39.29%	\$7,465,260.87	52.54%	15	27.27%	\$11,968,725.00	74.58%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	4	14.29%	\$560,000.00	3.94%		0.00%		0.00%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)						0.00%		0.00%
African American/Black	1	3.57%	\$407,861.00	2.87%		0.00%		0.00%
Asian	4	14.29%	\$2,650,000.00	18.65%	3	5.45%	\$1,808,021.00	11.27%
Latino	8	28.57%	\$3,124,375.00	21.99%	8	14.55%	\$2,271,667.00	14.16%
Sub-Total	13	46.43%	\$6,182,236.00	43.51%	11	42.31%	\$4,079,688.00	25.42%
Total	28	100.00%	\$14,207,496.87	100.00%	26	69.58%	\$16,048,413.00	100.00%

L. ROLE OF FOUNDATION SUPPORT

This information was not available. TCE has a category of data in their grants management system that is named "Primary Type of Support" but the categories in this data field are a combination of Types of Activity of Grantee and Types of Support Provided by Foundation. Information from TCE's "Primary Type of Support" field is, therefore, reported under Type of Activity of Grantee below.

M. TYPE OF ACTIVITY OF GRANTEE

The data categories found below are TCE's. Although some of them are similar to those recommended in the Template, the definition is not necessarily the same.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Applied Research	12	1.76%	\$2,446,667.87	1.25%	12	1.72%	\$1,403,220.00	0.76%
Capacity Building	63	9.22%	\$31,717,274.00	16.16%	62	8.91%	\$14,563,436.00	7.92%
Capital	54	7.91%	\$6,228,592.00	3.17%	48	6.90%	\$8,717,728.00	4.74%
Community Organizing	21	3.07%	\$6,828,576.00	3.48%	32	4.60%	\$4,602,851.00	2.50%
Core Operating Support	108	15.81%	\$11,950,449.00	6.09%	46	6.61%	\$2,705,048.00	1.47%
Direct Services	67	9.81%	\$26,397,833.88	13.45%	65	9.34%	\$19,374,842.00	10.54%

General (All Underserved Populations)	29	32.22%	\$2,745,679.00	11.05%	32	31.68%	\$7,861,840.00	31.39%
Homeless	8	8.89%	\$1,243,687.00	5.00%	10	9.90%	\$3,107,065.00	12.40%
Immigrants	2	2.22%	\$50,000.00	0.20%	3	2.97%	\$350,000.00	1.40%
Rural Populations	7	7.78%	\$5,111,704.00	20.57%	5	4.95%	\$1,328,305.00	5.30%
Substance Abusers	1	1.11%	\$199,904.00	0.80%	4	3.96%	\$611,230.00	2.44%
Urban Populations	10	11.11%	\$2,572,544.00	10.35%	1	0.99%	\$584,645.00	2.33%
Total	90	100.00%	\$24,850,878.00	100.00%	101	100.00%	\$25,047,400.00	100.00%
Information/Education								
Children, Youth & Families					18	13.74%	\$3,002,393.00	12.87%
Disabled					6	4.58%	\$105,856.00	0.45%
Disease Specific					15	11.45%	\$3,241,369.00	13.90%
Elderly					5	3.82%	\$1,766,473.00	7.57%
Gays & Lesbians					1	0.76%	\$10,000.00	0.04%
General (All Underserved Populations)					52	39.69%	\$4,308,752.00	18.48%
Health Professionals					7	5.34%	\$7,454,853.00	31.97%
Immigrants					10	7.63%	\$1,808,138.00	7.75%
Rural Populations					8	6.11%	\$950,271.00	4.07%
Substance Abusers					1	0.76%	\$25,000.00	0.11%
Urban Populations					7	5.34%	\$623,245.00	2.67%
Veterans					1	0.76%	\$25,000.00	0.11%
Total					131	100.00%	\$23,321,350.00	100.00%
Policy & Advocacy								
Children, Youth & Families					10	34.48%	\$5,031,145.00	32.93%
Disabled					2	6.90%	\$385,769.00	2.53%
General (All Underserved Populations)					13	44.83%	\$8,259,486.00	54.06%
Homeless					1	3.45%	\$836,413.00	5.47%
Immigrants					1	3.45%	\$680,000.00	4.45%
Urban Populations					2	6.90%	\$85,000.00	0.56%
Total					29	100.00%	\$15,277,813.00	100.00%
Re-Granting								
Agricultural/Seasonal Workers	1	2.38%	\$3,000,000.00	8.51%		0.00%		0.00%
Children, Youth & Families	3	7.14%	\$1,867,230.00	5.30%	3	30.00%	\$14,068,456.00	47.70%
Disease Specific	3	7.14%	\$2,264,100.00	6.43%	1	10.00%	\$1,400,000.00	4.75%
Gays & Lesbians		0.00%		0.00%	1	10.00%	\$25,000.00	0.08%
General (All Underserved Populations)	20	47.62%	\$7,209,940.00	20.46%	3	30.00%	\$225,000.00	0.76%
Immigrants	7	16.67%	\$3,250,000.00	9.22%		0.00%		0.00%
Rural Populations	6	14.29%	\$16,971,615.00	48.16%	1	10.00%	\$12,500,000.00	42.38%
Substance Abusers	1	2.38%	\$300,000.00	0.85%		0.00%		0.00%
Urban Populations	1	2.38%	\$375,480.00	1.07%	1	10.00%	\$1,278,000.00	4.33%
Total	42	100.00%	\$35,238,365.00	100.00%	10	100.00%	\$29,496,456.00	100.00%
Training & Mentoring								
Agricultural/Seasonal Workers		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.70%	\$580,000.00	4.08%
Children, Youth & Families	23	30.67%	\$7,464,486.00	48.11%	14	37.84%	\$5,151,929.00	36.26%
Disabled	10	13.33%	\$1,320,215.00	8.51%		0.00%		0.00%
Disease Specific	1	1.33%	\$680,846.00	4.39%		0.00%		0.00%
General (All Underserved Populations)	28	37.33%	\$1,130,150.00	7.28%	10	27.03%	\$1,300,000.00	9.15%
Health Professionals		0.00%		0.00%	4	10.81%	\$3,923,577.00	27.62%
Homeless		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.70%	\$320,000.00	2.25%
Immigrants	7	9.33%	\$2,991,852.00	19.28%	5	13.51%	\$2,492,911.00	17.55%
Rural Populations	1	1.33%	\$1,000,000.00	6.44%	1	2.70%	\$398,038.00	2.80%
Urban Populations	5	6.67%	\$929,000.00	5.99%	1	2.70%	\$40,000.00	0.28%
Total	75	100.00%	\$15,516,549.00	100.00%	37	100.00%	\$14,206,455.00	100.00%

2. Type of Activity Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Ethnicity/Race

Please note that some categories do not have spending that ≥\$10 million in both years of funding.

	# of Grants	%	FY 00		# of Grants	%	FY 01	
			Dollars	%			Dollars	%
Capacity Building								
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	16	25.40%	\$17,921,169.00	56.50%	41	66.13%	\$10,658,612.00	73.19%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	3	4.76%	\$394,000.00	1.24%	4	6.45%	\$879,230.00	6.04%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	11	17.46%	\$2,809,475.00	8.86%	3	5.45%	\$550,000.00	3.78%
Asian	6	9.52%	\$1,840,714.00	5.80%	4	7.27%	\$81,500.00	0.56%
Latino	23	36.51%	\$7,944,610.00	25.05%	9	16.36%	\$1,471,696.00	10.11%
Native American	3	4.76%	\$782,303.00	2.47%	1	1.82%	\$922,398.00	6.33%
White	1	1.59%	\$25,000.00	0.08%		0.00%		0.00%
Sub-Total	44	69.84%	\$13,402,102.00	42.25%	17	27.42%	\$3,025,594.00	20.78%
Total	63	100.00%	\$31,717,271.00	100.00%	62	100.00%	\$14,563,436.00	100.00%

Core Operating Support									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	48	44.44%	\$8,771,795.00	73.40%					
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	24	22.22%	\$642,754.00	5.38%					
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black	9	8.33%	\$694,745.00	5.81%					
Asian	10	9.26%	\$351,255.00	2.94%					
Latino	11	10.19%	\$470,000.00	3.93%					
Native American	4	3.70%	\$964,900.00	8.07%					
White	2	1.85%	\$55,000.00	0.46%					
Sub-Total	36	33.33%	\$2,535,900.00	21.22%					
Total	108	100.00%	\$11,950,449.00	100.00%					
Direct Services									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	39	58.21%	\$17,123,260.00	64.87%	33	50.77%	\$5,955,119.00	30.74%	
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	4	5.97%	\$234,750.00	0.89%	7	10.77%	\$2,124,324.00	10.96%	
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black	2	2.99%	\$901,925.00	3.42%	4	6.15%	\$1,561,627.00	8.06%	
Asian	2	2.99%	\$568,304.00	2.15%	6	9.23%	\$1,717,118.00	8.86%	
Latino	16	23.88%	\$7,073,244.00	26.79%	14	21.54%	\$7,996,654.00	41.27%	
Native American	2	2.99%	\$436,350.88	1.65%		0.00%		0.00%	
White	2	2.99%	\$60,000.00	0.23%	1	1.54%	\$20,000.00	0.10%	
Sub-Total	24	35.82%	\$9,039,823.88	34.24%	25	38.46%	\$11,295,399.00	58.30%	
Total	67	100.00%	\$26,397,833.88	100.00%	65	100.00%	\$19,374,842.00	100.00%	
Expansion									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	36	40.00%	\$10,621,122.00	42.74%	54	53.47%	\$13,227,444.00	52.81%	
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	16	17.78%	\$4,630,000.00	18.63%	10	9.90%	\$2,148,966.00	8.58%	
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black	9	10.00%	\$2,417,594.00	9.73%	5	4.95%	\$1,270,015.00	5.07%	
Asian	3	3.33%	\$70,000.00	0.28%	2	1.98%	\$513,700.00	2.05%	
Latino	22	24.44%	\$6,757,162.00	27.19%	24	23.76%	\$5,722,289.00	22.85%	
Native American	4	4.44%	\$355,000.00	1.43%	5	4.95%	\$2,139,986.00	8.54%	
White		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.99%	\$25,000.00	0.10%	
Sub-Total	38	42.22%	\$9,599,756.00	38.63%	37	36.63%	\$9,670,990.00	38.61%	
Total	90	100.00%	\$24,850,878.00	100.00%	101	100.00%	\$25,047,400.00	100.00%	
Information/Education									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)					72	54.96%	\$12,771,038.00	54.76%	
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)					8	6.11%	\$655,619.00	2.81%	
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black					12	9.16%	\$2,594,564.00	11.13%	
Asian					7	5.34%	\$2,018,326.00	8.65%	
Latino					26	19.85%	\$5,151,803.00	22.09%	
Native American					3	2.29%	\$85,000.00	0.36%	
White					3	2.29%	\$45,000.00	0.19%	
Sub-Total					51	38.93%	\$9,894,693.00	42.43%	
Total					131	100.00%	\$23,321,350.00	100.00%	
Policy & Advocacy									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)					17	58.62%	\$8,420,342.00	55.11%	
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)					3	10.34%	\$417,769.00	2.73%	
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black					2	6.90%	\$4,323,657.00	28.30%	
Asian					4	13.79%	\$785,000.00	5.14%	
Latino					2	6.90%	\$731,045.00	4.79%	
Native American					1	3.45%	\$600,000.00	3.93%	
Sub-Total					9	31.03%	\$6,439,702.00	42.15%	
Total					29	100.00%	\$15,277,813.00	100.00%	
Re-Granting									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	27	64.29%	\$19,900,150.00	56.47%	7	70.00%	\$20,178,000.00	68.41%	
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	3	7.14%	\$6,310,000.00	17.91%	2	20.00%	\$50,000.00	0.17%	
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black		0.00%		0.00%	1	10.00%	\$9,268,456.00	31.42%	
Latino	11	26.19%	\$7,171,615.00	20.35%		0.00%		0.00%	
Native American	1	2.38%	\$1,856,600.00	5.27%		0.00%		0.00%	
Sub-Total	12	28.57%	\$9,028,215.00	25.62%	1	10.00%	\$9,268,456.00	31.42%	
Total	42	100.00%	\$35,238,365.00	100.00%	10	100.00%	\$29,496,456.00	100.00%	
Training & Mentoring									
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	41	54.67%	\$8,359,760.00	53.88%	19	51.35%	\$9,032,669.00	63.58%	
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	10	13.33%	\$787,029.00	5.07%	4	10.81%	\$790,000.00	5.56%	
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)									
African American/Black	3	4.00%	\$64,650.00	0.42%	2	5.41%	\$611,060.00	4.30%	
Asian	7	9.33%	\$2,899,938.00	18.69%	2	5.41%	\$1,128,021.00	7.94%	
Latino	13	17.33%	\$3,382,222.00	21.80%	10	27.03%	\$2,644,705.00	18.62%	
Native American	1	1.33%	\$22,950.00	0.15%		0.00%		0.00%	
Sub-Total	24	32.00%	\$6,369,760.00	41.05%	14	37.84%	\$4,383,786.00	30.86%	
Total	75	100.00%	\$15,516,549.00	100.00%	37	100.00%	\$14,206,455.00	100.00%	

N. GRANTEE PROFILES

1. Age of Organizations

This information was not available.

2. Type of Organizations

The data categories found below are TCE's. Although some of them are similar to those recommended in the Template, the definitions are not necessarily the same.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Collaborative (Private/Non-Profit CBO)	22	3.22%	\$15,193,499.00	7.74%	1	0.14%	\$18,372.00	0.01%
Collaborative/Public Agency		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.14%	\$994,000.00	0.54%
College/University or its Agent	35	5.12%	\$13,991,329.88	7.13%	43	6.18%	\$23,108,201.00	12.57%
Community Clinic	27	3.95%	\$11,670,343.00	5.95%	24	3.45%	\$10,541,146.00	5.73%
Foundation/Re-Granting Organization	77	11.27%	\$41,657,986.00	21.23%	19	2.73%	\$22,026,138.00	11.98%
Other Health Care Provider	40	5.86%	\$12,044,153.00	6.14%	48	6.90%	\$12,251,293.00	6.66%
Primary/Secondary School or its Agent	11	1.61%	\$688,162.00	0.35%	15	2.16%	\$1,288,206.00	0.70%
Private/Non-Profit (CBO)	442	64.71%	\$94,537,519.35	48.17%	502	72.13%	\$92,840,849.37	50.49%
Professional/Membership	2	0.29%	\$80,380.00	0.04%	2	0.29%	\$50,000.00	0.03%
Public Agency	17	2.49%	\$5,091,929.00	2.59%	26	3.74%	\$19,082,550.00	10.38%
Religious Institution	10	1.46%	\$1,306,192.00	0.67%	15	2.16%	\$1,676,712.00	0.91%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

The following are types of re-granting intermediaries described in the body of the Case Study. Per the notes in those data fields, there were 17 projects funded by 20 grants, i.e., 3 projects received 2 grants each. For the purposes of this analysis, they will be treated as 17 grants.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Collaborative (Private/Non-Profit CBO)	2	16.67%	\$7,400,000.00	19.75%		0.00%		0.00%
College/University or its Agent*	1	8.33%	\$400,000.00	1.07%	2	40.00%	\$7,982,275.00	19.22%
Community Clinic	2	16.67%	\$850,000.00	2.27%		0.00%		0.00%
Foundation/Re-Granting Organization*	2	16.67%	\$6,316,600.00	16.85%	2	40.00%	\$24,278,000.00	58.46%
Other Health Care Provider	1	8.33%	\$5,000,000.00	13.34%		0.00%		0.00%
Private/Non-Profit (CBO)	3	25.00%	\$16,250,000.00	43.36%		0.00%		0.00%
Public Agency	1	8.33%	\$1,260,000.00	3.36%	1	20.00%	\$9,268,456.00	22.32%
Total*	12	100.00%	\$37,476,600.00	100.00%	5	100.00%	\$41,528,731.00	100.00%

* Please also note that 3 organizations -- UC San Francisco, the California Health Foundation and Trust, and the Centers for Disease Control -- were recipients of grants for more than one project. They are counted here for each project funded.

3. Size of Organizations by Annual Budget

This information was not available.

4. Board Profiles

This information was not available.

5. Staff Profiles

This information was not available.

O. TARGET POPULATION PROFILES

1. Target Populations

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Agricultural/Seasonal Workers	9	1.32%	\$3,814,037.00	1.94%	6	0.86%	\$1,162,068.00	0.63%
Children, Youth & Families	172	25.18%	\$77,563,852.00	39.52%	160	22.99%	\$57,730,394.00	31.40%
Disabled	41	6.00%	\$10,396,733.00	5.30%	34	4.89%	\$2,817,409.00	1.53%
Disease Specific	47	6.88%	\$9,687,590.87	4.94%	50	7.18%	\$14,067,140.00	7.65%
Elderly	7	1.02%	\$584,000.00	0.30%	27	3.88%	\$6,158,399.00	3.35%
Gays & Lesbians	10	1.46%	\$1,983,983.00	1.01%	4	0.57%	\$385,159.00	0.21%
General (All Underserved Populations)	216	31.63%	\$32,502,768.48	16.56%	249	35.78%	\$47,047,607.00	25.59%
Health Professionals		0.00%		0.00%	13	1.87%	\$11,413,430.00	6.21%
Homeless	23	3.37%	\$3,962,860.00	2.02%	28	4.02%	\$6,761,619.00	3.68%
Immigrants	42	6.15%	\$13,266,535.00	6.76%	38	5.46%	\$8,256,880.37	4.49%
Rural Populations	53	7.76%	\$29,209,026.88	14.88%	51	7.33%	\$20,399,194.00	11.09%
Substance Abusers	13	1.90%	\$2,200,904.00	1.12%	13	1.87%	\$1,527,945.00	0.83%
Urban Populations	47	6.88%	\$10,984,203.00	5.60%	22	3.16%	\$6,125,223.00	3.33%
Veterans	3	0.44%	\$105,000.00	0.05%	1	0.14%	\$25,000.00	0.01%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

a. Target Population Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Subject Area

Please note that some categories do not have spending that ≥\$10 million in both years of funding.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%

Children, Youth & Families								
Access to Care	10	5.81%	\$3,864,141.00	4.98%	15	9.38%	\$5,512,000.00	9.55%
Aging/Senior Issues		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.63%	\$23,000.00	0.04%
AIDS/HIV	1	0.58%	\$250,000.00	0.32%		0.00%		0.00%
Children & Youth	36	20.93%	\$9,906,491.00	12.77%	36	22.50%	\$8,172,109.00	14.16%
Chronic Disease	5	2.91%	\$4,555,521.00	5.87%	3	1.88%	\$13,146,675.00	22.77%
Dental	15	8.72%	\$7,484,482.00	9.65%	1	0.63%	\$1,227,200.00	2.13%
Disabilities	1	0.58%	\$20,000.00	0.03%	1	0.63%	\$25,000.00	0.04%
Domestic Violence	6	3.49%	\$4,010,630.00	5.17%	3	1.88%	\$1,322,695.00	2.29%
Education	2	1.16%	\$280,174.00	0.36%	2	1.25%	\$611,560.00	1.06%
Environmental Health	2	1.16%	\$606,645.00	0.78%	1	0.63%	\$636,000.00	1.10%
Health and Human Services	7	4.07%	\$127,567.00	0.16%	7	4.38%	\$1,128,991.00	1.96%
Health Coverage	7	4.07%	\$3,509,506.00	4.52%	3	1.88%	\$902,150.00	1.56%
Health Education	7	4.07%	\$1,030,982.00	1.33%	2	1.25%	\$40,000.00	0.07%
Health Policy	4	2.33%	\$18,040,000.00	23.26%	2	1.25%	\$50,000.00	0.09%
Homeless	1	0.58%	\$371,405.00	0.48%	2	1.25%	\$45,500.00	0.08%
Housing		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.63%	\$30,000.00	0.05%
Information Technology	1	0.58%	\$304,194.00	0.39%	2	1.25%	\$49,997.00	0.09%
Injury Prevention	1	0.58%	\$819,510.00	1.06%		0.00%		0.00%
Institutionalized/Incarcerated	1	0.58%	\$288,790.00	0.37%	1	0.63%	\$25,000.00	0.04%
Leadership Development	2	1.16%	\$755,324.00	0.97%	1	0.63%	\$24,500.00	0.04%
Mental Health	7	4.07%	\$3,265,342.00	4.21%	29	18.13%	\$11,401,249.00	19.75%
Nutrition	1	0.58%	\$2,000,000.00	2.58%	5	3.13%	\$1,079,795.00	1.87%
Organizational Development	19	11.05%	\$3,546,168.00	4.57%	2	1.25%	\$350,000.00	0.61%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	5	2.91%	\$324,730.00	0.42%	7	4.38%	\$1,379,800.00	2.39%
Physical Activity	1	0.58%	\$140,000.00	0.18%	2	1.25%	\$75,000.00	0.13%
PICO/Faith Based		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.63%	\$500,000.00	0.87%
Primary Care	6	3.49%	\$1,171,322.00	1.51%	12	7.50%	\$4,595,756.00	7.96%
Reproductive Health	3	1.74%	\$842,867.00	1.09%	2	1.25%	\$351,718.00	0.61%
Rural Health		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.63%	\$23,885.00	0.04%
Substance Abuse	4	2.33%	\$334,540.00	0.43%	5	3.13%	\$862,307.00	1.49%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	8	4.65%	\$2,388,521.00	3.08%	5	3.13%	\$281,845.00	0.49%
Welfare Reform	1	0.58%	\$25,000.00	0.03%	1	0.63%	\$15,000.00	0.03%
Wellness/Health Promotion	1	0.58%	\$1,260,000.00	1.62%	1	0.63%	\$600,375.00	1.04%
Workforce (health)	7	4.07%	\$6,040,000.00	7.79%	3	1.88%	\$3,241,287.00	5.61%
Total	172	100.00%	\$77,563,852.00	100.00%	160	100.00%	\$57,730,394.00	100.00%
Disabled								
Access to Care	1	2.44%	\$50,000.00	0.48%				
Aging/Senior Issues	2	4.88%	\$1,781,311.00	17.13%				
Cancer	1	2.44%	\$405,692.00	3.90%				
Children & Youth	2	4.88%	\$165,000.00	1.59%				
Chronic Disease	1	2.44%	\$25,000.00	0.24%				
Dental	1	2.44%	\$2,027,986.00	19.51%				
Disabilities	19	46.34%	\$5,178,058.00	49.80%				
Employment	1	2.44%	\$200,000.00	1.92%				
Health and Human Services	2	4.88%	\$50,000.00	0.48%				
Health Coverage	1	2.44%	\$7,500.00	0.07%				
Housing	1	2.44%	\$50,000.00	0.48%				
Mental Health	6	14.63%	\$180,000.00	1.73%				
Vision	1	2.44%	\$50,000.00	0.48%				
Welfare Reform	1	2.44%	\$22,950.00	0.22%				
Workforce (health)	1	2.44%	\$203,236.00	1.95%				
Total	41	100.00%	\$10,396,733.00	100.00%				
Disease Specific								
Aging/Senior Issues					1	2.00%	\$100,000.00	0.71%
AIDS/HIV					12	24.00%	\$1,911,432.00	13.59%
Cancer					14	28.00%	\$1,448,095.00	10.29%
Children & Youth					1	2.00%	\$15,000.00	0.11%
Chronic Disease					17	34.00%	\$10,253,519.00	72.89%
Hospice/Bereavement					1	2.00%	\$61,678.00	0.44%
Mental Health					1	2.00%	\$162,740.00	1.16%
Nutrition					1	2.00%	\$25,000.00	0.18%
Organizational Development					1	2.00%	\$64,676.00	0.46%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores					1	2.00%	\$25,000.00	0.18%
Total					50	100.00%	\$14,067,140.00	100.00%
General (All Underserved Populations)								
Access to Care	28	12.96%	\$12,929,786.00	39.78%	25	10.04%	\$4,266,162.00	9.07%

Aging/Senior Issues	7	3.24%	\$1,847,382.00	5.68%	5	2.01%	\$89,750.00	0.19%
AIDS/HIV	2	0.93%	\$20,000.00	0.06%	2	0.80%	\$50,000.00	0.11%
Cancer	2	0.93%	\$49,500.00	0.15%	3	1.20%	\$114,322.00	0.24%
Census	6	2.78%	\$1,115,125.00	3.43%	1	0.40%	\$10,000.00	0.02%
Children & Youth	12	5.56%	\$410,000.00	1.26%	16	6.43%	\$1,803,552.00	3.83%
Chronic Disease	3	1.39%	\$891,391.00	2.74%	6	2.41%	\$5,328,495.00	11.33%
Dental	5	2.31%	\$964,989.00	2.97%	3	1.20%	\$430,000.00	0.91%
Disabilities		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.40%	\$25,000.00	0.05%
Disaster Relief	3	1.39%	\$50,000.00	0.15%	3	1.20%	\$681,345.00	1.45%
Domestic Violence	2	0.93%	\$240,466.00	0.74%	7	2.81%	\$1,878,764.00	3.99%
Education	1	0.46%	\$40,000.00	0.12%	1	0.40%	\$25,000.00	0.05%
Employment	2	0.93%	\$482,567.00	1.48%	3	1.20%	\$530,795.00	1.13%
Environmental Health	4	1.85%	\$103,000.00	0.32%	6	2.41%	\$134,000.00	0.28%
Health and Human Services	24	11.11%	\$617,126.01	1.90%	4	1.61%	\$723,764.00	1.54%
Health Coverage	5	2.31%	\$353,000.00	1.09%	8	3.21%	\$2,566,377.00	5.45%
Health Education	15	6.94%	\$1,125,647.00	3.46%	12	4.82%	\$1,281,331.00	2.72%
Health Policy	15	6.94%	\$995,644.47	3.06%	9	3.61%	\$1,035,000.00	2.20%
Hospice/Bereavement	1	0.46%	\$25,000.00	0.08%	2	0.80%	\$511,394.00	1.09%
Housing		0.00%		0.00%	3	1.20%	\$269,045.00	0.57%
Information Technology		0.00%		0.00%	2	0.80%	\$75,000.00	0.16%
Injury Prevention		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.40%	\$219,080.00	0.47%
Institutionalized/Incarcerated		0.00%		0.00%	2	0.80%	\$202,239.00	0.43%
Leadership Development	1	0.46%	\$300,000.00	0.92%	2	0.80%	\$405,000.00	0.86%
Mental Health	8	3.70%	\$150,000.00	0.46%	16	6.43%	\$4,680,046.00	9.95%
Nutrition	2	0.93%	\$35,000.00	0.11%	2	0.80%	\$50,000.00	0.11%
Organizational Development	14	6.48%	\$4,788,526.00	14.73%	19	7.63%	\$3,636,061.00	7.73%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	5	2.31%	\$1,113,200.00	3.42%	25	10.04%	\$5,552,007.00	11.80%
Physical Activity	1	0.46%	\$25,000.00	0.08%		0.00%		0.00%
PICO/Faith Based	1	0.46%	\$40,000.00	0.12%	9	3.61%	\$1,854,688.00	3.94%
Primary Care	14	6.48%	\$1,686,295.00	5.19%	19	7.63%	\$3,386,407.00	7.20%
Reproductive Health	5	2.31%	\$195,000.00	0.60%	4	1.61%	\$543,700.00	1.16%
Rural Health	1	0.46%	\$25,000.00	0.08%	1	0.40%	\$250,000.00	0.53%
Substance Abuse	2	0.93%	\$465,528.00	1.43%	2	0.80%	\$229,951.00	0.49%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	6	2.78%	\$195,000.00	0.60%	9	3.61%	\$2,595,839.00	5.52%
Vision	1	0.46%	\$25,000.00	0.08%	3	1.20%	\$517,213.00	1.10%
Welfare Reform	2	0.93%	\$259,596.00	0.80%		0.00%		0.00%
Wellness/Health Promotion	10	4.63%	\$350,000.00	1.08%	5	2.01%	\$478,280.00	1.02%
Workforce (health)	6	2.78%	\$589,000.00	1.81%	8	3.21%	\$618,000.00	1.31%
Total	216	100.00%	\$32,502,768.48	100.00%	249	100.00%	\$47,047,607.00	100.00%
Health Professionals								
Mental Health					1	7.69%	\$30,000.00	0.26%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores					4	30.77%	\$3,171,353.00	27.79%
Wellness/Health Promotion					1	7.69%	\$25,000.00	0.22%
Workforce (health)					7	53.85%	\$8,187,077.00	71.73%
Total					13	100.00%	\$11,413,430.00	100.00%
Immigrants								
Access to Care	5	11.90%	\$677,900.00	5.11%				
Aging/Senior Issues	1	2.38%	\$315,350.00	2.38%				
Cancer	1	2.38%	\$25,000.00	0.19%				
Children & Youth	1	2.38%	\$30,000.00	0.23%				
Domestic Violence	1	2.38%	\$10,000.00	0.08%				
Education	1	2.38%	\$71,100.00	0.54%				
Health and Human Services	1	2.38%	\$45,000.00	0.34%				
Health Coverage	5	11.90%	\$3,475,000.00	26.19%				
Health Education	4	9.52%	\$1,561,852.00	11.77%				
Mental Health	2	4.76%	\$119,668.00	0.90%				
Nutrition	1	2.38%	\$144,680.00	1.09%				
Organizational Development	1	2.38%	\$350,000.00	2.64%				
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	6	14.29%	\$1,020,985.00	7.70%				
Primary Care	1	2.38%	\$50,000.00	0.38%				
Reproductive Health	3	7.14%	\$1,750,000.00	13.19%				
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	1	2.38%	\$20,000.00	0.15%				
Workforce (health)	7	16.67%	\$3,600,000.00	27.14%				
Total	42	100.00%	\$13,266,535.00	100.00%				
Rural Populations								
Access to Care	10	18.87%	\$5,467,069.00	18.72%	9	17.65%	\$1,693,330.00	8.30%

Aging/Senior Issues	1	1.89%	\$500,000.00	1.71%	1	1.96%	\$10,000.00	0.05%
AIDS/HIV	1	1.89%	\$850,000.00	2.91%		0.00%		0.00%
Cancer		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.96%	\$25,000.00	0.12%
Children & Youth		0.00%		0.00%	3	5.88%	\$371,423.00	1.82%
Chronic Disease	1	1.89%	\$405,000.00	1.39%	1	1.96%	\$24,000.00	0.12%
Dental	3	5.66%	\$917,278.00	3.14%	1	1.96%	\$252,895.00	1.24%
Disabilities	1	1.89%	\$50,000.00	0.17%		0.00%		0.00%
Disaster Relief	6	11.32%	\$94,350.88	0.32%	1	1.96%	\$25,000.00	0.12%
Education		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.96%	\$50,000.00	0.25%
Environmental Health	3	5.66%	\$204,984.00	0.70%	2	3.92%	\$438,038.00	2.15%
Health and Human Services	5	9.43%	\$144,000.00	0.49%	5	9.80%	\$103,500.00	0.51%
Health Education	1	1.89%	\$138,500.00	0.47%	1	1.96%	\$50,000.00	0.25%
Hospice/Bereavement	1	1.89%	\$336,250.00	1.15%	2	3.92%	\$40,000.00	0.20%
Information Technology	3	5.66%	\$16,000,000.00	54.78%	2	3.92%	\$12,510,000.00	61.33%
Mental Health	1	1.89%	\$50,000.00	0.17%	2	3.92%	\$423,340.00	2.08%
Nutrition	1	1.89%	\$30,000.00	0.10%	1	1.96%	\$10,000.00	0.05%
Organizational Development	3	5.66%	\$1,577,125.00	5.40%	2	3.92%	\$50,000.00	0.25%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	1	1.89%	\$719,470.00	2.46%	3	5.88%	\$846,896.00	4.15%
Physical Activity		0.00%		0.00%	2	3.92%	\$28,000.00	0.14%
Primary Care	2	3.77%	\$50,000.00	0.17%	5	9.80%	\$118,272.00	0.58%
Reproductive Health	2	3.77%	\$50,000.00	0.17%	1	1.96%	\$15,000.00	0.07%
Rural Health	4	7.55%	\$150,000.00	0.51%	2	3.92%	\$3,025,000.00	14.83%
Vision		0.00%		0.00%	2	3.92%	\$239,500.00	1.17%
Wellness/Health Promotion	2	3.77%	\$475,000.00	1.63%	1	1.96%	\$50,000.00	0.25%
Workforce (health)	1	1.89%	\$1,000,000.00	3.42%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	53	100.00%	\$29,209,026.88	100.00%	51	100.00%	\$20,399,194.00	100.00%
Urban Populations								
Access to Care	4	8.51%	\$1,258,468.00	11.46%				
Aging/Senior Issues	4	8.51%	\$1,613,802.00	14.69%				
AIDS/HIV	2	4.26%	\$40,000.00	0.36%				
Census	1	2.13%	\$10,000.00	0.09%				
Children & Youth	6	12.77%	\$1,419,300.00	12.92%				
Chronic Disease	1	2.13%	\$941,954.00	8.58%				
Disaster Relief	1	2.13%	\$25,000.00	0.23%				
Environmental Health	3	6.38%	\$625,000.00	5.69%				
Health and Human Services	6	12.77%	\$224,000.00	2.04%				
Health Coverage	1	2.13%	\$301,654.00	2.75%				
Health Policy	1	2.13%	\$20,000.00	0.18%				
Housing	1	2.13%	\$109,425.00	1.00%				
Information Technology	2	4.26%	\$506,000.00	4.61%				
Institutionalized/Incarcerated	1	2.13%	\$20,000.00	0.18%				
Mental Health	1	2.13%	\$401,925.00	3.66%				
Organizational Development	2	4.26%	\$575,480.00	5.24%				
Physical Activity	1	2.13%	\$100,000.00	0.91%				
Primary Care	1	2.13%	\$369,310.00	3.36%				
Reproductive Health	1	2.13%	\$370,185.00	3.37%				
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	3	6.38%	\$85,000.00	0.77%				
Vision	1	2.13%	\$502,700.00	4.58%				
Welfare Reform	3	6.38%	\$1,465,000.00	13.34%				
Total	47	100.00%	\$10,984,203.00	100.00%				

2. Gender

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Both Male & Female	612	89.60%	\$185,296,117.23	94.41%	625	89.80%	\$169,619,547.37	92.25%
Females	64	9.37%	\$10,065,656.00	5.13%	64	9.20%	\$12,463,080.00	6.78%
Males	7	1.02%	\$899,720.00	0.46%	7	1.01%	\$1,794,840.00	0.98%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

3. Age

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
General: All Ages	359	52.56%	\$121,240,177.23	61.77%	346	49.71%	\$104,662,958.37	56.92%
Infants & Toddlers: Generally 0-5	16	2.34%	\$6,924,693.00	3.53%	18	2.59%	\$5,288,038.00	2.88%
Children: Generally 6-12	19	2.78%	\$3,465,015.00	1.77%	14	2.01%	\$741,205.00	0.40%
Youth: Generally 13-23	57	8.35%	\$9,507,144.00	4.84%	56	8.05%	\$8,541,396.00	4.65%
Children & Youth: Generally 0-23	86	12.59%	\$21,111,865.00	10.76%	67	9.63%	\$19,244,591.00	10.47%
Adults: Generally 18-54	107	15.67%	\$23,159,707.00	11.80%	126	18.10%	\$25,583,751.00	13.91%

Seniors: 55+	24	3.51%	\$7,164,210.00	3.65%	31	4.45%	\$5,355,570.00	2.91%
Adults and Seniors: Generally 18+	15	2.20%	\$3,688,682.00	1.88%	38	5.46%	\$14,459,958.00	7.86%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

4. Ethnicity/Race

The ethnicity/race categories in use by TCE were significantly different than those recommended in the Template; the principal investigator applied the Template's categories to TCE data.

	# of Grants	%	FY 00		# of Grants	%	FY 01	
			Dollars	%			Dollars	%
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)	303	44.36%	\$106,749,784.87	54.39%	396	56.90%	\$104,517,596.37	56.84%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)	93	13.62%	\$18,416,942.00	9.38%	65	9.34%	\$10,280,856.00	5.59%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population)								
African American/Black	49	7.17%	\$13,274,611.00	6.76%	44	6.32%	\$22,899,309.00	12.45%
Asian	57	8.35%	\$8,242,181.01	4.20%	39	5.60%	\$6,641,777.00	3.61%
Latino	151	22.11%	\$44,475,033.47	22.66%	125	17.96%	\$34,190,319.00	18.59%
Native American	20	2.93%	\$4,817,940.88	2.45%	19	2.73%	\$4,765,959.00	2.59%
Pacific Islander	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	5	0.72%	\$533,279.00	0.29%
White	10	1.46%	\$285,000.00	0.15%	3	0.43%	\$48,372.00	0.03%
Sub-Total	287	42.02%	\$71,094,766.36	36.22%	235	33.76%	\$69,079,015.00	37.57%
Total	683	100.00%	\$196,261,493.23	100.00%	696	100.00%	\$183,877,467.37	100.00%

a. Ethnicity/Race Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Subject Area

Please note that some categories do not have spending that ≥\$10 million in both years of funding.

	# of Grants	%	FY 00		# of Grants	%	FY 01	
			Dollars	%			Dollars	%
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)								
Access to Care	32	10.56%	\$15,710,610.00	14.72%	28	7.07%	\$6,600,839.00	6.32%
Aging/Senior Issues	10	3.30%	\$3,012,802.00	2.82%	22	5.56%	\$2,372,350.00	2.27%
AIDS/HIV	9	2.97%	\$570,318.00	0.53%	6	1.52%	\$1,060,437.00	1.01%
Cancer	4	1.32%	\$790,057.00	0.74%	13	3.28%	\$4,100,031.00	3.92%
Children & Youth	38	12.54%	\$8,348,662.00	7.82%	40	10.10%	\$7,780,889.00	7.44%
Chronic Disease	8	2.64%	\$5,356,954.00	5.02%	9	2.27%	\$5,470,457.00	5.23%
Dental	14	4.62%	\$6,580,607.00	6.16%	4	1.01%	\$1,530,095.00	1.46%
Disabilities	12	3.96%	\$3,721,623.00	3.49%	25	6.31%	\$2,569,139.00	2.46%
Disaster Relief	5	1.65%	\$58,000.00	0.05%	4	1.01%	\$706,345.00	0.68%
Domestic Violence	3	0.99%	\$909,630.00	0.85%	4	1.01%	\$1,063,819.00	1.02%
Education	3	0.99%	\$90,000.00	0.08%	1	0.25%	\$25,000.00	0.02%
Employment	2	0.66%	\$246,000.00	0.23%	2	0.51%	\$386,795.00	0.37%
Environmental Health	5	1.65%	\$378,000.00	0.35%	6	1.52%	\$745,000.00	0.71%
Health and Human Services	25	8.25%	\$660,567.00	0.62%	13	3.28%	\$1,307,075.00	1.25%
Health Coverage	10	3.30%	\$2,795,006.00	2.62%	3	0.76%	\$156,377.00	0.15%
Health Education	14	4.62%	\$1,581,768.00	1.48%	3	0.76%	\$53,000.00	0.05%
Health Policy	7	2.31%	\$15,104,000.00	14.15%	7	1.77%	\$530,000.00	0.51%
Homeless	10	3.30%	\$1,242,765.00	1.16%	16	4.04%	\$3,160,068.00	3.02%
Hospice/Bereavement	1	0.33%	\$336,250.00	0.31%	4	1.01%	\$588,072.00	0.56%
Housing	1	0.33%	\$30,000.00	0.03%	2	0.51%	\$244,045.00	0.23%
Information Technology	4	1.32%	\$11,604,194.00	10.87%	6	1.52%	\$12,634,997.00	12.09%
Injury Prevention	2	0.66%	\$1,079,510.00	1.01%		0.00%		0.00%
Institutionalized/Incarcerated	1	0.33%	\$288,790.00	0.27%	3	0.76%	\$227,239.00	0.22%
Leadership Development	2	0.66%	\$755,324.00	0.71%	4	1.01%	\$480,000.00	0.46%
Mental Health	15	4.95%	\$3,209,854.00	3.01%	33	8.33%	\$10,357,671.00	9.91%
Nutrition	4	1.32%	\$2,065,000.00	1.93%	5	1.26%	\$398,750.00	0.38%
Organizational Development	16	5.28%	\$5,806,960.00	5.44%	16	4.04%	\$3,195,976.00	3.06%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	1	0.33%	\$25,000.00	0.02%	31	7.83%	\$9,325,807.37	8.92%
Physical Activity	1	0.33%	\$100,000.00	0.09%	4	1.01%	\$103,000.00	0.10%
PICO/Faith Based	1	0.33%	\$40,000.00	0.04%	5	1.26%	\$1,249,150.00	1.20%
Primary Care	8	2.64%	\$1,008,515.00	0.94%	27	6.82%	\$6,877,753.00	6.58%
Reproductive Health	5	1.65%	\$1,085,779.00	1.02%	5	1.26%	\$109,200.00	0.10%
Rural Health	1	0.33%	\$50,000.00	0.05%	4	1.01%	\$3,298,885.00	3.16%
Substance Abuse	8	2.64%	\$1,785,758.00	1.67%	10	2.53%	\$1,150,783.00	1.10%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	5	1.65%	\$2,178,521.00	2.04%	7	1.77%	\$1,811,459.00	1.73%
Vision		0.00%		0.00%	5	1.26%	\$453,368.00	0.43%
Welfare Reform	2	0.66%	\$527,700.00	0.49%		0.00%		0.00%
Wellness/Health Promotion	3	0.99%	\$150,000.00	0.14%	4	1.01%	\$425,000.00	0.41%
Workforce (health)	11	3.63%	\$7,465,260.87	6.99%	15	3.79%	\$11,968,725.00	11.45%
Total	303	100.00%	\$106,749,784.87	100.00%	396	100.00%	\$104,517,596.37	100.00%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)								
Access to Care	9	9.68%	\$4,528,900.00	24.59%	8	12.31%	\$1,028,223.00	10.00%
Aging/Senior Issues	1	1.08%	\$50,000.00	0.27%	1	1.54%	\$404,812.00	3.94%

AIDS/HIV	5	5.38%	\$90,500.00	0.49%	3	4.62%	\$1,055,000.00	10.26%
Cancer	3	3.23%	\$62,000.00	0.34%	2	3.08%	\$81,000.00	0.79%
Children & Youth	7	7.53%	\$665,000.00	3.61%	6	9.23%	\$471,000.00	4.58%
Chronic Disease	1	1.08%	\$25,000.00	0.14%		0.00%		0.00%
Dental	3	3.23%	\$184,989.00	1.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Disabilities	3	3.23%	\$431,529.00	2.34%		0.00%		0.00%
Disaster Relief	2	2.15%	\$30,000.00	0.16%		0.00%		0.00%
Domestic Violence	1	1.08%	\$20,000.00	0.11%		0.00%		0.00%
Education		0.00%		0.00%	2	3.08%	\$75,000.00	0.73%
Employment		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.54%	\$20,000.00	0.19%
Environmental Health		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.54%	\$25,000.00	0.24%
Health and Human Services	12	12.90%	\$300,000.00	1.63%	1	1.54%	\$232,466.00	2.26%
Health Coverage	2	2.15%	\$1,050,000.00	5.70%	6	9.23%	\$878,769.00	8.55%
Health Education	3	3.23%	\$69,040.00	0.37%	5	7.69%	\$577,331.00	5.62%
Health Policy	3	3.23%	\$3,045,000.00	16.53%	3	4.62%	\$735,000.00	7.15%
Homeless	1	1.08%	\$25,000.00	0.14%		0.00%		0.00%
Housing	1	1.08%	\$50,000.00	0.27%		0.00%		0.00%
Information Technology	1	1.08%	\$5,000,000.00	27.15%		0.00%		0.00%
Institutionalized/Incarcerated		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.54%	\$40,000.00	0.39%
Mental Health	6	6.45%	\$154,820.00	0.84%	10	15.38%	\$3,115,940.00	30.31%
Nutrition		0.00%		0.00%	1	1.54%	\$25,000.00	0.24%
Organizational Development		0.00%		0.00%	2	3.08%	\$49,000.00	0.48%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	3	3.23%	\$124,730.00	0.68%	2	3.08%	\$50,000.00	0.49%
PICO/Faith Based		0.00%		0.00%	2	3.08%	\$677,538.00	6.59%
Primary Care	4	4.30%	\$115,000.00	0.62%		0.00%		0.00%
Rural Health	3	3.23%	\$100,000.00	0.54%		0.00%		0.00%
Substance Abuse	2	2.15%	\$95,434.00	0.52%	2	3.08%	\$301,764.00	2.94%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	8	8.60%	\$205,000.00	1.11%	3	4.62%	\$75,000.00	0.73%
Vision	2	2.15%	\$75,000.00	0.41%	1	1.54%	\$313,345.00	3.05%
Wellness/Health Promotion	3	3.23%	\$1,360,000.00	7.38%	2	3.08%	\$49,668.00	0.48%
Workforce (health)	4	4.30%	\$560,000.00	3.04%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	93	100.00%	\$18,416,942.00	100.00%	65	100.00%	\$10,280,856.00	100.00%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population) -- African American/Black								
Access to Care	4	8.16%	\$1,949,230.00	14.68%	2	4.55%	\$205,809.00	0.90%
Aging/Senior Issues	2	4.08%	\$1,209,605.00	9.11%	2	4.55%	\$115,000.00	0.50%
AIDS/HIV	7	14.29%	\$720,000.00	5.42%	9	20.45%	\$855,600.00	3.74%
Cancer	1	2.04%	\$18,434.00	0.14%	2	4.55%	\$1,108,280.00	4.84%
Census	1	2.04%	\$978,870.00	7.37%	1	2.27%	\$10,000.00	0.04%
Children & Youth	4	8.16%	\$1,249,300.00	9.41%	3	6.82%	\$879,434.00	3.84%
Chronic Disease	2	4.08%	\$1,169,890.00	8.81%	5	11.36%	\$14,173,559.00	61.90%
Dental	1	2.04%	\$750,000.00	5.65%		0.00%		0.00%
Domestic Violence		0.00%		0.00%	2	4.55%	\$861,583.00	3.76%
Education		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.27%	\$586,560.00	2.56%
Employment	1	2.04%	\$436,567.00	3.29%		0.00%		0.00%
Health and Human Services		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.27%	\$25,000.00	0.11%
Health Education	2	4.08%	\$770,000.00	5.80%		0.00%		0.00%
Health Policy	3	6.12%	\$94,650.00	0.71%		0.00%		0.00%
Housing	1	2.04%	\$109,425.00	0.82%		0.00%		0.00%
Information Technology	1	2.04%	\$206,000.00	1.55%		0.00%		0.00%
Institutionalized/Incarcerated	1	2.04%	\$20,000.00	0.15%		0.00%		0.00%
Leadership Development		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.27%	\$24,500.00	0.11%
Mental Health	2	4.08%	\$451,593.00	3.40%	7	15.91%	\$2,456,634.00	10.73%
Organizational Development	8	16.33%	\$1,613,938.00	12.16%		0.00%		0.00%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	4	8.16%	\$489,708.00	3.69%	4	9.09%	\$387,670.00	1.69%
Physical Activity	1	2.04%	\$25,000.00	0.19%		0.00%		0.00%
Primary Care		0.00%		0.00%	2	4.55%	\$474,299.00	2.07%
Substance Abuse	1	2.04%	\$179,540.00	1.35%		0.00%		0.00%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)		0.00%		0.00%	2	4.55%	\$735,381.00	3.21%
Wellness/Health Promotion	1	2.04%	\$425,000.00	3.20%		0.00%		0.00%
Workforce (health)	1	2.04%	\$407,861.00	3.07%		0.00%		0.00%
Total	49	100.00%	\$13,274,611.00	100.00%	44	100.00%	\$22,899,309.00	100.00%
Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population) -- Latino								
Access to Care	15	9.93%	\$2,812,124.00	6.32%	11	8.80%	\$2,887,050.00	8.44%
Aging/Senior Issues	2	1.32%	\$525,000.00	1.18%	3	2.40%	\$864,427.00	2.53%
AIDS/HIV	2	1.32%	\$890,000.00	2.00%	1	0.80%	\$179,815.00	0.53%
Cancer	5	3.31%	\$971,196.00	2.18%	3	2.40%	\$108,774.00	0.32%
Census	1	0.66%	\$500,000.00	1.12%	1	0.80%	\$25,000.00	0.07%

Children & Youth	6	3.97%	\$1,622,929.00	3.65%	7	5.60%	\$1,580,055.00	4.62%
Chronic Disease	4	2.65%	\$1,481,306.00	3.33%	12	9.60%	\$7,637,475.00	22.34%
Dental	7	4.64%	\$4,340,949.00	9.76%	1	0.80%	\$139,230.00	0.41%
Disabilities	3	1.99%	\$1,014,906.00	2.28%	1	0.80%	\$10,000.00	0.03%
Disaster Relief	1	0.66%	\$25,000.00	0.06%		0.00%		0.00%
Domestic Violence	4	2.65%	\$3,090,466.00	6.95%	5	4.00%	\$1,922,794.00	5.62%
Education	2	1.32%	\$321,274.00	0.72%		0.00%		0.00%
Employment		0.00%		0.00%	3	2.40%	\$187,000.00	0.55%
Environmental Health	4	2.65%	\$1,061,629.00	2.39%	2	1.60%	\$423,038.00	1.24%
Health and Human Services	5	3.31%	\$120,000.00	0.27%	2	1.60%	\$426,714.00	1.25%
Health Coverage	7	4.64%	\$3,801,654.00	8.55%	2	1.60%	\$2,756,150.00	8.06%
Health Education	10	6.62%	\$1,901,235.00	4.27%	5	4.00%	\$666,000.00	1.95%
Health Policy	4	2.65%	\$130,046.47	0.29%	3	2.40%	\$70,000.00	0.20%
Homeless	1	0.66%	\$440,000.00	0.99%	1	0.80%	\$325,000.00	0.95%
Hospice/Bereavement	2	1.32%	\$35,000.00	0.08%	1	0.80%	\$25,000.00	0.07%
Housing	2	1.32%	\$3,025,000.00	6.80%	2	1.60%	\$229,700.00	0.67%
Injury Prevention		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.80%	\$219,080.00	0.64%
Leadership Development	1	0.66%	\$300,000.00	0.67%		0.00%		0.00%
Mental Health	4	2.65%	\$851,631.00	1.91%	12	9.60%	\$4,667,664.00	13.65%
Nutrition		0.00%		0.00%	3	2.40%	\$741,045.00	2.17%
Organizational Development	8	5.30%	\$1,606,401.00	3.61%	3	2.40%	\$362,007.00	1.06%
Outreach/Info & Edu/Promotores	10	6.62%	\$3,388,298.00	7.62%	11	8.80%	\$1,389,702.00	4.06%
Physical Activity	1	0.66%	\$140,000.00	0.31%		0.00%		0.00%
PICO/Faith Based		0.00%		0.00%	3	2.40%	\$428,000.00	1.25%
Primary Care	9	5.96%	\$2,122,497.00	4.77%	9	7.20%	\$1,284,079.00	3.76%
Reproductive Health	8	5.30%	\$3,013,052.00	6.77%	2	1.60%	\$612,518.00	1.79%
Rural Health	3	1.99%	\$194,037.00	0.44%		0.00%		0.00%
Substance Abuse	7	4.64%	\$1,120,432.00	2.52%	3	2.40%	\$330,471.00	0.97%
Violence/Crime Prevention (not DV/child abuse)	3	1.99%	\$235,000.00	0.53%	2	1.60%	\$805,489.00	2.36%
Welfare Reform	1	0.66%	\$244,596.00	0.55%	1	0.80%	\$15,000.00	0.04%
Wellness/Health Promotion	1	0.66%	\$25,000.00	0.06%	1	0.80%	\$600,375.00	1.76%
Workforce (health)	8	5.30%	\$3,124,375.00	7.03%	8	6.40%	\$2,271,667.00	6.64%
Total	151	100.00%	\$44,475,033.47	100.00%	125	100.00%	\$34,190,319.00	100.00%

b. Ethnicity/Race Categories with ≥\$10 million Further Analyzed by Type of Activity

Please note that some categories do not have spending that ≥\$10 million in both years of funding.

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
General Population (All Ethnicities/Races Targeted)								
Applied Research	5	1.65%	\$342,793.87	0.32%	8	2.02%	\$1,063,909.00	1.02%
Capacity Building	16	5.28%	\$17,921,169.00	16.79%	41	10.35%	\$10,658,612.00	10.20%
Capital	23	7.59%	\$2,054,719.00	1.92%	31	7.83%	\$5,820,556.00	5.57%
Community Organizing	12	3.96%	\$4,443,324.00	4.16%	16	4.04%	\$2,083,428.00	1.99%
Core Operating Support	48	15.84%	\$8,771,795.00	8.22%	25	6.31%	\$722,000.00	0.69%
Direct Services	39	12.87%	\$17,123,260.00	16.04%	33	8.33%	\$5,955,119.00	5.70%
Evaluation	1	0.33%	\$15,000.00	0.01%	8	2.02%	\$875,159.00	0.84%
Expansion	36	11.88%	\$10,621,122.00	9.95%	54	13.64%	\$13,227,444.00	12.66%
Information/Education	18	5.94%	\$1,426,345.00	1.34%	72	18.18%	\$12,771,038.00	12.22%
Media	8	2.64%	\$2,787,505.00	2.61%	7	1.77%	\$3,240,874.37	3.10%
Planning	8	2.64%	\$1,240,001.00	1.16%	38	9.60%	\$3,982,284.00	3.81%
Policy & Advocacy	10	3.30%	\$4,671,269.00	4.38%	17	4.29%	\$8,420,342.00	8.06%
Promotores	1	0.33%	\$941,954.00	0.88%	1	0.25%	\$316,423.00	0.30%
Re-Granting	27	8.91%	\$19,900,150.00	18.64%	7	1.77%	\$20,178,000.00	19.31%
Technical Assistance	4	1.32%	\$1,025,424.00	0.96%	11	2.78%	\$5,261,552.00	5.03%
Technology	6	1.98%	\$5,104,194.00	4.78%	8	2.02%	\$908,187.00	0.87%
Training & Mentoring	41	13.53%	\$8,359,760.00	7.83%	19	4.80%	\$9,032,669.00	8.64%
Total	303	100.00%	\$106,749,784.87	100.00%	396	100.00%	\$104,517,596.37	100.00%
Multi-Ethnic/Racial (No Single Ethnicity/Race ≥50%)								
Applied Research	3	3.23%	\$1,070,000.00	5.81%	1	1.54%	\$36,000.00	0.35%
Capacity Building	3	3.23%	\$394,000.00	2.14%	4	6.15%	\$879,230.00	8.55%
Capital	12	12.90%	\$335,239.00	1.82%	6	9.23%	\$583,000.00	5.67%
Community Organizing	1	1.08%	\$49,730.00	0.27%	4	6.15%	\$100,000.00	0.97%
Core Operating Support	24	25.81%	\$642,754.00	3.49%	3	4.62%	\$63,843.00	0.62%
Direct Services	4	4.30%	\$234,750.00	1.27%	7	10.77%	\$2,124,324.00	20.66%
Evaluation	1	1.08%	\$3,000,000.00	16.29%	2	3.08%	\$400,000.00	3.89%
Expansion	16	17.20%	\$4,630,000.00	25.14%	10	15.38%	\$2,148,966.00	20.90%
Information/Education	2	2.15%	\$69,040.00	0.37%	8	12.31%	\$655,619.00	6.38%
Media	5	5.38%	\$240,000.00	1.30%	1	1.54%	\$50,000.00	0.49%

Planning	5	5.38%	\$79,400.00	0.43%	7	10.77%	\$1,158,105.00	11.26%
Policy & Advocacy		0.00%		0.00%	3	4.62%	\$417,769.00	4.06%
Re-Granting	3	3.23%	\$6,310,000.00	34.26%	2	3.08%	\$50,000.00	0.49%
Technical Assistance	3	3.23%	\$525,000.00	2.85%	2	3.08%	\$374,000.00	3.64%
Technology	1	1.08%	\$50,000.00	0.27%	1	1.54%	\$450,000.00	4.38%
Training & Mentoring	10	10.75%	\$787,029.00	4.27%	4	6.15%	\$790,000.00	7.68%
Total	93	100.00%	\$18,416,942.00	100.00%	65	100.00%	\$10,280,856.00	100.00%

Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population) -- African American/Black

Applied Research		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Capacity Building	11	22.45%	\$2,809,478.00	21.16%	3	6.82%	\$550,000.00	2.40%
Capital	2	4.08%	\$1,280,000.00	9.64%	1	2.27%	\$500,000.00	2.18%
Community Organizing		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.27%	\$251,072.00	1.10%
Core Operating Support	9	18.37%	\$694,745.00	5.23%	6	13.64%	\$1,037,205.00	4.53%
Direct Services	2	4.08%	\$901,925.00	6.79%	4	9.09%	\$1,561,627.00	6.82%
Evaluation		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.27%	\$254,334.00	1.11%
Expansion	9	18.37%	\$2,417,594.00	18.21%	5	11.36%	\$1,270,015.00	5.55%
Information/Education	2	4.08%	\$857,861.00	6.46%	12	27.27%	\$2,594,564.00	11.33%
Media	1	2.04%	\$978,870.00	7.37%	1	2.27%	\$25,000.00	0.11%
Planning	7	14.29%	\$2,368,213.00	17.84%	2	4.55%	\$115,000.00	0.50%
Policy & Advocacy	1	2.04%	\$50,000.00	0.38%	2	4.55%	\$4,323,657.00	18.88%
Promotors	1	2.04%	\$414,708.00	3.12%	1	2.27%	\$150,736.00	0.66%
Re-Granting		0.00%		0.00%	1	2.27%	\$9,268,456.00	40.47%
Technical Assistance		0.00%		0.00%	2	4.55%	\$386,583.00	1.69%
Technology	1	2.04%	\$436,567.00	3.29%		0.00%		0.00%
Training & Mentoring	3	6.12%	\$64,650.00	0.49%	2	4.55%	\$611,060.00	2.67%
Total	49	100.00%	\$13,274,611.00	100.00%	44	100.00%	\$22,899,309.00	100.00%

Sole or Primary Ethnicity/Race (≥50% of Target Population) -- Latino

Applied Research	3	1.99%	\$804,037.00	1.81%	3	2.40%	\$303,311.00	0.89%
Capacity Building	23	15.23%	\$7,944,610.00	17.86%	9	7.20%	\$1,471,696.00	4.30%
Capital	12	7.95%	\$2,363,634.00	5.31%	5	4.00%	\$1,097,000.00	3.21%
Community Organizing	6	3.97%	\$1,713,574.00	3.85%	9	7.20%	\$2,128,576.00	6.23%
Core Operating Support	11	7.28%	\$470,000.00	1.06%	6	4.80%	\$722,000.00	2.11%
Direct Services	16	10.60%	\$7,073,244.00	15.90%	14	11.20%	\$7,996,654.00	23.39%
Evaluation	1	0.66%	\$387,331.00	0.87%		0.00%		0.00%
Expansion	22	14.57%	\$6,757,162.00	15.19%	24	19.20%	\$5,722,289.00	16.74%
Information/Education	10	6.62%	\$1,929,741.00	4.34%	26	20.80%	\$5,151,803.00	15.07%
Media	4	2.65%	\$945,000.00	2.12%	2	1.60%	\$531,000.00	1.55%
Planning	7	4.64%	\$475,000.00	1.07%	8	6.40%	\$361,550.00	1.06%
Policy & Advocacy	5	3.31%	\$252,921.47	0.57%	2	1.60%	\$731,045.00	2.14%
Promotors	5	3.31%	\$2,402,817.00	5.40%	6	4.80%	\$4,845,785.00	14.17%
Re-Granting	11	7.28%	\$7,171,615.00	16.13%		0.00%		0.00%
Technical Assistance	2	1.32%	\$402,125.00	0.90%	1	0.80%	\$482,905.00	1.41%
Training & Mentoring	13	8.61%	\$3,382,222.00	7.60%	10	8.00%	\$2,644,705.00	7.74%
Total	151	100.00%	\$44,475,033.47	100.00%	125	100.00%	\$34,190,319.00	100.00%

5. Income Level

This information was not available.

6. Rural/Urban

This information was not available.

7. Geographic Diversity ("Geographic Area Served")

	FY 00				FY 01			
	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%	# of Grants	%	Dollars	%
Bay Area	30	3.72%	\$3,733,992.00	1.90%	22	2.27%	\$4,896,476.00	2.66%
Bay Area\Alameda	24	2.97%	\$6,783,274.00	3.46%	46	4.75%	\$11,716,665.00	6.37%
Bay Area\Contra Costa	16	1.98%	\$1,115,835.00	0.57%	28	2.89%	\$4,010,663.00	2.18%
Bay Area\Marin	5	0.62%	\$542,500.00	0.28%	13	1.34%	\$1,122,651.00	0.61%
Bay Area\San Francisco	42	5.20%	\$6,813,812.00	3.47%	67	6.92%	\$11,028,424.00	6.00%
Bay Area\San Mateo	5	0.62%	\$686,449.00	0.35%	19	1.96%	\$1,787,039.00	0.97%
Bay Area\Santa Clara	15	1.86%	\$1,580,211.00	0.81%	22	2.27%	\$4,149,597.00	2.26%
Sub-Total Bay Area	137	16.98%	\$21,256,073.00	10.83%	217	22.42%	\$38,711,515.00	21.05%
Central California	3	0.37%	\$271,467.00	0.14%	9	0.93%	\$2,472,907.00	1.34%
Central California\Inyo	2	0.25%	\$423,840.00	0.22%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Central California\Mariposa	4	0.50%	\$109,100.00	0.06%	3	0.31%	\$51,471.00	0.03%
Central California\Mono	2	0.25%	\$423,840.00	0.22%	1	0.10%	\$25,000.00	0.01%
Central California\Tuolumne	4	0.50%	\$282,875.00	0.14%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Sub-Total Central California	15	1.86%	\$1,511,122.00	0.77%	13	1.34%	\$2,549,378.00	1.39%

Central Coast	1	0.12%	\$25,000.00	0.01%	2	0.21%	\$358,272.00	0.19%
Central Coast\San Luis Obispo	5	0.62%	\$360,647.00	0.18%	5	0.52%	\$825,821.00	0.45%
Central Coast\Santa Barbara	4	0.50%	\$1,016,610.00	0.52%	7	0.72%	\$1,024,205.00	0.56%
Sub-Total Central Coast	10	1.24%	\$1,402,257.00	0.71%	14	1.45%	\$2,208,298.00	1.20%
Central Valley	12	1.49%	\$1,414,482.00	0.72%	11	1.14%	\$1,156,789.00	0.63%
Central Valley\Fresno	23	2.85%	\$1,867,475.00	0.95%	40	4.13%	\$2,557,111.00	1.39%
Central Valley\Kern	6	0.74%	\$313,268.00	0.16%	13	1.34%	\$2,301,297.00	1.25%
Central Valley\Kings	4	0.50%	\$109,100.00	0.06%	7	0.72%	\$525,343.00	0.29%
Central Valley\Madera	7	0.87%	\$273,443.00	0.14%	8	0.83%	\$382,283.00	0.21%
Central Valley\Merced	5	0.62%	\$960,272.00	0.49%	9	0.93%	\$1,128,107.00	0.61%
Central Valley\San Joaquin	8	0.99%	\$1,516,488.00	0.77%	9	0.93%	\$942,984.00	0.51%
Central Valley\Stanislaus	4	0.50%	\$569,824.00	0.29%	5	0.52%	\$494,886.00	0.27%
Central Valley\Tulare	18	2.23%	\$707,639.00	0.36%	33	3.41%	\$2,054,140.00	1.12%
Sub-Total Central Valley	87	10.78%	\$7,731,991.00	3.94%	135	13.95%	\$11,542,940.00	6.28%
Los Angeles	87	10.78%	\$13,190,134.00	6.72%	103	10.64%	\$17,737,192.00	9.65%
Los Angeles\Antelope Valley	3	0.37%	\$625,827.00	0.32%	2	0.21%	\$262,686.00	0.14%
Los Angeles\East	6	0.74%	\$2,789,010.00	1.42%	3	0.31%	\$914,610.00	0.50%
Los Angeles\Metro	27	3.35%	\$4,472,223.00	2.28%	15	1.55%	\$2,058,444.00	1.12%
Los Angeles\San Fernando	14	1.73%	\$2,129,043.00	1.08%	10	1.03%	\$958,191.00	0.52%
Los Angeles\San Gabriel	7	0.87%	\$860,664.00	0.44%	7	0.72%	\$1,716,106.00	0.93%
Los Angeles\South	15	1.86%	\$3,526,521.00	1.80%	7	0.72%	\$1,109,275.00	0.60%
Los Angeles\South Bay	3	0.37%	\$193,374.00	0.10%	6	0.62%	\$1,840,580.00	1.00%
Los Angeles\Ventura	6	0.74%	\$1,529,081.00	0.78%	6	0.62%	\$307,414.00	0.17%
Los Angeles\West	9	1.12%	\$842,212.00	0.43%	5	0.52%	\$112,000.00	0.06%
Sub-Total Los Angeles	177	21.93%	\$30,158,089.00	15.37%	164	16.94%	\$27,016,498.00	14.69%
Monterey Bay	4	0.50%	\$345,757.00	0.18%	1	0.10%	\$91,942.00	0.05%
Monterey Bay\Monterey	7	0.87%	\$738,495.00	0.38%	11	1.14%	\$674,834.00	0.37%
Monterey Bay\San Benito	1	0.12%	\$212,500.00	0.11%	2	0.21%	\$203,933.00	0.11%
Monterey Bay\Santa Cruz	8	0.99%	\$1,265,464.00	0.64%	13	1.34%	\$2,191,127.00	1.19%
Sub-Total Monterey Bay	20	2.48%	\$2,562,216.00	1.31%	27	2.79%	\$3,161,836.00	1.72%
North Coast	4	0.50%	\$100,000.00	0.05%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
North Coast\Del Norte	1	0.12%	\$30,000.00	0.02%	6	0.62%	\$518,507.00	0.28%
North Coast\Humboldt	21	2.60%	\$1,806,556.00	0.92%	17	1.76%	\$1,356,734.00	0.74%
North Coast\Lake		0.00%		0.00%	2	0.21%	\$337,500.00	0.18%
North Coast\Mendocino	5	0.62%	\$567,181.00	0.29%	6	0.62%	\$1,163,306.00	0.63%
North Coast\Napa	2	0.25%	\$2,300,000.00	1.17%	4	0.41%	\$340,289.00	0.19%
North Coast\Sonoma	25	3.10%	\$1,057,375.00	0.54%	15	1.55%	\$2,195,704.00	1.19%
North Coast\Trinity	3	0.37%	\$521,008.00	0.27%	5	0.52%	\$328,965.00	0.18%
Sub-Total North Coast	61	7.56%	\$6,382,120.00	3.25%	55	5.68%	\$6,241,005.00	3.39%
North Counties	2	0.25%	\$320,000.00	0.16%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
North Counties\Butte	2	0.25%	\$1,223,570.00	0.62%	3	0.31%	\$430,866.00	0.23%
North Counties\Colusa	1	0.12%	\$331,250.00	0.17%	2	0.21%	\$28,539.00	0.02%
North Counties\Glenn	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	2	0.21%	\$68,190.00	0.04%
North Counties\Lassen	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	5	0.52%	\$373,565.00	0.20%
North Counties\Modoc	2	0.25%	\$45,192.00	0.02%	3	0.31%	\$161,065.00	0.09%
North Counties\Nevada	1	0.12%	\$40,000.00	0.02%	3	0.31%	\$192,777.00	0.10%
North Counties\Plumas	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	2	0.21%	\$66,957.00	0.04%
North Counties\Shasta	4	0.50%	\$1,292,953.00	0.66%	7	0.72%	\$959,091.00	0.52%
North Counties\Sierra	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	2	0.21%	\$45,834.00	0.02%
North Counties\Siskyou	1	0.12%	\$25,000.00	0.01%	5	0.52%	\$389,437.00	0.21%
North Counties\Tehama	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	3	0.31%	\$162,298.00	0.09%
Sub-Total North Counties	13	1.61%	\$3,277,965.00	1.67%	37	3.82%	\$2,878,619.00	1.57%
Northern California	13	1.61%	\$2,872,069.00	1.46%	16	1.65%	\$3,167,600.00	1.72%
Orange	12	1.49%	\$1,910,466.00	0.97%	25	2.58%	\$4,636,222.00	2.52%
Sacramento Delta	4	0.50%	\$411,440.00	0.21%	4	0.41%	\$567,875.00	0.31%
Sacramento Delta\Alpine	1	0.12%	\$40,000.00	0.02%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Sacramento Delta\Amador	2	0.25%	\$44,125.00	0.02%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Sacramento Delta\Calaveras	3	0.37%	\$139,780.00	0.07%	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Sacramento Delta\EI Dorado	2	0.25%	\$631,250.00	0.32%	3	0.31%	\$535,504.00	0.29%
Sacramento Delta\Placer	3	0.37%	\$1,132,209.00	0.58%	4	0.41%	\$180,277.00	0.10%
Sacramento Delta\Sacramento	17	2.11%	\$3,622,541.00	1.85%	20	2.07%	\$3,524,529.00	1.92%
Sacramento Delta\Solano	3	0.37%	\$1,780,367.00	0.91%	6	0.62%	\$1,150,653.00	0.63%
Sacramento Delta\Sutter	1	0.12%	\$331,250.00	0.17%	1	0.10%	\$44,943.00	0.02%
Sacramento Delta\Yolo	4	0.50%	\$1,540,732.00	0.79%	9	0.93%	\$711,902.00	0.39%
Sacramento Delta\Yuba	0	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%	4	0.41%	\$115,777.00	0.06%
Sub-Total Sacramento Delta	40	4.96%	\$9,673,694.00	4.93%	51	5.27%	\$6,831,460.00	3.72%
San Bernardino/Riverside	3	0.37%	\$339,414.00	0.17%	3	0.31%	\$296,792.00	0.16%
San Bernardino/Riverside\Riverside	13	1.61%	\$2,669,534.00	1.36%	16	1.65%	\$1,455,953.00	0.79%
San Bernardino/Riverside\San Bernardino	6	0.74%	\$1,049,748.00	0.53%	18	1.86%	\$1,760,975.00	0.96%

Sub-Total San Bernardino/Riverside	22	2.73%	\$4,058,696.00	2.07%	37	3.82%	\$3,513,720.00	1.91%
San Diego/Imperial	3	0.37%	\$946,013.00	0.48%	3	0.31%	\$210,726.00	0.11%
San Diego/Imperial\Imperial	3	0.37%	\$916,898.00	0.47%	4	0.41%	\$650,322.00	0.35%
San Diego/Imperial\San Diego	57	7.06%	\$13,346,526.00	6.80%	59	6.10%	\$11,904,146.00	6.47%
Sub-Total San Diego/Imperial	63	7.81%	\$15,209,437.00	7.75%	66	6.82%	\$12,765,194.00	6.94%
Southern California	6	0.74%	\$1,734,544.00	0.88%	6	0.62%	\$260,038.00	0.14%
Statewide	131	16.23%	\$86,520,751.00	44.08%	105	10.85%	\$58,393,156.00	31.76%
Total*	807	100.00%	\$196,261,490.00	100.00%	968	100.00%	\$183,877,479.00	100.00%

* Since many grantees serve more than one geographic area, and thus listed more than one per grant, these columns add up to a total greater than the total number of TCE grants funded in FY 00 and FY 01. The "Dollars" column was calculated by dividing each grant amount equally among all the geographic areas noted for that grant. Therefore, the "Dollars" columns do roughly equal the total amount of grants for FY 00 and FY 01, with insignificant rounding errors.