MacArthur Foundation
macfound.org

REFLECTIONS ON DISCOVERY GRANTS

By Jeff Ubois, Senior Program Officer

INTRODUCTION

The MacArthur Foundation's Discovery Grants program supported promising approaches to important social problems and other transformative projects that did not fit within the Foundation's existing programs and strategies. Between 2012 and 2015, it made 35 awards to 34 projects and organizations, and considered more than 150 other ideas offered by staff, Board members, current and past grantees, academics, students, and entrepreneurs.

This paper summarizes the goals, processes, achievements, failures, and lessons from that experience with the intention of identifying replicable approaches to finding and funding new ideas and to cross-Foundation collaborative work.

TAKEAWAYS

- The discovery process benefits from cultivating multiple sources of ideas and projects but getting the right rate of flow — enough to offer choice but without overwhelming selection capacity — is challenging.

- Discovery and innovation programs can bridge between programs within organizations. Cross-program staffing for discovery and innovation programs allows consideration of new ideas from multiple perspectives.

- High levels of intellectual and emotional trust between participants are needed to support the kinds of robust and critical discussions innovation programs require. High trust allows programs to function based on rough consensus; governance of these programs cannot be effective if it is top-down.

- Even when programs have explicitly stated criteria, the first few grants will reflect implicit selection criteria and send signals to potential grantees.

- Discovery programs often address diverse hopes within an organization, but there is a danger in overburdening a discovery process with multiple objectives, e.g. between exploring selected topics and making exceptions and opportunistic grants.

- Peripheral vision complements focus. A process for making grants outside existing program guidelines and strategies can provide surprising insights into institutional work and culture.

GOALS AND PURPOSES

Discovery Grants began in early 2012 as an effort to help the Foundation become more receptive to good ideas, whatever their source, and to demonstrate this openness to others. This initial program mission represented an evolution from prior efforts, including the New Ideas program implemented by the Foundation in the early 2000s and the early work of the General Program of the 1990s.

This mission soon expanded to include providing a means for staff to consider and fund projects and organizations that fell outside Foundation strategies and areas of interest; to address a leadership goal of then President Robert Gallucci, who wanted to encourage a culture within the Foundation of "collaboration and dissent;" to improve management of inquiries sent to the President, Board members, and staff; to encourage collaboration between different programs and people who did not typically communicate with each other; and to experiment with new or different approaches to grantmaking, such as open calls, investments in commercial enterprises, or "scaled" investments, in which the most successful projects would receive larger, follow-on rounds of support.

All of these purposes were debated at length, and the tension between keeping many possibilities open and making choices in a timely way remained an issue over the life of the program. Discovery's reliance on voluntary staff participation encouraged this breadth of ambitions though it sometimes slowed decision making.

STARTING UP

Fairly quickly, it became apparent that many of the goals of the Discovery program would be well served by creating a cross-Foundation group that could draw on the diverse perspectives of different programs. The "Discovery Grants Committee" thus included participants from all areas of the Foundation at that time (Media, Culture, and Special Initiatives; U.S. Programs; International Programs; Fellows, legal, the library, and finance), and from every level of seniority, from the President to administrative assistants. This diversity of perspectives was integral to the tone and culture of the effort, and very useful to developing a wide range of possibilities and to the subsequent decisions about project selection and funding.

The Committee began meeting to consider particular projects and proposals while still facing critical choices about its goals and processes. Should Discovery be an innovation fund for new programs? A counterweight to strategic approaches to philanthropy operating in other areas of the Foundation? A chance to experiment with new methods of grantmaking? A seed fund for exceptionally creative people, projects, and ideas? A signal to the field about MacArthur's intentions?

SURVEYING THE FIELD

An early task for Discovery staff was a survey of comparable innovation programs at peer foundations, including Rockefeller, Robert Wood Johnson, Gates, and the National Science Foundation.

This survey revealed a set of issues common to other efforts like Discovery grants. How is it possible to rationalize the pursuit of innovation? What is the best way to find new possibilities and to select among them? Is it appropriate to pursue work and projects based only on the significance of a problem, without a well-articulated remedy, solution, or theory of change? And if projects don't work immediately as expected, is it better to move on, or does supporting innovation require long-term commitments?

A universal concern was the relationship between these (often small) innovation programs and other areas of an organization; some operated very independently, while others actively facilitated collaboration with and between programs. Some were tasked with helping to create new programs, others focused on small grants, while others existed to challenge existing programs or hedge against larger strategies.

These programs grappled with opposing forces and organizational needs — to take risks but to consider how the failure of any one grant may reflect on a funder and its grantees; to take the long view but to fail fast; to remain open to everything but to keep some focus. Some programs were designed to provide services to larger programs within their home foundations, while others were deliberately segregated from existing work, directed to avoid topics of potential interest to existing programs.

We also heard concerns about risk in the field of philanthropy — whether foundations tend to support only safe projects, create hidden disincentives for staff to make risky grants, or lack the ability to accept failure as a necessary price for innovative work.

Participation in an "innovation funders" group formed and led by the Monitor Institute (now a part of Deloitte Consulting) provided other useful introductions and insights, particularly regarding grant and program life cycles, specifically how (1) new possibilities are sourced and identified, (2) candidate projects are selected for funding, (3) foundations can best interact with grantees, and (4) successful projects are expected to grow or remain sustainable.

All of these findings provided grounds for group discussion and helped to shape Discovery grants at MacArthur.

SOURCING NEW POSSIBILITIES: FINDING AND IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE PROJECTS

We began looking for potential grants close to home: soliciting recommendations from Foundation staff. We reasoned that this would advance the cultural changes (particularly collaboration and open dialogue) intended by Foundation leadership, would have a low risk of sending confusing signals to the field, and would allow us to refine our grantmaking criteria and committee processes before making the work more public.

Over time, we broadened the variety of sources for fundable ideas and projects. We opened the program to suggestions from the Board, and later, from the Fellows selection committee. We began to get referrals from selected MacArthur grantees and from program staff at other foundations with programs similar to Discovery grants, and we learned of some interesting possibilities that way. We reviewed unsolicited inquiries sent to the President's Office and MacArthur's general delivery mailbox, conference and trip reports from Foundation staff, selected media, and meetings organized by other programs at the Foundation.

We also considered other potential sources of new proposals, such as competitions, research networks,

business networks that highlighted investments in for-profit rather than nonprofit organizations, and partnerships with other funders or online marketplaces through which we might share proposals under consideration. At various times we pursued all of these options opportunistically, though never in a sustained or systematic way.

At some points, translation of ideas and concerns between participants took a significant amount of energy. This was not only due to differing levels of subject matter expertise but also to different sensibilities in grantmaking practices. Program staff were typically more sensitive about implicit signals sent to the public by off-strategy grants and how these signals might be received or misinterpreted by would-be grantees. But over time, the group established a high degree of trust, a series of norms regarding its deliberative process, and a reputation of openness to any Foundation staff member who wished to attend and comment on proposals under consideration (this was appealing to non-grantmaking staff yet occasionally vexing to those who saw themselves as more skilled in grantmaking decisions and processes). These positive social factors helped to make some of the tensions described elsewhere more acceptable.

By the end of 2012, Discovery had a small but fairly steady flow of possibilities. Typically, the Committee would consider five to eight proposals per month and fund one, sometimes two, even as selection criteria and deliberative processes continued to evolve. But for the life of the program, the question of how best to source possibilities and the optimal flow of new proposals remained open; the section below on "Challenges, Shortcomings, and Constraints" offers some further observations on this point.

SELECTION CRITERIA, DECISIONS, AND CHOICES

Translating a set of general aspirations – to be open to risk, to make intelligent exceptions, to be more responsive to new people and possibilities, to provide some peripheral vision as a complement to the focus of programs – into grant criteria proved surprisingly difficult. Based on broad agreement that Discovery Grants should support promising approaches to important social problems and that awards should go to projects that did not fit into the Foundation's existing programs and strategies, the group developed five criteria against which ideas could be judged:

- Important - addresses an important social issue in a domain in which the Foundation can have an impact
- Timely - responds to an urgent problem or opportunity
- Testable - promises definite results, for example, a prototype or other proof of concept, with outcomes that can be assessed
- Bold - ambitious but prepared to learn from interesting failure
- Anticipatory - showing awareness of future trends and needs

Although we did not include "quality of project leader-ship" on our list of criteria, it was almost always a factor. Similarly, project feasibility and the reputation of the organization proposing a new idea were also factors in decision making.

Projects that addressed concerns familiar to Foundation staff were also privileged in certain ways; these projects benefitted from advocacy by senior executives and a greater understanding of their merits. A few grants were effectively service grants for other parts of the Foundation that were exploring new possibilities; for example, several early awards supported work on climate change, which has since become a primary focus for the Foundation. Others, such as an early grant for urban green spaces, also encouraged cross-program collaboration, collegial relations, and new expectations about the role of non-program staff.

Because these criteria and qualities were so general, applying them was challenging. Grant decisions were heavily dependent on the Discovery Grants Committee's monthly meetings, where proposals were debated. Decisions were based on rough consensus, sometimes supplemented by informal votes or polls of the group.

The tone and tenor of these meetings was critical to the functioning of the program. Meetings were inclusive and open to all staff. Meeting participants were free to weigh in on any proposal, and many participants noted the discussions had broad educational value. Debates were sometimes intense; anticipating the discussions, we often provided guidance for staff offering ideas with warnings that that we "strive to be supportive of new possibilities but rigorous in our questions." Some proposals engendered split decisions; others passed

by acclaim almost immediately; while a few were immediately rejected. Most were sent back to the staff person who brought the idea with questions to be answered that reflect a degree of collective interest or skepticism.

In practice, some meetings were heavily influenced by the presence or support of senior staff, though there were no guarantees: projects offered by President Gallucci were among those turned down. This reflected a commitment to avoid top-down approaches to decisions. At the same time, the group also benefitted enormously from the perspective of non-program staff from areas such as legal, finance, public affairs, and the library and archives, who had special skills and interests as well as a sense of the Foundation's entire body of work.

One of the early expectations was that the project qualities we were seeking would become evident over time through exemplary awards, naturally emergent themes, and clusters of grants of that were representa-tive of both stated and unstated aspirations. This proved to be the case: by 2013, we began to see an organic emergence of themes from the grants made over the first year of the program.

In hindsight, grants fell into one or more of a small number of patterns and categories. Most concerned new conceptual approaches to important social problems. Often, but not always, these explored social implications of rapidly emerging technologies or sought in some way to channel corporate or commercial behavior to social ends (e.g. accounting for green costs and benefits or improvements in labor practices). "Technology & Society" was identified as a specific theme we pursued, making grants concerning artificial intelligence, robotics, gene editing, privacy, and surrogacy. Later in the life of the program, we also vigorously pursued the issue of open access publishing.

Other grants concerned worthy extensions to the existing guidelines of other programs. These included projects intended to provide better lives for vulnerable populations, including immigrants, farm workers, and inmates. Given MacArthur's historic commitment to Chicago, it is perhaps unsurprising that many of the early grants went to local organizations. On occasion, proposals were brought to Discovery by staff holding a minority (but favorable) opinion within their program regarding the quality of an idea.

SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS AND WORKING WITH GRANTEES

Most Discovery grants provided general operating support, though work housed in larger institutions, particularly universities, was by necessity project support. This preference for general operating support reflected the exploratory nature of the proposals that were funded and a desire to provide maximum flexibility for grant recipients doing exploratory work.

The athematic nature of the program, particularly in its first two years, limited our inclination to treat grant recipients as a cohort. Generally, we did not attempt to convene Discovery grantees (since they were working on diverse topics), nor did we actively attempt to strongly influence their work.

The initial design for the program suggested that we would winnow our portfolio and provide follow-on funding for the most successful projects, but fairly early on we had a major discussion about follow-on grants and determined that we would instead presume that all grants would be one time.

RESULTS

Given the myriad goals and an essentially opportunistic approach – one without explicit causal pathways, a limited set of activities, and a general sense of values, ends, and means – any discussion of "achievements" could be discounted by skeptics as post hoc justification.

Yet Discovery helped Foundation staff see patterns and types of problems philanthropy might address, including encouraging better corporate behavior; closing the gap between technologists and policy-makers; solving collective action dilemmas; building observational systems; and investing in other than 501c3 organizations. Often, these "problem types" were identified through particular grants, and, indeed, the quality and success of the best of the Discovery grantees may be the most meaningful or identifiable achievement.

Several grants stimulated new thinking, broke new ground, or advanced and improved the quality of debate. These included awards for the first major public discussion of the gene editing technology CRISPR, the first academic center focused on the sociology of masculinity, and a series of grants about drones and robotics (see Appendix I). We found that

open calls for ideas without thematic restrictions can lead to effective grants and projects.

Discovery was often the first institutional funder for new projects, and subsequent additional funding by other foundations or by government sources may be viewed as validation of our choices. Several of our peer foundations, including the Arnold, Mellon, and Helmsley Foundations, as well as the National Science Foundation, followed up on our initial awards with support of their own.

Several grants allowed for collaboration between different MacArthur programs, as in between Media and Justice for Jail Education Solutions, while others, like those to the Open Access Collaborative and the Authors Alliance, supported the Foundation's explorations regarding its own Open Access policy. A few grants provided a way for us to collaborate with other funders, as with the Ford Foundation on a study of the pipeline for engineering talent (see A Future of Failure: The Flow of Technology Talent into Government and Civil Society).

Other projects grew remarkably in scope or scale. The Human Vaccines Project has received more than $20 million in funding from other sources; the Justice Entrepreneurs Project has been replicated in other cities; Edovo has gone on to raise more than $10 million and now operates in 20 states and in over 50 facilities and has served educational materials to over 50,000 people.

A surprising number of grantees received significant media attention. Although we never counted this as success or rigorously estimated the monetary value of this media coverage, it seems likely that its dollar value exceeded the total grant awards if valued in terms of advertising value equivalency (see Appendix III).

As in any program, the grants awarded sometimes had an effect on the careers of particular individuals and institutions. Though this was something we did not track systematically, the credibility conferred through MacArthur funding was noted by several recipients as being very substantial, particularly for new organizations. To pick just one example, the principal investigator in the exploration of the ethics of semi-autonomous artificial intelligence programs became an ethicist for Google, and now leads a $27 million fund devoted to exploring the ethics of AI.

The overall effect on Foundation culture is hard to assess. Discovery Grants provided a way for everyone in the Foundation to participate in the grantmaking process, and, at times, extra consideration was given to projects proposed by non-program staff. The openness of the monthly meetings and regular participation by senior staff including the President also opened some lines of communications. At the same time, trying to factor general concerns about Foundation culture or the enthusiasm of individual staff members into grant decisions may have muted more critical voices.

Discovery also allowed for exploration of other methods of sourcing ideas, including competitions and prizes, to identify new projects. For example, we hosted representatives from the Gates, Knight, Kresge, Joyce, Case, Sloan, and Mozilla Foundations, along with representatives from the White House, to discuss open calls and competitions as an approach to grantmaking. This informed some of the *100&Change* work that followed.

CHALLENGES, SHORTCOMINGS, AND CONSTRAINTS

Several of the challenges facing Discovery grants persisted throughout the life of the program. These challenges were interrelated in complex ways, but they might be grouped roughly into program management, capacity, and external relations.

Program Management

Among the challenges in program management were focus, consistency, and sourcing of new proposals. Looking backward, it was also clear we missed some opportunities because of these challenges.

Focus. As initially designed, the program was explicitly athematic, with some hope or recognition that certain themes might emerge. Eventually, this did occur, and beginning in 2014, we began to work more thematically and with small clusters of grants. Reversing our initial practice, starting work with problems and concepts, and then making small clusters of grants provided more focus and, if pursued further, might have served as a way to explore potential big bets. Overall, we found that evaluating work in many unfamiliar areas is difficult and time intensive but, given our intent to provide some peripheral vision for the Foundation, somewhat unavoidable.

Consistency. Applying broadly defined criteria in a consensus-driven process is difficult to do consistently. Allowing the meetings to remain open to all staff meant that the character of meetings changed as attendance fluctuated; new arrivals did not always share the tacit understandings developed by long time members of the group. With the explicit willingness, especially in the early years of the program, to consider exceptions, it was hard to avoid some appearance – or reality – of arbitrary or random decision making. Early exceptions to satisfy interest of non-program staff or proposals from less senior people also contributed to the difficulty of maintaining consistency. "You know it when you see it," is not a perfect guide to grantmaking decisions (but then neither is anything else).

Sourcing. Although our intent was to be open to new ideas from whatever their source, in practice, the origin of a suggested proposal or idea was often an important factor in accepting or rejecting it. Ideas from grantees already known to staff, from tier-one research universities, or former staff were sometimes given more benefit of the doubt than those from unknown organizations. This may be an almost unavoidable outcome for any diverse group considering unfamiliar ideas.

Missed opportunities. Two projects (the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board and Crisis Text Line) were considered but not funded, though both projects were well known to program staff. The Sustainability Accounting Standards Board was rejected for lack of staff support, while Crisis Text Line was rejected due to an abundance of it — it had been funded by another program. Both of these organizations went on to demonstrate considerable effectiveness and to secure funding from other sources. While that might suggest that MacArthur's support proved unnecessary, the decision not to fund these organizations was based on a mix of valid concerns and what hindsight says was excessive skepticism regarding the worth of these efforts.

Capacity and Constraints

Discovery was never more than a very modest program: it was limited in staffing, scale, the size of grants awarded, and the Discovery program's appetite for risk.

Staffing. No staff members were devoted full time to Discovery, and most participation in the effort was voluntary. This may have been insufficient; certainly, it limited our ability to work with grantees and others, to develop concepts, and to seek new possibilities more

systematically. Most, but not all, of the grants approved were for proposals that were already well-formed. Our ability to document and monitor progress on individual grants was limited.

Scale. While some of the issues addressed were big, most of the actual projects were not. All but one of the grants were under $500,000, and no single theme or cluster of grants received more than $2 million. At such levels of funding, exploration and proofs of concept are possible, as is attracting support from other sources. Though the idea of supporting the best performers with larger rounds of funding was considered from the beginning, it only happened on one occasion. For all the merits of an experimental, athematic, "little bets" approach to discovering and testing new possibilities (often applied in other MacArthur programs as well), it is notable that MacArthur's subsequent search for new ideas, *100&Change*, focused on those needing $100 million in funding.

Risk. Some participants in discussions did not frame considerations in terms of risk at all, while for others having sufficient risk was almost a qualifying criterion. Generally, discussions were not framed explicitly in terms of risk, yet different appetites for risk led us to forego grants to some projects. These perceived risks were various and ranged from basic feasibility to reputational risk to the Foundation and other grantees.

Relations within and outside the Foundation
Relations with other programs, with staff within MacArthur, and with the other institutions and the public were key to Discovery's operations.

Relations with other programs were nearly always constructive. At its best, Discovery provided a way to support exceptionally creative projects that were nonetheless outside program eligibility guidelines or provided space for two different programs to collaborate. On occasion however, Discovery was asked to cease work in a particular area for fear of confusing the field or encroaching on territory under consideration by large programs.

Addressing staff concerns (and turning down staff ideas) sometimes proved difficult. Discovery Grants was a program in which ideas competed and the strongest were pursued. On occasion, projects that were passionately promoted by staff were not approved, yet our work to allow broader participation

led some people to expect that their personal passions would be funded. Communication of this reality was challenging, particularly given the flexibility of eligibility guidelines.

Public visibility affected relations with both internal and external groups. A few Discovery grants and projects, such as Retraction Watch and a project with the Ford Foundation to study technology in government, received a great deal of public attention. Yet the program itself generally tried to remain fairly low profile in order to limit the number of unsolicited proposals received. Increasing program visibility might have brought a greater flow of ideas to us or helped us communicate the Board's ambitions for us to be bold.

SOME SUBJECTIVE COMMENTARY AND CONCLUSIONS
The preceding sections have been (or were intended to be) fact based and logically structured; the following more subjective reflections and observations are not. Yet they represent some of the harder-to-classify and harder-to-prove aspects of Discovery Grants, and knowledge of them would have been useful to have at the start of the program.

- Innovation programs can benefit from adopting more than one approach to program design and to grant-making. There are in fact many viable choices about how to build an innovation or discovery program. A diversity of approaches—to how ideas are sourced and prioritized, how they are funded, what institutional needs are addressed, and so on—can be a program strength, rather than a distraction or evidence of a lack of rigor. Many of these approaches to innovation funding are well documented in professional literature, though the difference between reading about them and applying them is enormous.

- High levels of intellectual and emotional trust between participants are needed to support the kinds of robust and critical discussions innovation programs require. Given looser program guidelines, the emotional tone and intellectual attitudes prevalent within meetings and in other communications are unusually crucial to program success. Selecting participants for temperament can be as important as selecting for expertise.

- Accounting for the varying tenor of each meeting and for the changes in the types of questions posed as a proposal is examined is critical. Generally, openness

and curiosity during initial discussions of a new idea, followed by closer scrutiny and greater skepticism prior to a final decision seems to be the most effective way of both weeding out relatively weak proposals and strengthening projects that are not fully mature.

- Though the presence of senior staff at times inhibits free discussion by less senior participants, understanding the needs of the organization, obtaining permission to take certain risks, and resolving issues with other program areas are much easier with Presidential or Vice-Presidential participation.

- Insisting on the use of plain English by staff and applicants, and a commitment to resisting jargon can help programs addressing a broad range of topics be more effective. A requirement for plain English provides a screen against poorly conceived proposals, and enables collaboration between staff with diverse expertise. "Articulate your objectives using absolutely no jargon" was one of the first requirements of one of the 20th century's great research managers, George Heilmeier, whose "Heilmeier Catechism" still guides decisions at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency at the Department of Defense and other research labs.

- Innovation and discovery programs can function based on rough consensus, but split decisions are fine and sometimes desirable. The genuine merits of a new idea are not always apparent to everyone simultaneously. "Champion-based review," in which a single well-informed advocate may approve a project despite broad skepticism among her or his colleagues sometimes results in the best grants – at least in those cases where genuine merit is recognized by a minority.

- Some experienced program staff have an almost uncanny intuition regarding grant proposals. To the extent grantmaking involves pattern matching, or a sense of aesthetics, long experience in diverse fields provides a unique source of great insight. Of course, at other times, experience can induce unnecessary skepticism regarding new ideas, but a rich set of comparisons concerning past endeavors in philanthropy can be extremely useful, and is sometimes undervalued, particularly in cultures with an avowed focus on innovation.

- Programs designed to make occasional exceptions can provide surprising insights into Foundation processes and culture. We found approaches to considering prospective grants varied widely between members of the Discovery Grants Committee; particularly notable were the different cultures of different programs. Watching these diverse approaches to evaluating prospective grants was of benefit to all involved.

A few remaining Discovery Grants ran through 2017. As the program winds down, we continue to work with grantees, collect grant products, and monitor public discussions and media coverage. The full set of proposals received, meeting minutes, and other records are being passed to the Foundation's archives.

Discovery was one of several explicitly athematic programs run by the Foundation. The General Program, New Ideas, Targets of Opportunity grants, and *100&Change* were all designed to address problems with certain characteristics (such as timelineness or durability) rather than to address a defined subject. Though all of these programs are quite distinct, they have also shared certain aspirations – for exploration, learning, impact, and risk – that represent enduring interests of the Foundation and, perhaps, the field of philanthropy as a whole.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

APPENDIX I: REPRESENTATIVE GRANTS

Following are more detailed descriptions of selected grants that were particularly representative of the program.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: Human Gene Editing, $200,000 over two years, November 2015
This project addresses the global risks, opportunities, and ethical implications of advanced research into a gene editing technique called CRISPR/Cas9. Though less than four years old, Crispr/Cas9 has already been used to make cells impervious to the AIDS virus, to reverse a genetic mutation that causes blindness, and to introduce heritable characteristics into human embryos. The potential social consequences are far reaching; while Crispr/Cas9 may provide enormous savings for health care systems by eliminating chronic diseases, it also threatens a future in which extraordinary powers to change future generations of people will reside with a small number of individuals. The project will help researchers, funders, and policy makers understand and respond to the ethical implications regarding this research.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES: $250,000 over two years, January 2015
This award supports a multidisciplinary study group on new ethical dilemmas arising from the intersection of contemporary political developments and changes in military technology, including the use of drones and autonomous weapons systems that operate independently of human control and make complex decisions about how to seek, identify, and attack targets. The project addresses the legal, moral and policy concerns that will help shape the debate about these weapons, which are likely to be in regular use within the next decade, and will help to build a common understanding of autonomous weapons systems, and ensure that policy makers are well informed about their options.

THE EQUITABLE FOOD INITIATIVE: $1,000,000 over two years, December 2014
The Equitable Food Initiative is a new organization, incubated as a project of Oxfam America, that is pioneering a multi-stakeholder approach to advancing worker protections, food safety, and environmental sustainability in the $140 billion fresh produce industry. This award supports the scale-up of the Initiative's voluntary scheme for certifying fresh produce farms that meet a rigorous set of standards for worker conditions, food safety practices, and responsible pesticide use. Through this program, farmworkers are trained to meet these standards and help identify and correct violations. The resulting reduction in unsalable, wasted produce will lead to greater margins for growers and higher wages for workers. A consumer-facing Equitable Food Initiative label, piloted by leading food retailers, will help drive consumer demand for produce from certified farms.

JUSTICE ENTREPRENEURS PROJECT: $400,000 over two years, December 2014
The Chicago Bar Foundation (CBF) is the charitable arm of The Chicago Bar Association. Its Justice Entrepreneurs Project (the Project) is an initiative of the CBF to address a failure of the market for legal assistance for low- and moderate-income people in the Chicago area. The Project serves as a small business incubator for recent law school graduates starting socially conscious law practices intended to serve those with too much income to qualify for free legal aid, but without the means to pay for market rate legal services.

RETRACTION WATCH: $400,000 over two years, August 2014
Retraction Watch is a research organization that works to improve practices in science, publishing, research funding, and peer review by collecting and analyzing notices issued by leading academic journals, publishers, and scientific societies regarding acknowledged errors, corrections, and retractions. It publishes its findings via its website, RetractionWatch.com, which serves roughly 100,000 readers per month, many of whom actively contribute information to the site about scientific controversies, errors, and misconduct. The proposed grant will provide project support for a comprehensive database of retractions, and for a series of long form reports about errors in scientific research and publishing.

THE DATA & SOCIETY RESEARCH INSTITUTE: $400,000 over two years, May 2014
The Data & Society Research Institute is dedicated to

addressing social, technical, ethical, legal, and policy issues created by emerging data-centric technologies. This grant will explore the legal, economic, and cultural implications of "intelligent systems," software that exercises judgment and control in lieu of human management, in fields such as medicine, finance, transportation, and security. It will seek underlying principles that can be applied across these fields, build networks between legal, technical, and economic experts, develop specific legal recommendations, and respond to the needs of policy makers.

THE LADY MECHANIC INITIATIVE: $340,000 over two years January, 2014

The Lady Mechanic Initiative is a Nigeria-based non-governmental organization dedicated to equipping young women with economically valuable skills and attitudes. The Discovery Grants Committee recommended this project because it challenges traditional gender roles and perceptions by giving women skills in traditionally male-dominated and well-paid professions, and in its new work with the secondary school system in Nigeria, has the potential to scale up. The grant will help the organization to continue its out-of-school training in auto mechanics and motor repair, start a pilot on training in generator and water pump repairs, create a pilot strategy to work with girls in the formal secondary school education sector in Nigeria, and begin a program to train girls as professional drivers.

STATE UNIVERSITY AT STONY BROOK: Masculinity Studies, $300,000 over two years, December 2012

This grant provides seed funding to establish a center for the study of men and masculinities at State University of New York (SUNY) at Stony Brook. Gender Studies is one of the fastest growing interdisciplinary fields, yet its historical origins have meant that most programs have been by and about women. The center will conduct research and interdisciplinary scholarship, create a Master's degree program, and serve as a resource for nonprofit organizations concerned with a wide range of social problems that might be addressed through a deeper understanding of masculinity. The Committee recommended a grant based on the project's potential to increase public discussion of important social issues, and to inform work in other areas of the Foundation on topics ranging from violence to maternal mortality.

APPENDIX II: ALL DISCOVERY GRANTS

GRANTEE	GRANT AMOUNT	SOURCE OF IDEA	START DATE	END DATE	PURPOSE
Openlands	$90,660	Admin staff	6/1/12	5/31/13	To create a system for citywide expansion of community and school food gardens.
George Washington University, Elliott School of International Affairs	$20,000	Human Rights Program Staff	6/1/12	5/31/13	To support work on Internet governance.
International Living Future Institute	$100,000	Green Committee Program Staff	10/1/12	9/30/13	To develop and deploy a new environmentally-sound investment model for the real estate industry.
Oxfam America	$300,000	Migration program	10/1/12	12/31/14	To pilot the EquiTABLE Food Initiative, a multi-stakeholder effort to enhance the safety and sustainability of U.S. food production while improving conditions for farm workers.
State University of New York at Stony Brook Office of Grants and Contracts	$300,000	Maternal Health Program Staff	1/1/13	12/31/15	To establish and inaugurate a new center for the study of men and masculinities.
Elevate Energy	$100,000	Green Committee Program Staff	1/16/13	1/15/14	To develop and deploy a new application to simplify the process of planning environmentally-sustainable events and meetings in Chicago.
Chicago Architecture Foundation	$100,000	Program Staff	2/14/13	8/13/14	To support the City of Big Data initiative.
Hunt Alternatives Fund	$150,000	US programs	5/20/13	5/19/14	To support the Demand Abolition program, a project aimed at reducing the illegal sex trade.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Office of Sponsored Programs	$50,000	Outside consultant to arts and culture	5/1/13	4/30/14	To support the Evolving Culture of Science Engagement workshop.
New York University School of Law Engelberg Center on Innovation Law and Policy	$60,000	Other grantee (Mozilla)	6/27/13	6/26/14	To support a conference on the topic of drones and aerial robotics.
Jail Education Solutions	$325,000	Public event & program staff	9/13/13	9/12/14	In support of the production of original video content targeted to people in jail, the development of an interactive website, and an independent evaluation of the project.
Columbia University	$500,000	HR Program Staff	1/1/14	9/12/15	In support of the Declassification Engine project.
Natural Resources Defense Council	$400,000	IPS Program Staff	10/10/13	10/9/15	To support the Pilot Citizen Radiation Monitoring Network.
Lady Mechanic Initiative	$340,000	Nigeria Office Program Staff	1/1/14	8/26/16	In support of a project to help women acquire economically valuable skills in male dominated professions in Nigeria.
Tides Center	$200,000	Former grantee	1/15/14	1/14/16	In support of the project, Center for Genetics and Society, to develop information resources related to assisted reproductive technologies.

GRANTEE	GRANT AMOUNT	SOURCE OF IDEA	START DATE	END DATE	PURPOSE
National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine	$50,000	LOI to president	6/20/14	6/19/16	In support of the project, Gain-of-Function Research with Avian Influenza: A Symposium.
Electronic Privacy Information Center	$82,500	LOI	4/17/14	4/16/15	In support the project, A Plan for Action: Visions of Privacy in the Modern Age.
Data & Society Research Institute	$400,000	LOI	7/1/14	6/30/16	In support of the project, Social Architecture of Intelligent Systems.
Equitable Food Initiative	$1,000,000	Program Staff	4/1/15	3/31/17	To support a voluntary certification program for labor standards, food safety, and safe pesticide use in the fresh produce industry.
Center for a New American Security	$100,000	Program Staff	8/13/14	8/12/16	In support of the project, Ethical Autonomy: Legal, Moral, and Policy Concerns Regarding Autonomous Weapons.
Chicago Bar Foundation	$400,000	Program Staff	12/16/14	12/15/16	To support the Justice Entrepreneurs Project.
American Academy of Arts and Sciences	$250,000	Former president Fanton	1/1/15	12/31/16	In support of the project, New Dilemmas in Ethics, Technology and War.
Center for Scientific Integrity	$400,000	Media grantee & Arnold Fnd	8/13/14	8/12/16	To support the Retraction Watch database, a project to investigate errors in scientific research and publishing.
Asylum Access	$400,000	Migration program	12/16/14	12/15/16	To support The Refugee Rights Toolkit project.
Authors Alliance	$325,000	Former Felllow	4/20/15	4/19/17	In support of general operations.
Stanford University Graduate School of Education	$460,000	Program Staff	5/15/15	5/14/17	In support of An Open Access Cooperative: Assessing the Viability for Libraries, Journal, Societies, Presses, and Funders.
National Academy of Sciences	$200,000	Former grantee	12/1/15	11/30/17	To support of policy development regarding global risks, opportunities, and ethical implications of a new gene editing technique, CRISPR/Cas9.
Human Vaccines Project	$425,000	Fellows program	12/1/15	11/30/17	For the Ethics and Policy Initiative of the Human Vaccines Project.
Harvard University Office for Sponsored Programs	$425,000	Luce Fnd, MacArthur Board member	8/10/15	8/9/17	In support of ShariaSource.
Illinois Institute of Technology, Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions	$200,000	Discovery program staff	12/1/15	11/30/17	To support development of the Ethics Codes Collection, and research based upon it.
Creative Commons	$25,000	Human Rights Program Staff	10/2015	10/2015	Travel to and participation the Creative Commons Global Summit.
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	$215,000	Open Access Working Group	12/1/15	11/30/16	For the Research Data Alliance, a standardization process intended to bridge the gaps between related data sets.
Refugee Services of Texas	$325,000	Migration program	3/1/16	6/30/17	For a technology-based demonstration program to facilitate the integration of refugees in the United States.

APPENDIX III: PRESS COVERAGE

ASPEN INSTITUTE (THE FRANKLIN PROJECT)
Opinions. *The Washington Post*. "Keep Maryland at the forefront of service." June 10, 2016.

Press Release. *The Aspen Institute*. "Aspen Institute and Defense One to Host Panel Discussion, 'Beyond the Draft: Rethinking National Service.'" November 18, 2015.

Col. Michael Ruhey and Col. Charles Allen, U.S. Army. *Military Review November-December 2015*. "An All-Volunteer Force for Long-Term Success."

Stelljes, Drew (Assistant Vice President, The College of William & Mary) . *Huffington Post*'s The Blog. "Inspiring American Citizenship: Franklin Project Call to Action." October 12, 2015.

Zagursky, Erin. College of William & Mary. "Virginia college presidents discuss 'bid idea' of service year at governor's summit." October 6, 2015.

Hessler-Radelet, Carrie (Director, Peace Corps) and Wendy Spender (CEO, Corporation for National and Community Service. *Huffington Post*. "Why Job Candidates from Peace Corps and AmeriCorps Are Good for Business." September 16, 2015.

Merisotis, Jamie. Lumina Foundation. "Talent-Attracting, Educating & Deploying the 21st Century Workforce." September 8, 2015.

Zagursky, Erin. College of William and Mary. "College presidents to gather at W&M for summit on national services." September 9, 2015.

Brown, Marshall. *Huffington Post*. "Moving the Country Forward—Dartmouth College Elects to Become a Model for Civic Engagement via The Franklin Project." July 23, 2015.

Curtis Institute of Music. "Curtis ArtistYear Fellowship Program Expands to Five Fellows in its Second Year." June 24, 2015.

McCain, John and Stan McChrystal. CNN. "Expand opportunities for young Americans to serve their country." August 10, 2015.

Press Release. "Bennet, McCain Introduce Bill to Expand National Service Opportunities for American Youth." August 5, 2015.

The Associated Press. "Dartmouth to promote gap year service." July 25th, 2015.

Glickman, Dan. *The Kansas City Star*. "Dan Glickman: A year of national service for young Americans could restore trust in government." June 21, 2015.

Aspen Institute. Press Release. Moritz, MacKenzie. "Innovation Challenge to Foster Higher Education-Affiliated Service Year Positions." January 15, 2015.

Deel, Rachel. *University of Kentucky News*. "UK Nonprofit Program to Compete as Finalist in Higher Ed Challenge." April 9, 2015.

Drake University. *Newsroom*. "Drake University service year proposal is finalist for national innovation award." April 8, 2015.

Press Release. PRNewswire-USNewswire. "Stan McChrystal Issues Challenge to Presidential Candidates to Embrace National Service." March 30, 2015.

Press Relese. PRNewswire-UANewswire. "$100,000 Given for Innovative Service Models to Be Integrated at Higher Education Institutions." April 17, 2015.

Sullivan, Joseph. UMass Dartmouth. "UMass Dartmouth Winner of National Community Service Innovation Challenge." April 20, 2015.

Brokaw, Tom. Council on Foreign Relations. "Reimagining National Service." March 23, 2015.

Byron, William J. *America-The National Catholic Review*. "A Rite of Passage-Should young people be required to do a year of service?" March 2, 2015 Issue.

Dionne Jr., E.J. *The Washington Post*. "AmeriCorps is a program conservatives should love." April 13, 2014.

Friedman, Michael. *Huffington Post*. "Would a Year of Voluntary Public Service Bring Out America's Best?" March 11, 2015.

Gergen, Christopher and Stephen Martin. *The News and Observer*. "Doing Better: Momentum builds for a national service corps." Raleigh, North Carolina, February 28, 2015.

McChrystal, Stan. CNN. "Stan McChrystal: A Million Young People to Empower America." January 2, 2015.

Milbank, Dana. *The Washington Post*. "How can American inspire the Slacktivist Generation to action?" December 30, 2014.

PR Newswire. "Innovation Challenge to Foster Higher Education-Affiliated Service Year Positions." January 15, 2015.

Ignatius, David. *The Washington Post*. "The Case for National Service. Requiring young people to spend a year helping others could help mend a torn American society." November 27, 2014.

Aspen Institute. "Former President Clinton and Chelsea Clinton Announce National Service Alliance Commitment Championed by General Stanley McChrystal and Chelsea Clinton on CGI Main State." September 22, 2014.

Aspen Institute. "2 Minutes on Why Young Americans Should Complete A Service Year." August 6, 2014.

United Way of New York City. *PRNewswiere*. "United Way of New York City and NYC Service Launch Ambitious Service and Volunteerism Effort in Partnership with The Franklin Project." July 14, 2014.

McChrystal, Stanley. *Democracy-a Journal of Ideas*. "Securing the American Character." Issue #33, Summer 2014.

Albright, Madeleine. *USA Today*. "D-Day About National Service." June 5, 2014.

Maller, Tara. The Aspen Institute – Press Center. "The Franklin Project at The Aspen Institute Announces 2014 Summit on National Service at Gettysburg." April 10, 2014.

Coretz, Adam. *The Huffington Post*. "Harnessing the Drum Major Instinct Through National Service." Last modified January 20, 2014.

Bridgeland, John. *The Huffington Post*. "A Civilian Corps for the Modern Age." Last modified January 8, 2014.

Dionne, Jr., E.J. *The Washington Post*. "A Call for National Service." Last modified July 03, 2013.

Readey, Jay and Devin Race. *Chicago Tribune*. "Millennials Can Transform America's Neighborhoods." Last modified February 2, 2012.

ASYLUM ACCESS
Quinley, Caleb. Asian Correspondent. "One year on from Rohingya boat crisis: Human rights groups call for action." June 9, 2016.

Dolan, Kerry A. *Forbes*. "How philanthropists and nonprofits are working on the refugee crisis." April 7, 2016.

Siegel Bernard, Tara. *The New York Times*. "How to help in a global refugee crisis." December 25, 2015.

AUTHORS ALLIANCE
Samuelson, Pamela. ArtsTechnica.com. "Google's fair use victory is good for open source." June 2, 2016.

Samuelson, Pamela. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. "Google's Court Victory is Good for Scholarly Authors. Here's Why." October 27, 2015.

CENTER FOR NEW AMERICAN SECURITY
Herman, Arthur. *Foreign Affairs*. "The Pentagon's "Smart" Revolution." June 16, 2016.

Suciu, Peter. Fox News. "Rise of the machines? The danger of autonomous weapons." March 21, 2016.

NPR. "Weighing the good and the bad of autonomous killer robots in battle." April 28, 2016.

Jones, Tony. ABC News. "Interview: Robotics Professor Noel Sharkey." May 21, 2015.

Horowitz, Michael C. and Paul Scharre. *The New York Times*. "The Morality of Robotic War." May 26, 2015.

Gady, Granz-Stefan. *The Diplomat*. "Unmanned 'Killer Robots': A New Weapon in the US Navy's Future Arsenal?" April 17, 2015.

Atherton, Kelsey D. *Popular Science*. "How to talk about killer robots that make their own decisions." February 13, 2015.

Paul, Kari. *Motherboard*. "Before Anyone Bans Killer Robots, We Have to Define What They Are." February 16, 2015.

CHICAGO ARCHITECTURE FOUNDATION (CITY OF BIG DATA)

Dale, Kim Z. *Chicago Now*. "City of Big Data promotes data benefits, ignores privacy concerns." May 20, 2014.

Chicago Tribune. "Divvy bikes, Chicago Dashboard, architects and the City of Big Data." May 15, 2014.

Kamin, Blair. *Chicago Tribune*. "Chicago, 'big data' focus of CAF exhibition." May 10, 2014.

Fox 32 News Chicago. "Chicago: City of Big Data." May 13, 2014.

Kokalitcheva, Kia. *VentureBeat News*. "How a Swarm of Data is Helping Chicago Re-Map Urban Life." May 14, 2014.

Pletz, John. *Crain's Chicago Business*. "City of Big Data: Information Metts Architecture." May 9, 2014.

CHICAGO BAR FOUNDATION

Amato, Theresa. *New York Times*. "Put Lawyers Where They're Needed." June 17, 2015.

Bushey, Claire. *Crain's Chicago Business*. "MacArthur Foundation awards $400,000 to legal incubator." February 26, 2015.

"Legal incubator dubbed 'Project Lemonade' gets $400K grant from MacArthur Foundation."

"MacArthur Foundation awards $400,000 to legal incubator."

"WTTW: Chicago Incubator Reinventing the Legal Field." January 23, 2014.

"How Nora Endzel and others are broadening accessibility to justice."

"More on the innovative Chicago Justice Entrepreneurs Incubator Project."

"MacArthur Foundation awards $400,000 to legal incubator."

"Training New Lawyers to Start Affordable Law Firms."

"What do you get when you mix a lawyer with an incubator?"

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY (DECLASSIFICATION ENGINE)

Connelly, Matthew. *Prezi, Inc*. "What drives the declassification engine?" February 2, 2016.

Bernstein, Joseph. *BuzzFeedNews*. "Can an algorithm do the job of a historian?" June 15, 2015.

Hodson, Hal. *New Scientist*. "Super-literate software reads and comprehends better than humans." Magazine issue 3051 published 12 December 2015.

O'Brian, Bridget. Columbia University in the City of New York. "Magic Grants Merge Technology and Storytelling." Last modified August 28, 2013.

Metz, Cade. *WIRED*. "The Declassification Engine: Your one-stop shop for government secrets." May 24, 2013.

COOL THE EARTH

Press Release. Kern Valley Sun-California. "Cool the Earth: Students get cool tips to help the environment." September 16, 2015.

Trezza, Denise. Oyester Bay Enterprise Pilot. "Students Keep the Earth Cool." June 4, 2015.

DATA AND SOCIETY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Magid, Larry. *The Huffington Post*. "Podcast: Advantages and potential harms of refugees' 'digital passage'." May 18, 2016.

Schockman, Elizabeth. Public Radio International. "Gamifying the workplace: is it ethical?" Septmber 5, 2015.

Wang, Tim and Madeleine Elish. *Motherboard*. "Might Intelligent Machines One Day Convince Us It's Time to Die?" May 27, 2015

ELECTRONIC PRIVACY INFORMATION CENTER

Zara, Christopher. *International Business Times*. "Where are the Panama Papers? Governments May Pester Amazon, But Good Luck Getting In." April 4, 2016.

Butler, Alan. Electronic Privacy Information Center. "It's How Hackers Help That Matters." Article published in the *New York Times-The Opinion Pages-Room for Debate*. March 30, 2016.

Herold, Benjamin. Education Week-Trubine Content Agency. "Schools, Government Agencies Move to Share Student Data." October 21, 2015.

Robers, Jeff. GIGAOM. "Public interest groups appeal $20M Facebook 'Sponsored Stories' deal." September 24, 2013.

ELEVATE ENERGY
Loeb, Nancy C. *Huffpost Politics*. "Lead in Paint is Harming Hundreds of Thousands of Children." February 10, 2016.

Wang, Eva Jiayu. *GreenBiz*. "Efficiency for all: How lower energy bills open new markets." February 12, 2016.

Datcher, Mary L. *Chicago Defender*. "ComEd Partners Showcase 'Community of the Future' Plan in Bronzeville." Febrary 2, 2016.

EQUITABLE FOOD INITIATIVE
Business Wire. "Costco Stocks 'Good Farms' Blueberries, Strawberries and Organic Strawberries from Equitable Food Initiative-Certified Farms." June 2, 2016.

FreshFruitPortal.com. "Canada: Windset Farms joins Equitable Food Initiative." May 2, 2016.

Business Wire. "Equitable Food Initiative (EFI) Partners with Whole Foods Market; Retailer to Recognize EFI Certification from Suppliers in 2016."

BusinessWire. "Equitable Food Initiate Partners with Whole Foods Market; Retailer to Recognize EFI Certification from Suppliers in 2016." March 17, 2016.

Greenhouse, Steven. *The New York Times*. "Farm Labor Groups Make Progress on Wages and Working Conditions."

Greenhouse, Steven. *The New York Times*. "Farm Labor Groups Make Progress on Wages and Working Conditions."

McDonough, Eliza. *The Dartmouth*. "Holmes delivers lecture on U.S. migrant farming." April 7, 2015.

Skilton, Isabel M. Center for American Progress. "How the November Immingration Directives Will Help Farmworkers." April 30, 2015.

Ganzier, Maisie. *The Huffington Post*. "Got Food? Thank a Farmworker This Week." March 23, 2015.

Prendergast, Curt. Nogales International. "Industry leaders see obstacles on the way to fair trade." March 17, 2015.

Campbell, Monica. Public Radio International. "What's it like to be a migrant farmworker? One anthropologist lived and worked alongside them." February 6, 2015.

To the Editor. *The New York Times*. "Food Safety and Worker Safety Are Inextricably Linked." November 27, 2014.

Biron. Carey L. "EPA Finally Updating Pesticide-Use Guidelines for Farm Workers." November 13, 2014.

3BLMedia. "Participant Media's Grass Roots 'Cesar Chavez' Film Campaign Grows Support for Sustainable Food." July 21, 2014.

Sharing this ad Lauren Pabst came across on Upworthy asking people to sign a pledge being administered by Take Part (the social action arm of Participant Media) in support of Oxfam's Equitable Food Initiative, tied to the Cesar Chavez movie that came out last weekend.

Levine, Sydney. *IndieWire*. "LatinoBuzz: Cesar Chavez Film Social Action Campaign Supports the Equitable Food Initiative." April 3, 2014.

Welsbaum, Herb. NBC News. "Culture-changing' initiative to stop food contamination on the farm." Last modified August 19, 2013.

FREEDMAN CONSULTING (TALENT TO GOVERNMENT AND NON-PROFITS)
Hoffman, Hannah. *Statesman Journal*. "Report: Government Lacks People for IT Projects." September 14, 2014.

Freedman, Tom. Sam Gill, and Alexander C. Hart. *Chronicle of Philanthropy Op-Ed*. "3 Ways Nonprofits Can Find Talented Technology Experts." June 16, 2014.

Corbin, Kenneth. *CIO Magazine*. "Federal CIOs Struggle to Recruit Top Tech Talent." May 1, 2014.

Davenport, Reid. *FCW Magazine*. "It's Not Just About the Money." April 29, 2014.

New America Foundation. "The Technology Deficit: Attracting Tech Talent into Government and Civil Society."

Leibowitz, Jon. *San Jose Mercury News.* "Jon Leibowitz: Fix government's technology talent struggles." Last modified January 10, 2014.

Meyers, Jessica. *Politico*. "Silicon Valley lures tech talent D.C. craves." Last modified December 3, 2013.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY-INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY (INTERNET GOVERNANCE)
Chen, Weihua. *China Daily*. "US, Chinese Re-connect on Cyber Talk." December 3, 2014.

The George Washington University, Institute for International Economic Policy. "The IIEP Global Economic Governance in the 21st Century Initiative." Last modified December 3, 2013.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY (SHARIASOURCE)
Harvard Law Today. "MacArthur Foundation awards $425,000 to SHARIAsource project led by Intisar Rabb." October 22, 2015.

Harvard Law Today. "Luce Foundation Awards $400k to Harvard Law for the development of SHARIsource." June 30, 2015.

Garlock, Stephanie. *Harvard Magazine*. "Debating Sharia Law, Digitally." May-June, 2015.

HUMAN VACCINES PROJECT
PRWeb. "Vanderbilt and the human vaccines project launch initial studies to decode the human immune system." June 21, 2016.

PRWeb. "Aeras to join the Human Vaccines Project to accelerate global disease prevention and control." April 11, 2016.

LaFee, Scott and Ted Schenkelberg. UC San Diego Health. "San Diego to be Research Hub for New Human Vaccines Project." April 7, 2016.

PharmExec.com. "Pfizer joins the Human Vaccines Project." March 23, 2016.

HUNT ALTERNATIVES FUND (DEMAND ABOLITION PROGRAM)
McNeill, Maggie. *The Washington Post*. "Lies, damned lies and sex work statistics." March 27, 2014.

Sarwar, Beena. *GlobalPost*. "Sex trafficking snares hundreds of thousands of American children." June 20, 2012.

Grant, Melissa Gira. ALTERNET. "DNA Database of Men Who Pay for Sex? The Strange Push to Make Cops Collect DNA from Suspected Johns." January 27, 2012.

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY – CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF ETHICS IN THE PROFESSIONS
Scoles, Sarah. *The Atlantic*. "Astronomers are finally doing something about sexual harassment." January 6, 2016.

INTERNATIONAL LIVING FUTURE INSTITUTE
PRNewswire. "TOTO is the first pluming manufacturer to earn the International Living Future Institute's Prestigious Declare Label and offer sustainable minds' new material health overview." September 17, 2015.

Staff. *Portland Business Journal.* "Architect to Lead Living Building Challenge Efforts." September 5, 2014.

JAIL EDUCATION SOLUTIONS (PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL VIDEO CONTENT TARGETED TO PEOPLE IN JAIL)
Rekdal, Andreas. BuiltinChicago. "With new funding, Edovo brings tablet-based learning to correctional facilities." February 24, 2016.

Field, Anne. *Forbes*. "Edovo, Maker of Tablet-Based Education for Inmates, Aims to Reduce Recidivism and Continues to Grow." March 12, 2016.

Erbentraut, Joseph. *The Huffington Post*. "Free Online Course Connects Ex-Inmates With The Job Skills They Need." The aim is also cut recidivism. September 1, 2015.

Jealous, Ben. *North Dallas Gazette*. "Is justice tech a solution for jails and prisons work better?" July 20, 2015.

Born, Molly. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. "Allegheny County Jail inmates getting some life lessons via tablets." July 28, 2015.

Jealous, Ben. The Times Weekly.com. "Justice Tech: Making Jails and Prisons Work." July 22, 2015.

O'Connor, Brian J. *The Detroit News*. "Shark Tank Star Brings Business Advice to Detroit." July 10, 2015.

Hustad, Karis. ChicagoInno. "What Chicago Jail Education Entreprenelurs learned working in Philadelphia prisons." June 16, 2015.

Erbentraut, Joseph. *Huffington Post*. "The Next Tech Boom Is Taking Place Behind Bars." April 7, 2015.

Field, Anne. *Forbes*. "What Gates Foundation's $52M investment says about social enterprise funding." March 14, 2015.

Hill, Brian. *The Columbia Chronicle*. "Notable Native: Brian Hill." February 23, 2015.

Megias, Mari. Harvard Kennedy School of Government. "Crossing Boundaries: Jessica Droste Yagan MPA 2007." February 20, 2015.

Schena. Susan C. *Napa Valley Patch*. "Napa County Jail Provides Inmates Learning Tablets." It is a pilot program offered by the Napa County Department of Corrections in partnership with Jail Education Solutions. February 20, 2015.

US Official News. "USPTO Grants Trade Mark 'EDOVO' to Jail Education Solutions, Inc. (Illinois)." January 24, 2015.

Field, Anne. *Forbes*. "Startup's Education Platform for Curbing Recidivism Launches Pilot in Philly Prison." October 31, 2014.

Rawlins, Aimee. CNN Money. "How Philadelphia's Prisons Are Embracing Technology." October 7, 2014.

Lockwood, Benjamin. *The Marquette Tribune*: Marquette University. "Social Innovation Continues with Good Money Challenge." September 16, 2014.

NationalSwell. "How Competition Breeds Innovation." September 3, 2014.

PRWeb Newswire. "Techweek Chicago Wraps Up 2014 Conference and Expo Showcasing Tech Innovation." July 2, 2014.

Carpenter, John. *Chicago Tribune-Press Reader*. "Chicago firm's new take on helping inmates learn." September 30, 2015.

Edelstein, Jeff. *Portland Press Herald*. "Commentary: Invitation to innovation." October 4, 2015.

State New Service. "City of Philadelphia Celebrates First Fast Forward Cohort; Launches Second Cohort Call for Ideas." June 4, 2014.

State News Service. "Double Impact Kellogg Team Takes Top Prizes in Impact Investing Plan for Kellogg Startup." April 28, 2014.

Voket, John. *The Newtown Bee*. "Organizers Hope 'Shell Shocked' Screening, Panel Discussion Promotes 'Bridge Building'." Last modified January 17, 2014.

Gallaguer, Kathleen. *Milwaukee-Wisconsin Journal Sentinel*. "Prison programming start-up wins challenge. Midwest Social Innovation Start-Up Challenge." Last modified August 15, 2013.

LADY MECHANICS INITIATIVE-NIGERIA

Adaramola, Zakariyya. *Daily Trust* (Abuja, Nigeria). "Nigeria: Government to support productions of Lady Mechanic's car."

Onehi, Victoria. *Daily Trust* (Abuja, Nigeria). "My next target is to assemble vehicles locally – Lady mechanic." March 4, 2016.

Daily Observer-Monrovia, Liberia. "Would You Hire A Ladymechanic?" October 5, 2015.

Al Jazeera – Poverty & Development. "Sandra Aguebor: Lady Mechanic." September 15, 2015.

Husseini, Shaibu. *The Guardian*. "Film: My Nigeria… From Doha, Lens Zoom On The Giant." August 9, 2015.

Otti, San. *The Sun-Nigeria*. "Female mechanics grooms female students in automobile repairs." July 1, 2015.

The Peninsula-Qatar. "Al Jazeera to launch 'My Nigeria' documentary series on August 24." Qatar, August 7, 2015.

Okere, Roseline. *The Guardian*. "Oando marketing rewards distributors for best performance." May 20, 2015.

News at Ten from Nigeria. "Lady Mechanic Initiative Produces New Female Mechanics."

Adebayo, Toyin. *Newswatch Times Nigeria*. "Jonathan Urges Women Involvement in Nigeria's Economy." Abuja, December 6, 2014.

Okonkwo, Henry. *The Sun*. "May Discouraged Me When I Became Mechanic, Today They Respect Me-Mary Sunday, MD, MS Auto Ventures." December 14, 2014.

All Africa. Press Release. "Nigeria: Aganga urges Lady Mechannic Initiatives to Adopt Spare Parts Manufacturing." July 21, 2014.

Olaode, Funke. *All Africa*. "Nigeria: Event-Coca-Cola Backs Initiative to Produce Female Mechanics." August 2, 2015.

Onoiribholo, Francis. *Daily Independent*. "Aguebor-Ekperuoh: Raining Lady Mechanis for Nigeria." August, 2014.

Onoiribholo, Francis. *All Africa*. "Nigeria: Government to Reduce Poverty Via Women Empowerment." July 31, 2014.

McIver, Brian. *Daily Record*. "Slum princess: Apprentice mechanic Kayleigh was treated like royalty in Nigeria." July 4, 2014.

NPR. "Africa is Champion: Reporting from a Changing Continent." July 31, 2014.

Thiel, Julia. *Chicago Reader*. "Lady Mechanics." June 19, 2014.

This Day Live. "Growing Brand Equity Through Sponsorship." August 7, 2014.

Vanguard, Africa News. "Nigeria; Life As Lady Mechanics-Mrs. Aguebor-Ekperuoh." Last modified February 2, 2014.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (EVOLVING CULTURE OF SCIENCE ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP)

Kaiser, David. *The Huffington Post*. "Of black holes and glittering starts: The theory of everything and Hollywood physics." January 12, 2015.

Kaiser, David. *The Huffington Post*. "Evolving culture of science engagement." October 3, 2014.

Dizikes, Peter. MIT News. "Q&A: John Durant and David Kaiser on spurring public interest in science." September 17, 2014.

Hosler, Linda. American Association for the Advancement of Science. "The Culture of Science Engagement Is Becoming Less Formal, Experts Agree." Last modified October 8, 2013.

NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCE (GAIN-OF-FUNCTION RESEARCH WITH AVIAN INFLUENZA: A SYMPOSIUM)

GenomeWeb. "Gain-of-Function Oversight." June 3, 2016.

Schnirring, Lisa. "NSABB finalizes GOF guidance; White House to weigh in." June 1, 2016.

Lipsitch, Marc. Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy. "Six policy options for conductiong gain-of-function research." March 8, 2016.

Schnirring, Lisa. "Gain-of-function debate focuses on clarity, global perspective." January 8, 2016.

NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES, ENGINEERING, AND MEDICINE (HUMAN GENE EDITING)

Daily Star Gazette, Albany. "Ethical Conclusions of DNA Editing-Antioch Technology Time." June 16, 2016.

Geddes, Linda. *The Guardian*. "It's time society discussed the ethical issues raised by the gene revolution." June 11, 2016.

Cima, Greg. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association – AVMA. "Editing Animals."

Karlin, Sarah. *Politico*. "Gene editing: The next frontier in America's abortion wars." February 16, 2016.

Maron, Dina Fine. *Scientic American*. "Patients unsure about the value of cutting-edge gene-editing technology." February 12, 2016.

White, Mark. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. "Fear and hope over the arrival of human gene editing." January 29, 2016.

Reardon, Sara. *Nature*. "Global summit reveals divergent views on human gene editing." December 8, 2015.

Bernstein, Lenny. *The Washington Post*. "It's too early for gene-editing of human reproductive cells, experts conclude." December 3, 2015.

McKie, Robin. *The Guardian*. "Top biologists debate ban on gene-editing." November 28, 2015.

Maxmen, Amy. *WIRED*. "Easy DNA Editing Will Remake the World. Buckle Up."

Specter, Michael. *The New Yorker-Annals of Science*. "The Gene Hackers." November 9, 2015.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL-NRDC (RADIATION MONITORING NETWORK)
Alemayehu, Bemnet. *NRDC Switchboard*. "A Citizen Radiation Monitoring Workshop at NRDC." April 25, 2014.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW (CONFERENCE ON DRONES AND AERIAL ROBOTICS)
Martin, Tim. *Eureka Times Standard*. "Drone strikes equal collateral massacre." June 6, 2015.

PR Newswire. "NYU Researchers: One-Big-Data Picture is Worth a Thousand Words on Human Rights." June 1, 2015.

Clegg, Chris. *The Daily Iowan*. "Clegg: Drone Madness." May 12, 2015.

Morinigo, Jennifer. American Law Institute. "The American Law Institute Announces Project on Police Investigations." February 19, 2015.

Semerau, Kat. *The Justice – Brandeis University*. "Reevaluate 'the Golden Rule" in international politics." March 18, 2015.

Witkovsky, Benny. *CommonDreams*. "January 23-25 at Princeton: Nation's First Interfaith Conference on Drone Warfare." December 5, 2014.

Zulfqar, Saman. *The Pakistan Observer*. "Building consensus against drones." Last modified December 24, 2013.

Flegenheimer, Matt. *The New York Times*. "At Drone Conference, Talk of Morals and Toys." Last modified October 11, 2013.

REFUGEE SERVICES OF TEXAS
Gonzalez, Raquel. CW33. "Home, Sweet Home: Refugees Celebrate New Life." June 18, 2016.

Smith, Diane. *Star Telegram*. "Fort Worth refugee community honors World Refugee Day 2016." June 18, 2016.

Lewis, Brooke. *Houston Chronicle*. "Her 'name' almost snags refugee's journey to Houston." June 19, 2016.

RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
Venkataraman, Bina. *Boston Globe*. "The race to preserve disappearing data." May 17, 2015.

National Science Foundation. "Developing infrastructure for data sharing around the world." March 9, 2015.

HPC Wire. "Paving the way for accelerated data sharing: An interview with Francine Berman." February 27, 2015.

Jackson, Shirley Ann. *U.S. News*. "Op-ed: The new polytechnic: Preparing to lead in the digital economy." September 22, 2014.

Kash, Wyatt. *Information Week*. "Why free government data remains a tough sell." January 28, 2014.

Markoff, John. *The New York Times*. "How to share scientific data." August 12, 2013.

RETRACTION WATCH
Ellis Nutt, Amy. *The Washington Post*. "This scientist nearly went to jail for making up data." April 1, 2016.

Enright, Michael. *The Sunday Edition*. CBC Radio-Canada. "Meet The Cops of The Scientific Method." February 18, 2016.

Flier, Jeffrey S. *Wall Street Journal*. "How to Keep Bad Science From Getting Into Print." March 1, 2016.

Freeman, David. *The Huffington Post*. "How One Doctor is Waging War On Bulls**t Science." February 23, 2016.

McCook, Alison. Retraction Watch. "Improving reproducibility: What can funders do? Guest post by Dorothy Bishop." November 24, 2015.

McCook, Alison. Retraction Watch. "We're wasting a lot of research funding using the wrong cell lines. Here's one thing we can do." December 8, 2015.

McCook, Alison. Retraction Watch. "Hundreds of researchers are using the wrong cells. That's a major problem." December 8, 2015

McCook, Alison. Retraction Watch. "A new metric: The Rapid Science Collaboration Score." February 5, 2016.

McCook, Alison. Retraction Watch. "Hundreds of researchers are using the wrong cells. That's a major problem." December 8, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Helmsley Trust helps Retraction Watch chart its future with new $130,000 grant." December 3, 2015.

Palus, Shannon. Retraction Watch. "BMJ corrects controversial critique of UD dietary guidelines report." October 28, 2015.

McCook, Alison. Retraction Watch. "Predatory journals published 400,000 papers in 2014: Report." September 30, 2015.

Tuller, David. Virology Blog-About Viruses and Viral Disease. "Trial By Error: The Troubling Case of the PACE Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Study." October 21, 2015.

Aschwanden, Christie. FiveThirtyEight-Science. "Science Isn't Broken." August 19, 2015.

Marcus, A. Retraction Watch. "To catch a cheat: Paper improves on stats method that nailed prolific retractor Fujii." July 7, 2015.

Dokoupil, Tony. MSNBC. "Study casts harsh light on scientists accused of bogus work." June 24, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "The Retraction Watch Leaderboard." June 16, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "New $300,000 grant marks the fifth anniversary of Retration Watch." August 3, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "At least one-third of top science journals lack a retraction policy – a big improvement." August 3, 2015.

Palus, Shannon. Retraction Watch. "Hundreds sign letter criticizing Science for reinforcing 'damaging stereotypes'" July 16, 2015.

Robinson, Michael. *Toronto Star*. "Top doctor resigns amid falsified data probe." July 28, 2015.

Marcus, Adam and Ivan Oransky. The Verge. "The lessons of famous science frauds." June 9, 2015.

Schupak. Amanda. CBS News. "How often are scientific studies retracted?" May 26, 2015.

Adaes, Sara. BrainBlogger. "The Unveiling of Sexism in Academia." May 15, 2015.

Online Searcher. "Watching retractions and text duplications." March 1, 2015

Carey, Benedict. *The New York Times*. "Science, Now Under Scrutiny Itself." June 15, 2015.

Carey, Benedict and Pam Belluck. *The New York Times*. "Maligned Study on Gay Unions is Skaking Trust." May 25, 2015.

Katsnelson, Alla. Retraction Watch. "The first author assumes all responsibility: Malaria vaccine article retracted for image manipulation." May 22, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Weekend reads: Gay canvassing study redux; editors fired; how the world's biggest faker was caught." May 23rd, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Pressure to publish not to blame for misconduct, says new study." June 10, 2015.

Scudellari, Megan. Retraction Watch. "Evidence of data duplication infects lung inflammation paper from Harvard and Yale." June 11, 2015

Schupak, Amanda. CBS News. "How often are scientific studies retracted?" May 26, 2015.

The Editorial Board. *The New York Times*. "Scientists Who Cheat." June 1, 2015.

Ferguson. Cat. Retraction Watch. "Journal retracts part of molecular bio paper due to 'unsubstantiated conclusions'." April 1, 2015.

Joelving, Frederik. Retraction Watch. "Cell Press investigating possible image manipulation in influential yeast genetics paper." June 4, 2015.

Katsnelson, Alla (Freelance Science Writer and Editor). "Snail egg article retracted for fishing for material from six other papers." April 28, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "When should a paper be retracted? A tale from the obesity literature." April 24, 2015.

REFLECTIONS ON DISCOVERY GRANTS

Ferguson, Cat. Retraction Watch. "A rare event: Toronto Star retracts fear-mongering vaccine story." February 23, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Weekend reads: P values banner, climate skeptic fails to disclose corporate funding, editors behaving badly." February 28, 2015.

Ferguson, Cat. Retraction Watch. "More evidence scientists continue to cite retracted papers." February 18, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Weekend reads: Potti trial to begin; fraudster post-doc fired; how to avoid predatory journals." January 24, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Meet the new Retraction Watch editor: Alison McCook." February 2, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "IP Lawyer/ Plagiarist's PhD Thesis Under Review." February 10, 2015.

Oransky, Ivan. Retraction Watch. "Retraction Watch is growing, thanks to a $400,000 grant from the MacArthur Foundation."

Grens, Kerry. The Scientist. "Journalists to catalog retractions." December 16, 2014.

Bio.IT World. "Retraction Watch to Build Comprehensive Database of Retractions." December 15, 2014.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK (CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF MEN AND MASCULINITIES)

Allard, Jody. *The Washington Post*. "Rape culture is a man problem. Why aren't more men speaking up?" June 10, 2016.

Paquette. Danielle. *The Washington Post*. "Why men fear paternity leave." June 19, 2016.

Reiner, Andrew. *The New York Times*. "Teaching Men to be Emotionally Honest." April 4, 2016.

Buglis, Sarah. *The Hatchet* – George Washington University. "Rename 'women's studies' to include 'gender'." September 28, 2015.

Milam, Brett. *The Miami Student*, Oxford, Ohio. "Masculinity Suppressess All Genders." October 20, 2015.

Paquette, Danielle. *The Washington Post*. "What happens when you act too manly at work." September 23, 2015.

Greenfield, Scott H. *Simple Justice*. "Masculinity in The First Degree." September 6, 2015.

Ryan, Jill and Brittany Tesoriero. *The Statesman-Stony Brook University*. "Stony Brook's partnership with HeForShe brings optimism, controversy." September 18, 2015.

Schulten, Katherine. *The New York Times*. "What Does it Mean to Be 'a Real Man'?" September 10, 2015.

Smith, Fiona. *Australian Financial Review*. "Michael Kimmel knows what makes men happy-and it is not being the boss."

Bennet, Jessica. *The New York Times*. "A Master's Degree in…Masculinity?" August 8, 2015.

Press Release. Stony Brook University. "We are HeforShe: Stony Brook University Commits to take action for gender equality." June 19, 2015.

Bennet, Jessica. *Cosmopolitan*. "Men Want Work-Life Balance Too." March 5, 2015.

Ross, Martha. Bay Area News Group. *Marin Independent Journal*. "Dad bloggers are redefining 'real men'." March 3, 2015.

Sheprow, Lauren. *Stony Brook University-Newsroom*. "$2.2 million raised for scholarships at the 16th annual starts of Stony Brook gala." April 29, 2015.

Chen, Peter. State University of New York at Stony Brook. "Center for the Study of Men and Masculinities hosts inaugural conference." March 11, 2015.

Copeland, Libby. *The Washington Post*. "Michael Kimmel is out to show why feminism is good for men." March 8, 2015.

Gabbatt, Adam. *The Guardian*. "What a masculinity conference taught me about the state of men." March 12, 2015.

Vagianos, Alanna. *Huffington Post*. "Gloria Steinem on what men have to gain from feminism." March 6, 2015.

Wallace, Kelly. CNN. "Sheryl Sandberg teams up with LeBron James to get men to #LenIn." March 5, 2015.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges. "President's Forum: Kimmel on 21st Century Gender Issues." February 6, 2015.

Khaza, Olga. *The Atlantic*. "The Bro Whisperer." December 28, 2014.

Wallace, Kelly. CNN. "'Dad' gets a makeover in Super Bowl ads." January 31, 2015.

Khazan, Olga. *The Atlantic*. "The Bro Whisperer." December 28, 2014.

Dotzenrod, Nicole. *The Massachusetts Daily Collegian*. "Michael Kimmel Speaks to UMass Students About Guyland." October 23, 2014.

Davis, Richie. *The Recorder*. "Is this the Moment for Feminist Men? New Book 'Voice Male' Explores Male Gender Roles, Reversing Violent Trends." October 2, 2014.

Frakes, Andy. *The North Wind*. "Feminism: Two Perspectives, One Story." September 18, 2004.

Colton, Tegan. *Daily Nebraskan: University of Nebraska-Lincoln*. "Sexism Cages Men Into a 'Man' Box." September 11, 2014.

NPR Staff. NPR. "The New American Man Doesn't Look Like His Father." June 23, 2014.

Michael Kimmel, of The Center for the Study of Men and Masculinities, is featured in a new film funded by Wendy Schmidt, "The Mask You Live In."

Alpert Reyes, Emily. *Los Angeles Times*. "Men are stuck in gender rules, data suggest."

TIDES CENTER (CENTER FOR GENETICS AND SOCIETY)

Walsh,, Fergus. BBC News. "Gene editing technique could transform future." June 6, 2016.

Stein, Rob. NPR. "Scientists say they hope to create a human genome in the lab." June 2, 2016.

Thompson, Charis, Ruha Benjamin, Jessica Cussins and March Darnovsky. *The Guarding*. "Innovation and equity in an age of gene editing." May 19, 2015.

Ollove, Michael. The Pew Charitable Trusts-Stateline. "States not eager to regulate fertility industry." March 18, 2015.

Smith-Spark, Laura. CNN. "UK Lawmakers Approve '3-parent babies' Law." February 3, 2015.

Darnovsky, Marcy and Jessica Cussing. Center for Genetics and Society for Los Angeles Times. February 15, 2015.

Vogel, Gretchen and Erik Stokstad. AAAS Science Insider. "U.K. Parliament approves controversial three-parent mitochondrial gene therapy." February3, 2015.

Ensor, Josie. *The Telegraph*. "The 'Egg Whisperer' Helping Silicon Valley Women Defy Time." December 6, 2014.

BioSpectrum Bureau. *Bio Spectrum-The Business of Bioscience*. "CGS Slams Apple, Facebook Egg Freezing Call." October 17, 2014.

FPJ Bureau. *The Free Press Journal*. "What you may not know about reproductive technologies." October 12, 2014.

Cheng, Maria. Associated Press International. "Making Embryos From 3 People Doesn't Look Unsafe." June 3, 2014.

Fobel, Susan Berke, Pro-Choice Alliance for Responsible Research (PCARR); Francine Coeytaux, Public Health Institute (PHI); Marcy Darnovsky, Center for Genetics and Society; Lisa Ikemoto, University of California-Davis School of Law; Judy Norsigian, Our Bodies, Ourselves. "Invoking 'Choice' When Discussing Surrogacy as a Feminist Concern Is a Mistake." April 23, 2014.

Sandle, Tim. *Digital Journal-Science*. "Should the U.S. Prohibit Reproductive Cloning?" April 18, 2014.

Darnovsky, Marcy. *The New York Times*. "Genetically Modified Babies." February 23, 2014.

MacArthur Foundation

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation supports creative people, effective institutions, and influential networks building a more just, verdant, and peaceful world. MacArthur is placing a few big bets that truly significant progress is possible on some of the world's most pressing social challenges, including over-incarceration, global climate change, nuclear risk, and significantly increasing financial capital for the social sector. In addition to the MacArthur Fellows Program, the Foundation continues its historic commitments to the role of journalism in a responsible and responsive democracy; the strength and vitality of our headquarters city, Chicago.

For more information or to sign-up for news and event updates, please visit www.macfound.org.

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
140 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60603-5285
Phone: (312) 726-8000
TDD: (312) 920-6285
E-mail: 4answers@macfound.org

www.macfound.org
twitter.com/macfound
youtube.com/macfound
facebook.com/macarthurfdn
linkedin.com/company/macarthur-foundation