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The result of these deliberations is our new initiative to support research to reduce inequality in youth outcomes.
Letter from the President

I joined the William T. Grant Foundation as president on September 1, 2013. Taking on this role has been a pleasure, thanks to the warm reception I have experienced from Board members, staff, and grantees. But it also comes with a serious responsibility for shepherding the Foundation’s resources wisely and deploying them in ways that serve our mission to support research to improve the lives of young people.

During the course of my first year, our Board and staff engaged in a process of considering the key trends and challenges that confront the Foundation at the present time. The result of these deliberations is our new initiative to support research to reduce inequality in youth outcomes. This Annual Report includes an essay in which I explain why, as President Obama has stated, inequality is “the defining challenge of our time,” and how the Foundation intends to respond. The Foundation will address youth inequality in many domains, including child welfare, mental health, and criminal justice—as well as in education—which is the main focus of my essay and a long-standing area of work at the Foundation.

Alongside our inequality initiative, the Foundation will continue to support work that helps us understand the use of research evidence in practices and policies for youth. Child welfare is a domain that is ripe for such endeavors, and Program Officer Kim DuMont has contributed an essay to this Annual Report that explains why understanding the use of research evidence will, as she puts it, help “realize the potential of child welfare.” As a foundation primarily concerned with research, it is essential for us to understand and ultimately improve the extent to which research evidence actually makes a difference for policy and practice.

From 2003 to 2013, the Foundation supported research to understand and improve the social settings in which young people develop. Although we have retired the social settings initiative, our new focus on inequality builds on the contributions of this research in important ways. For example, our past grantees developed tools that have helped many researchers to better study the effects of place-based interventions. These tools will remain available on our website. Moreover, many of the studies in our social settings portfolio are ultimately concerned with improving conditions for disadvantaged young people, and this provides an important platform for future research on inequality.

My predecessor, Bob Granger, served as president for 10 years. He leaves a powerful legacy of important contributions that the Foundation has offered to the worlds of research, policy, and practice. He also shaped a strong and stable staff who continue to advance the work of the Foundation. On behalf of everyone reading this letter, I thank Bob for his work. He’s a tough act to follow, but I’ll do my best.

I would also like to thank three individuals who ably served the Foundation for many years, most recently as senior program associates. Ed Seidman, Tom Weisner, and Brian Wilcox have helped mold a generation of research through their efforts, and I know I express the gratitude of many in saying thanks.

I am pleased to welcome new program staff to the Foundation: Vivian Louie, the Thomas Tam Visiting Professor at CUNY and author of *Keeping the Immigrant Bargain: The Costs and Rewards of Success in America* (Russell Sage Foundation 2012), will join us as a full-time program officer, and Carola Suárez-Orozco, a renowned scholar of immigration and education on the UCLA faculty, will join us as a part-time senior program associate. They, along with Vice President for Program Vivian Tseng and Program Officer Kim DuMont, will ably lead our grantmaking in research and fellowships into the future.

As the Foundation opens new areas of research and endeavors to understand how research may be used more widely, our attention has also turned to our communications practices. In the future, we plan to expand our communications beyond the research community to include policymakers, practitioners, and key intermediaries who inform the direction of research and help bring research to policy and practice. I am pleased to introduce Lenore Neier as our communications manager who will implement this fresh approach, starting with the unveiling of our new website. And be sure to follow us on Twitter: @wtgrantfdn.

This is an exciting time for the Foundation and for me, and I look forward to many productive years together.

Adam Gamoran, Ph.D.
President, William T. Grant Foundation
Letter from the Chair

Our Foundation, like many others, is structured to exist in perpetuity. Much of the William T. Grant Foundation management is guided by an acknowledgement of its long future life. However, a trademark of the organization has been our flexibility and ability to evolve as the world around us changes. During the past year we welcomed our new president, began the process of defining a new research focus, outlined a new communications strategy, retired two trustees, and welcomed their successors.

In September 2013, Adam Gamoran assumed the presidency of the Foundation. Having lived in Madison, Wisconsin, for many years, Adam and his wife were also making a major lifestyle change. Happily, they both enthusiastically embraced our great city and Adam began a seamless leadership transition. He quickly settled into his new role and initiated a systematic review of the organization and its programs, which was embraced by Foundation staff.

In his three-decade career as a professor of Sociology and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Adam’s longstanding research interest had been inequality in education and youth development. Soon after joining the Foundation, he proposed addressing the question of the programs, policies, and practices that reduce inequality as our new research interest. This not only resonated with many Board and staff members, but had also been one of the Foundation’s original mandates: understanding why some young people succeeded and others did not, and discovering ways to help all young people realize their potential. This new focus area succeeds our 10-year emphasis on understanding and improving youth settings. However, our work on settings laid the groundwork for our new initiative and continues to be of interest as a lens through which to study inequality. The Foundation will also continue our initiative on the use of research evidence in social policy and practice.

Another of Adam’s early initiatives has been to focus on enhancing the Foundation’s brand and reach, including a refreshed website, a new logo, and the development of a communications strategy. Adam recognized an opportunity to make a greater impact and communicate our research to wider audiences. This means developing a web presence and materials that could be more broadly disseminated—and in language that is more accessible. Our new website will feature dynamic blog posts by grantees and other renowned contributors, and a robust resources section. As part of the newly developed communications strategy, we will use our site, social media, and email communications much more strategically.

Our Board term limits resulted in the retirement of two nine-year trustees, Lisa Hess and Sara McLanahan. Lisa was an important contributor to the success of our endowment investments; Sara was a consistent and objective voice of reason on the program committee and played a key role in our presidential search. Prudence Carter and Scott Evans were welcomed as new members. Prudence, a professor of education and sociology at Stanford University, has considerable research experience on academic achievement disparities and social inequality. Scott, who was most recently executive vice president of TIAA-CREF and president of its asset management subsidiaries, brings a wealth of investment knowledge and experience.

This year should be one characterized by the initial implementation of our new research focus and further innovation which will build upon the Foundation’s considerable core strengths.

Sincerely,

Henry E. Gooss
Chair, William T. Grant Foundation
This year should be one characterized by the initial implementation of our new research focus and further innovation which will build upon the Foundation’s considerable core strengths.
Inequality Is the Problem: Prioritizing Research on Reducing Inequality

Adam Gamoran, President
William T. Grant Foundation
“Once a Leader, U.S. Lags in College Degrees.” So rang out a recent headline in the *New York Times* (Lewin 2010). In the 1980s, young people in the United States were more likely to attend and complete college than those in any other nation, but that record has long since been eclipsed. By 2008, 15 other countries had higher proportions of persons between the ages of 25 and 34 with college degrees (Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation [OECD] 2010).

What lies behind these numbers? Is this a story of a stalled society—or of unequal progress across the nation? Further investigation reveals that whereas, on average, 41 percent of U.S. 25- to 34-year-olds hold associate or bachelor’s degrees, rates of degree completion are much lower in many states. For example, New Mexico, West Virginia, Louisiana, and Arkansas have rates below 30 percent, far behind on the global scale (Lee and Rawls 2010). Meanwhile Massachusetts, at 54.4 percent, would have ranked fourth in the world rankings.

The disparities are not just geographic. While persons from economically advantaged backgrounds have always gone to college at higher rates than their less-privileged peers, these gaps have expanded since the 1980s (Lee and Rawls 2010). Whereas the difference in college entry between students in the top and bottom income quartiles was 39 percentage points around 1980, it was 51 percentage points by about 1998 (see Figure 1, adapted from Bailey and Dynarski 2011). And differences in college entry between white and Asian students on the one hand and African American and Hispanic students on the other have also widened in recent years (Carnevale and Strohl 2010).

Inequality in education and other domains of life stands in the way of economic and civic progress in the United States. It forestalls social mobility and economic productivity and impairs social cohesion. As a result, national and international leaders—from big-city mayors to Pope Francis—recognize that, as President Obama (2013) put it, inequality is “the defining challenge of our time.”

Although inequality is pervasive, it can be addressed. One way to reduce inequality over time is to lessen the effects of inequality in one generation on the outcomes of the next. If we can help children from low-income families succeed in school, for example, we may be able to improve their job prospects in the future. Today, we have some good ideas about how to meet this challenge, but there is much more to learn. Hence, the William T. Grant Foundation recently...
announced a new initiative to support research on programs, policies, and practices that reduce inequality in youth outcomes in the academic, social, behavioral, and economic realms.

Our interest in inequality extends to many areas of youth development, reflecting disparities in arenas beyond education such as mental health, criminal justice, and workforce development (Alegria, Vallas, and Pumariega 2010; Fader, Kurlychek, and Morgan 2014; Schwartz, Ferguson, and Symonds 2010). This essay uses educational inequality to highlight new ways of thinking about inequality, key leverage points for reducing inequality, and the potential for research to develop more effective responses to inequality.

Growing Achievement Inequality

As with college enrollment, international comparisons of academic achievement often miss the main story. Most headlines focus on the mediocre performance of U.S. students (e.g., Layton and Brown 2012), but this emphasis fails to detect the key problem: test scores in the United States are too unequal. Compared to other countries, the dispersion of achievement in the United States is exceptionally wide, and it is tied to differences in students’ economic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds.

Examples of wide disparities are easily discernable if one probes beneath the averages. For instance, on the 2011 Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMS), a survey of mathematics and science performance in 55 nations, U.S. fourth graders ranked near the middle in mathematics, comparable to many northern European nations but far below international leaders such as Singapore, S. Korea, and Japan (Provasnik et al. 2012). Yet when the U.S. sample is restricted to school districts with fewer than 10 percent of students on free and reduced-priced lunch—that is, districts with fewer poor students—average scores were equal to those of the top-scoring countries. At the same time, in school districts with 75 percent or more of students on free and reduced-priced lunch—those with the highest concentrations of economically disadvantaged students—average scores were much lower, comparable to lower-performing countries such as Kazakhstan, Croatia, and New Zealand (see Figure 2).

Differences in academic outcomes by socioeconomic origins, as well as by race, ethnicity, and immigration status, have long been recognized. Equality of Educational Opportunity, a 1966 landmark study of more than 600,000 young people in schools across the United States, established this point definitively, demonstrating that differences in academic outcomes were more closely tied to students’ family backgrounds than to the schools they attend (Coleman et al. 1966). These findings have been replicated repeatedly over the past five decades (Gamoran and Long 2007). The recent rise in test-based accountability across the United States has highlighted another dimension of inequality: differences among states. By linking the National
Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, a test administered to a sample of students across the nation) to international benchmarks, researchers at the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) revealed that state performance levels ranged from those that nearly equaled the world’s highest performing nations (e.g., Massachusetts, Vermont, Minnesota, New Jersey, and New Hampshire) to those with scores well below the U.S. average and lower than nearly any other western nation (e.g., Mississippi and Alabama) (NCES 2013; see also Hanushek, Peterson, and Woessmann 2012).

Achievement differences by income levels have become particularly pronounced in the United States at the present time. As Reardon (2011) has shown, the achievement gap between children from families at the 10th and 90th income percentiles has increased over the last 50 years, and it is now double the size of the black-white achievement gap. Indeed, family income is now as important as parents’ education in predicting children’s school success. In a recent international study of literacy, socioeconomic differences in performance were greater in the United States than in any other nation (OECD 2013).

Consequences of Inequality

The United States lags behind the top-scoring nations at every performance level, so the mediocre performance of U.S. schoolchildren does not merely reflect low scores at the bottom of our achievement distribution (Hanushek, Peterson, and Woessmann 2010). Yet it is the prevalence of low performers—more than the dearth of high performers—that is most problematic for economic progress and civil society. Among nations tested, the United States leads the world in the number of low-achieving students and in the number of high performers (Petrilli and Scull 2011). This occurs in part because the population of the United States is large, and in part because the degree of inequality is high. In other words, even though our high-achieving students tend to score lower than the highest achievers of the top-performing nations, we still have an extraordinarily large number of high achievers. As a result, the markers of elite accomplishment in U.S. society are likely to persist. For example, we produce more Nobel Prize winners than any other nation (Bruner 2011; Stephens 2013) and we establish almost as many patents each year as all other nations combined (U.S. Patent and Trademark Office 2012). The U.S. system of higher education continues to be the envy of the world as evidenced by continuing waves of international student enrollment (Project Atlas 2013) and our scientific infrastructure is unparalleled (National Science Board 2012). The prospects for sustained economic and scientific leadership are strong, despite the pressures of international competition (National Research Council 2007).

Meanwhile, students who do not achieve even a basic level of academic performance, or do not complete at least a high school education, are limited in their capacity to contribute to the U.S. economy (Goldin and Katz 2010). Thus, even though our students’ average scores fall below those of their counterparts in the highest-performing nations at every achievement level, it is the prevalence of low achievers rather than the shortfall of high achievers that gives greatest cause for alarm. As Belfeld and Levin (2012, p. 2) explained, “purely from an economic perspective—leaving aside important questions of social equity—opportunity is being lost on a large scale.”

The drag on economic progress is not the only reason to be concerned about unequal school performance. Educational inequality is also socially divisive, for at least three reasons. First, as sociologists have long recognized (e.g., Durkheim [1925] 1973; Parsons 1959; Dreeben 1968), schooling provides a common socializing experience that forges bonds despite differences in origins. When young people from different backgrounds experience different levels or types of education, schooling cannot instill shared values throughout the U.S. population. Second,
schooling can create social networks that cross the boundaries of families and communities, and these networks help knit the fabric of American society (Putnam 2000; Stiglitz 2012). Third, of course, educational outcomes predict future economic outcomes, so as education becomes increasingly stratified by social origins, the prospects for social mobility across generations are diminished (OECD 2011; Corak 2012).

While it is widely agreed that inequality is a problem, economists continue to debate how bad the consequences are and what degree of inequality is necessary to motivate performance (e.g., Mankiw 2013; Solow 2014). The society-wide consequences of inequality are difficult to pin down. International comparisons show correspondences between, for example, high levels of income inequality and low levels of social mobility, but the causal links between these conditions are open to debate. At the individual level, however, there is no question that young people who are born into economic and social disadvantage have fewer opportunities for advancement and lower educational and occupational achievements in adulthood.

Social Policy Research Can Help

At the William T. Grant Foundation, we are convinced that social science research on youth development can play an important role in addressing the challenge of inequality. We think that the degree of inequality and its effects on youth outcomes are both amenable to changes in policies, the introduction of new programs, and implementation of gap-closing practices, and moreover that high-quality research can identify approaches that help reduce disparities. Our approach to inequality is distinctive in that it combines the following elements:

- We invest in research that addresses inequality.
- We focus on young people ages 5–25.
- Although we recognize that no single study will lead to major changes, we intend that the studies we fund will culminate in approaches that work to reduce inequality—hence our attention to programs, policies, and practices.
- We have a long tradition of supporting tools that prove useful to a wide range of researchers.
- Our portfolio is broadly interdisciplinary, drawing on ideas and tools from sociology, psychology, and beyond.

As a private foundation, we have a unique opportunity to help build a body of evidence that can contribute to meeting the challenge of inequality. Moreover by focusing simultaneously on the use of research evidence as our other main interest, we can support the emergence of knowledge about how evidence on programs, policies, and practices that reduce inequality may lead to action.

**Efforts to reduce inequality in youth outcomes come in at least three forms:**

- **“Programs”** are coordinated sets of activities designed to achieve specific aims in youth development.
- **“Policies”** are broader initiatives intended to promote success through the allocation of resources or regulation of activities. Policies may be located at the federal, state, local, or organizational level.
- **“Practices”** consist of the materials and activities through which youth development is enabled (e.g., coaching, mentoring, parenting, peer interactions, teaching). Practices involve direct interaction with youth (though not necessarily in person, as technology affords direct interaction from anywhere).
SOCIAL POLICY AND INEQUALITY

The year 2014 marks the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty, and the news is filled with analyses of this national effort. Clearly, the War on Poverty has not been “won.” About 15 percent of Americans are under the poverty level, including nearly 22 percent of children. This includes especially high rates among African American children (37.5 percent) and Hispanic children (33 percent) (U.S. Census Bureau 2013, CLASP 2013). Yet poverty would be even more widespread had social policies not emerged to fight off its grip. Policies such as social security, food stamps, school lunches, the earned income tax credit, housing assistance, and unemployment insurance have held back the throes of poverty to a meaningful degree even as fiscal crises have gripped the country (Bailey and Danziger 2013). These initiatives have provided an economic floor for some—but clearly not all—Americans struggling to make ends meet. Far less has been done to limit inequality on the other end of the spectrum, as income levels among the top 20 percent of earners have continued to rise, largely unimpeded by tax policies or other approaches. Nonetheless, the success of anti-poverty programs shows that inequality can be mitigated by social policy. Similarly, federal policies that eliminated overt discrimination in areas such as housing and education reduced inequities based on race, although much more is needed in this area as well. For example, racial gaps in school performance declined markedly during the 1970s and 1980s. At least in part, this was likely due to policies such as school desegregation and class size reduction (Gamoran 2001), but the remaining gaps have been largely persistent (Magnuson and Waldfogel 2008).

No less dramatic and perhaps even more lasting are programs, policies, and practices that reduce the effects of unequal circumstances on the opportunities and outcomes of the next generation. High-quality early education programs give children from poor families and families of color a boost (e.g., NICHD Early Child Care Research Network and Duncan 2003), although these benefits may be lost as children advance in school (Puma et al. 2012), probably because these children attend lower quality schools (Lee and Loeb 1995). Programs that promote healthier parenting also elevate children’s chances as they enter school (Kitzman et al. 2010). Family-school engagement programs aid children’s socioemotional functioning by reducing family stress and helping parents and children feel more comfortable in school (Gamoran et al. 2012). Classroom instructional practices that combine higher-order skills with a supportive climate elevate the performance of low-achieving students (Crosnoe et al. 2010). Small classes in the early elementary grades not only enhance the learning of all students, but help reduce gaps by giving an extra boost to students of color. This is either because class size reduction especially benefits such students—as was the case in Tennessee (Finn and Achilles 1999)—or because it is a policy that can be targeted toward schools with high concentrations of low-income minority students, as was initially the case in Wisconsin (Molnar et al. 1999). Other statewide efforts to reduce class size have not fared as well, apparently because they were not accompanied by sufficient resources such as space and high-quality teachers (Milesi and Gamoran 2006). Meanwhile, several programs funded under the U.S. Department of Education’s Investing in Innovation (i3) initiative are now bearing fruit (Sparks 2013). These include prominent efforts such as Teach for America, Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP) Academies, the comprehensive school reform program Success for All, and the one-on-one tutoring program Reading Recovery.

Among older youth, activities undertaken to enhance students’ beliefs in their abilities to succeed are moving from the laboratory to the classroom. There is increasing evidence that these practices can reduce racial and ethnic achievement gaps (Walton and Cohen 2011; Hanselman et al. 2014). As more and more young people complete high school, policies are beginning to confront the challenge of access to postsecondary education, where gaps between socioeconomic, racial, and
ethnic groups are wide. Need-based financial aid (Harris and Goldrick-Rab 2011), assistance with financial aid forms (Bettinger et al. 2012), and information about applying to college (Turner and Hoxby 2013) have supported college enrollment or retention of low-income students.

These are but a few examples of programs, policies, and practices that have demonstrated benefits for youth. They illustrate that the constraints of disadvantage are not unbreakable. What strategies might we pursue to increase the extent and coherence of successful programs and ultimately reduce the effects of inequality on young people’s prospects?

RESEARCH ON EFFORTS TO REDUCE INEQUALITY AND THE EFFECTS OF INEQUALITY ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Each initiative cited above was supported by a long process of experimentation and evaluation. Similar efforts are needed to increase the number and scope of programs, policies, and practices that reduce disparities in young peoples’ outcomes.

With all these examples of success, why does inequality remain so high, and why are its effects growing? At least two reasons are paramount for the persistence of inequality and its effects. First, although effective responses have emerged, they are modest compared to the scope of the problem. No single program or policy will close the achievement gap or eliminate outcome disparities in mental or physical health, education, juvenile justice, or social mobility. Rather it will take a constellation of efforts to achieve discernable progress. Second, programs take time to yield impact. The benefits of evidence-based school reform, for example, often do not emerge until a reform has been in place for three to five years (Borman et al. 2003; Bryk et al. 2011), and the effects of high-quality child care may not reveal themselves for a decade or longer (Schweinhart et al. 2005).

Whereas the programs discussed above are supported by credible evidence, many other plausible programs have fallen short of their intended outcomes. Moreover, even when average effects are promising, implementation decisions do not rest so much on effectiveness, but on what works for whom and when. For example, Weiss, Bloom, and Brock (2013) explained that the effectiveness of a program may depend on a variety of contextual conditions, such as the availability of similar programs. Likewise, Hanselman et al. (2014) demonstrated that an intervention designed to mitigate “stereotype threat” (the internalized sense that members of one’s own social group tend to perform poorly on a high-stakes task) may be more effective in a high-threat context, such as a school with a wide achievement gap. This sort of nuance is important for identifying programs and policies that may reduce inequality in particular contexts, but it also increases the challenge for research studies that must examine multiple contexts.

Conclusions

The salience of inequality in the United States is widely recognized, and voices from many spheres are calling for efforts to combat inequality. Prior research and development demonstrates that social policies can reduce inequality and its effects on young people, yet the current level of inequality shows that past efforts have left us with wide disparities. Substantial new efforts are needed to identify approaches that will reduce inequality in youth outcomes so that a generation from now, both the degree of inequality in society and the effects of inequality on outcomes for youth will have diminished.

Through our new research initiative, the William T. Grant Foundation has pledged to play a role in this effort. We recognize that no single study will bring about change. Our hope, however, is that knowledge will eventually accumulate from many studies—those we support and those supported by others—which will point the way to real solutions to our pressing problems. We will continue to draw attention to inequality in young people’s academic, social, behavioral, and economic outcomes. We have
commissioned five papers to address key issues: the first will set an agenda for research on social inequality and the others will examine inequalities through the lenses of immigration and education, mental health, criminal justice, and workforce development. The papers will be released on our website and discussed through other venues. Our site will also host a blog that will include ongoing reports and commentaries about the challenges of and responses to inequality. And of course, we invite researchers to look to us for funding to build, understand, and assess promising approaches to reducing inequality. In these ways, we hope our work will make a meaningful contribution to meeting this “defining challenge of our time.”
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The plight of the “forgotten half,” never easy, has become alarming. This nation may face a future divided not along the lines of race or geography, but rather of education.

On November 24, 1986, at the Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C., the William T. Grant Foundation celebrated its 50th anniversary by announcing the launch of its Commission on Youth and America’s Future. Through this $1.4 million investment, the Foundation hoped to gain greater insight into the challenges facing youth at the time and to identify programs with the potential to alleviate their problems. The Commission was designed to “consolidate and evaluate relevant information from a wide variety of sources, and make recommendations for constructive alterations of present public and private initiatives, and...point to new directions for research in this area,” said then-President Robert Haggerty.

With members including luminaries like Theodore Hesburgh, William Julius Wilson, Harold Howe II, and Hillary Rodham Clinton, the Commission embarked on a 26-month endeavor to paint a clearer picture of contemporary youth in the United States. The Commissioners held hearings across the country, initiated review papers, and issued reports. In January 1988, they released their interim report, The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America. This was followed by their final report, The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America’s Youth and Young Families, in November of the same year. In 2013, we marked the 25th anniversary of this groundbreaking report.
The Forgotten Half revealed a generation of America’s youth that was largely misunderstood—and unsupported. The Commission focused on a particularly vulnerable portion of this generation: the 20 million young men and women who did not continue to college, who may or may not have attained a high school diploma. They found that, in the wake of deindustrialization, these youth were met with shrinking opportunities for advancement. They often wound up in a cycle of under- and unemployment that became increasingly difficult to break as time went by. What’s worse was that while the nation provided a significant sum to subsidize college-bound youth, there was little to no support for non-college-bound youth. They were, by and large, forgotten. “They are on their own in the search for work,” the report said. “This is neither right nor fair.”

The Commission is concerned that a large fraction of them are finding it harder than ever to swim against the economic tide that is flowing against them. They are seeking jobs they cannot find. Their work, increasingly only on a part-time basis, earns too little to support themselves or a family. They are floundering in their efforts to find a place for themselves. And some are losing hope that they have much of a future.

—The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America

The Commission urged the nation to fill this gap, evoking not only the nation’s moral responsibility but its economic self-interest. “A kindlier society would support the Forgotten Half; a more gentle society would encourage them,” the report warned. “A pragmatic nation would acknowledge that its
very future depends on them.” The Commission made concrete recommendations to aid these young men and women, including enhancing the quality of youth-adult relationships, expanding community support for all young people, extending and improving employment and training opportunities, and improving education and job training policies.

Never content to simply publish a report, the Foundation kept the Commission staffed to disseminate findings, identify solutions, and work toward their implementation. Between 1987 and 1993, the Foundation published three dozen background papers and follow-up documents. “It was visionary,” said Sam Halperin, director of the Commission.

These efforts paid off, as The Forgotten Half became one of the most influential reports on youth and opportunity of the past half-century. Upon release, it garnered significant press coverage, from the New York Times and Washington Post to the Orlando Sentinel. It continues to be cited in scholarly articles. Recently, it was mentioned prominently in the Harvard Graduate School of Education’s 2011 Pathways to Prosperity Report, as well as the influential Shriver Report. “The term ‘The Forgotten Half’ has entered the policy, research, and media vernacular,” Halperin wrote 10 years later. “This addition to America’s collective vernacular has enriched our ability to understand and value all young people and to consider new directions that will benefit not just youth but society in general.”

As an outgrowth of the William T. Grant Commission on Youth and America’s Future, Halperin launched the American Youth Policy Forum with the express purpose of strengthening connections across research, practice, and policy. The Forum still operates in Washington, D.C. today and maintains a strong relationship with the Foundation. Through this organization and with funding from the William T. Grant Foundation and others, Dr. Halperin issued The Forgotten Half Revisited in 1998. This 10-year retrospective took careful stock of the nation’s progress toward the 1988 recommendations.
The overarching conclusion was that there was still work to do. The report noted progress toward increased educational aspirations and attainment. Still, in 1996, it found that nearly half (48.2 percent) of all adults had not gone to college. On the other hand, despite a strengthening economy, the report’s authors determined that youth in the job market in 1997 were actually worse off than they had been in 1989. Their opportunities and earning potential had declined even further.

As Halperin wrote in the introduction to *The Forgotten Half Revisited*, “This 10-year review—a reality check on where we are and where we’re going—is offered with humility befitting the magnitude of the task ahead.” That task remains.

With its new research initiative on inequality, the William T. Grant Foundation is picking up the mantle yet again.
Realizing the Potential of Research in Child Welfare

Kim DuMont, Program Officer
William T. Grant Foundation
In 2009 the William T. Grant Foundation launched an initiative to better understand the use of research evidence in policy and practice as it relates to youth. Our grantees have examined the use of research evidence across a number of systems, from the federal policy context to the local level. This essay discusses our interest in the use of research within the child welfare system. The essay has two goals: (1) to stimulate interest in understanding the use and impact of research evidence in child welfare and (2) to offer promising strategies for tackling this challenge.

Research evidence has the potential to contribute to child welfare policy and practice, but we know little about its use and impact. We need stronger theories about how decision-makers engage with research evidence. We need studies that explore who uses research, when and why it is called upon, and how it is shared. We also need to understand how child welfare decision-makers integrate research with other types of evidence. In addition, we need to examine attempts to improve the use of research and to understand what is required to create organizational cultures that routinely consider relevant research evidence. A deeper understanding of how research evidence is acquired, interpreted, and used can advance its production and uptake within the child welfare system. Ultimately, this may benefit youth.

It Is Important to Understand Research Evidence Use in Child Welfare

The child welfare system is critical to the development of vulnerable children. In 2011, 6.2 million children across the United States were referred to Child Protective Services, and more than 1 million children received services following the initial response or investigation (U.S. Department of Human Services 2011). The system delivers a range of services to promote the well-being of youth, including in-home family preservation, foster care, residential treatment, mental health and substance abuse treatment, and assistance with housing, employment, and benefits. The organizations delivering services involve multiple governing bodies, different structures and incentives, internal and external stakeholders, and a range of decision-making processes. This system is complex and varies considerably across states and locales. This presents a challenge to understanding how research evidence is used. There is a diversity of key decision-makers, with differing needs and capacities for accessing and interpreting research, and varying ways in which research evidence might be used.

HIGH STAKES

We need studies to identify the structures and conditions that productively leverage research evidence. Strategies for allocating resources, conducting assessments, and delivering services to promote child safety, stable living situations for children and youth, and healthier families involve high stakes. These decisions can affect both short-term and long-term outcomes for youth. Ineffective risk assessments may prolong threats to a child’s safety or result in unnecessary disruptions to a child’s living situation or schooling. Similarly, ineffective prevention strategies or misapplied interventions can result in wasted resources with few, if any, benefits to the child. Left unattended, risk and existing problems
may exacerbate. Research exists to guide screenings and investigations, but this evidence often fails to reach the hands of decision-makers, to answer their most pressing questions, and to move into practice.

UNREALIZED POTENTIAL
Research has the potential to sharpen decision-makers’ understanding of the issues, provide strong assessment tools, inform principles of practice, and generate evidence about the effectiveness of programs, policies, and practices (Littell and Shlonsky 2010). While research evidence holds promise, there is room for improvement. Policymakers and practitioners do not always use available research evidence (Aarons and Palinkas 2007; Horwitz et al. 2014; Nelson, Roberts, Maederer, Wertheimer, Johnson 1987; Wang, Saldana, Brown, Chamberlain 2010). Validated screening tools and risk assessments are overlooked (Johnson et al. 2008). There is also a long tradition within child welfare of moving from one reform or program to another—even when research evidence exists to support the existing practice (Aarons and Palinkas 2007; Littell and Shlonsky 2010). Researchers also overlook questions that are salient to policy and practice. I spoke with five individuals who lead agencies that form the backbone of the child welfare system and they requested more research evidence about the costs and resources required to implement a program, practices to promote the healthy development of older youth, and scalable strategies to effectively avert entry into the child welfare system.

Promising Directions for Studying the Use of Research in Child Welfare

What can be done to generate research evidence that is more useful and better utilized? At the William T. Grant Foundation, we think studying the use of research evidence in policy and practice is an important first step. We need to understand (1) the users of research, (2) their motivations and uses of research evidence, (3) their decision-making context, and (4) the strategies and conditions that lead to informed uses of research. Stronger theories about these areas will result in research evidence that better informs the programs, policies, and practices affecting youth.

UNDERSTANDING RESEARCH USERS’ PERSPECTIVES
To create research evidence that is more aligned with issues and questions of policy and practice, we need to understand decision-makers’ needs.

In my 30 years as an administrator of child welfare organizations, never has a researcher asked me my thoughts about the critical issues in child welfare. Mostly they ask me about what data they can access and what programs they can study to answer their research questions. I have not seen an interest in listening to what we need.

That was the start of a conversation I recently had with a leader of an agency that serves more than 40,000 children. The comment was prompted by my interest in how leaders engaged with research, their thoughts about obstacles to research use, and understanding some of the critical issues facing the child welfare system where research might be useful. The sentiment highlights a striking disconnect between the users of research and its producers. This disconnection hampers productive uses of research, and calls for studies that inform strategies to strengthen connections between research and policy and practice (Tseng 2013). Given the complexities of the child welfare system, we need studies to generate systematic knowledge about what drives differences in the use of research across users and their contexts.

The leaders I spoke with suggested that understanding differences in uses of research evidence requires rethinking the starting point of research and listening to users’ needs. Studying the people who draw on research to inform programs, policy, and practice is critical. Legislators and child welfare administrators influence how research is valued within an organization and the structures that support its use (Palinkas et al. 2011). Administrators and mid-level managers make decisions that influence what
assessments, protocols, programs, and practices are used and how they are implemented. We welcome projects that contribute to our understanding of what decision-makers want to know and how they engage with research to meet their goals.

The child welfare agency administrators I spoke with wanted stronger theory about why programs work, who benefits, and under what conditions they work best. They were less interested in knowing which out-of-home placement worked best for youth (e.g., kinship care, adoption, or foster care) and more interested in the specific supports needed to promote beneficial out-of-home placements—regardless of their form. Despite improvements in available methods, there is a lag in researchers’ efforts to move beyond the question of whether an intervention works. More studies regarding the mechanisms of programs and the conditions that promote successful outcomes are needed. Leaders also expressed a keen interest in the steps required to translate existing research evidence into effective policy and practice.

UNDERSTANDING HOW DECISION-MAKERS ENGAGE WITH RESEARCH

In addition to understanding what policymakers in child welfare want to know, we also need to understand decision-makers’ motivations to use research evidence, and their applications of research. A number of conceptual frameworks exist to help capture the uses of research. Research evidence is used in a variety of ways, ranging from direct uses that drive decision-making to more conceptual or indirect uses that inform how policymakers and practitioners think about problems and potential solutions (Nutley, Walter, and Davies 2007). At other times, research evidence is used to justify pre-existing agendas or to challenge existing or emerging policies and practices (Nutley, Walter, and Davies 2007). There are also instances when research is encouraged or mandated for use. State agencies have promoted the use of research to inform practice for children who have experienced trauma (Lindhorst and Herting 2013) and federal agencies have mandated the use of research-tested home visiting and teen pregnancy programs (Haskins and Margolis 2014; Orzag 2009). The system has also called for the creation of research evidence on previously untested programs and practices (Haskins and Margolis 2014). We do not know the impact of these policies on the uptake of research evidence, how it is melded with current programs and practices, or the effects of research use on the delivery of services and on youth.

A stronger understanding of these motivations and applications may help researchers anticipate emerging questions and improve the utility and uptake of research. The William T. Grant Foundation is particularly interested in instances when decision-makers engage with research to promote high-quality services and strong outcomes for youth. For example, if packaged for easy access and in response to users’ interests, syntheses can improve understanding of differences that appear across different studies, groups, and locations as well as reveal consensus in findings (Littell and Shlonksy 2010). In turn, this information can be used to guide the selection of programs, develop hypotheses about how to better deliver services, and help decision-makers make sense of volumes of sometimes conflicting information.

STUDY USERS’ CONTEXTS

In my conversations, child welfare leaders also encouraged increased attention to their political contexts. Politics can present obstacles to the use of research evidence, such as longstanding debates about whether to invest limited dollars in prevention or to prioritize youth who are already experiencing problems. The president of a regional child abuse and neglect prevention agency urged studying how the political context directs research use. He suggested that “the most impactful megaphone for promoting research is the allocation of resources and mandates by legislators, administrators, and regulation.” For example, recent policies extended states’ responsibility for caring for older adolescents and young adults, but little is known about how agencies’ leaders are engaging with the thin body of research that exists to respond to this challenge (Mosley and Courtney 2012). Another agency director commented, “we just move the goal posts and extend our services to youth for a longer period of time with some age-appropriate services patched in.”
Studies are needed to understand how deliberations call on different types of evidence, including research, to implement policy.

Researchers also need a better understanding of how values affect what research is considered, how it is interpreted, and its effect on the uses and effectiveness of research. Research may help to clarify some of the questions in child welfare that frequently evoke values. For example, when should a child be removed from his or her parent? When should a family be kept together? Should children be placed with their relatives (kin) or another guardian? Values regarding such questions often create conflict. Research cannot resolve such differences but it can inform the responses and the consequences of potential solutions; we need to know more about how research affects the deliberation process.

EXAMINE STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE THE USE OF RESEARCH EVIDENCE IN CHILD WELFARE

The William T. Grant Foundation is interested in projects that examine attempts to improve the use of research. We suspect there are a number of strategies for increasing the use of research evidence and enhancing its integration with other types of evidence, including decision-makers’ relationships with others and the organizational decision-making context.

Investigate the power of relationships

One way to strengthen the connection between research and policy and practice is to gain a stronger understanding of how research moves from the researcher (or shelf) into decision-makers’ hands, and in turn how it is used. As described in our Use of Research Evidence guidance, we are interested in understanding how to leverage relationships to increase the impact of research evidence. These relationships can take various forms. Work by one of the Foundation’s current grantees, Larry Palinkas, suggests relationships with peers in similar organizations reinforces and informs the decisions of child welfare agency leaders and helps them to prioritize their choices. As a director of a public child and family services agency noted:

I let other folks take the long road and weigh the research, try out the program, and generate their own evidence. I shop around. My expertise is knowing our own issues, knowing our goals, knowing our values, and assessing the potential for fit. I want to know if the evidenced-based program or research-informed practice makes sense for our population and the needs of the families in our jurisdiction. To do this, I ask others.

Researchers Jennifer Mosley and Mark Courtney (2012) suggest that the impact of politics and values is dampened when coalitions of key stakeholders persist through the entire legislative process. A key to this process is the presence of intermediaries who are able to communicate evidence from various sources, sustain interest, and provide resources at the various stages of the policymaking process. From our portfolio in education we are finding that formal partnerships—sustained relationships between researchers and practitioners—help to develop a common language, align agendas, and create routines for use (Coburn, Penuel, and Geil 2013).

An important exploration in child welfare is whether involvement with peers, coalitions of stakeholders, and partnerships increases practitioners or policymakers’ effective use of research evidence. How do networks within and across agencies affect the flow of information and what research is ultimately applied? What conditions are required to establish and sustain relationships that can better bridge researchers with decision-makers in policy and practice? We hypothesize that such relationships will both improve the relevance of research questions and the effectiveness of the application of research evidence. We need to test these ideas and better understand what is required to facilitate meaningful partnerships.

Organizational structure matters to research use

We need studies that contribute to knowledge about how research comes to play a meaningful role in programs, policies, and practices. From my conversations with the leaders of various child
welfare agencies it was clear that the structure of an organization has important implications for how research evidence is acquired, considered, and applied.

The William T. Grant Foundation is interested in studies that provide rich explanations of how organizational goals, routines, and incentives influence how decision-makers engage with research. Internal capacity is also likely to matter. My recent conversations illustrate the potential of organizations to engage with research evidence. One leader noted, “Only a small subset of organizations keep their eye on research. The rest have to keep their heads down just to do the work. They just don’t have the resources to watch research.” In contrast, the director of a community-based organization described their internal capacity to engage with research:

*We have [someone with] a Ph.D. with research experience on staff part-time to review the research and develop interventions that fit our needs. We also review research to develop principles that we infuse in practice (e.g., the importance of bonding and attachment, an appreciation of windows of opportunity in pre-adolescence, awareness of how trauma affects brain development). We reinforce what we are learning in-house by bringing in consultants to raise awareness, and trainers to help workers translate and implement these ideas. We have even done trials to test our home-grown programs.*

What is striking about this example is the organization’s capacity to produce and integrate research evidence into its operations. They use it to frame problems and solutions, guide improvements, and make decisions about everyday practice. Research evidence is valued, involves a collective effort, and involves opportunities for internalizing the research through training and application. We hypothesize that this would lead to high-quality training, high-quality services, and positive youth development.

We need studies to explore how the structure of an organization relates to the quality of the delivery system and the effectiveness of these programs, policies, and practices. For example, the Foundation is supporting Fred Wulczyn to investigate how research evidence is used to make decisions in private child welfare agencies. The state agencies and local districts that regulate and retain private providers have expectations and preferences regarding the use of research evidence. Individual leaders also have differing research skills, knowledge, and experience. Wulczyn is investigating how agency decisions about services for foster care youth relate to leaders’ attitudes toward research as well as institutional incentives supports for the use of research evidence. Wulczyn hypothesizes that context can either facilitate or prohibit research use, and, in turn, an agency’s use of research evidence relates to the quality of services delivered.

**A SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE FOR STUDIES OF THE USE OF RESEARCH EVIDENCE**

Given the importance of users’ perspectives and capacities and their political contexts, relationships, and organizations, the Foundation encourages a systems perspective rather than studying research use in isolation. The Foundation agrees with a recent report by the National Research Council (National Research Council 2012). The report called for the use of systems theory to enrich explanations about how and under what conditions research is used. A systems perspective allows “insights into the way in which people, programs, and organizations interact with each other, their histories, and their environments” (Rogers and Williams 2006; National Research Council 2012). This perspective demands consideration of the context in which research and other types of evidence are being considered.

Policy decisions evolve over time and are typically made by groups. Groups of individuals deliberate and negotiate as they develop policy (Asen, Gurke, Conners, Solomon, and Gumm 2013). Studying research use from a systems perspective may help to anticipate emerging questions and build bases of evidence to drive agendas or respond to windows...
of opportunity. A CEO of a community-based child welfare agency suggested that researchers provide evidence to fill gaps created by policy, such as access to services for young children who have experienced trauma. “Children need services very early on,” she said, “but Medicaid requirements make it nearly impossible for reimbursed treatment for a traumatized youth under age five. Research on the efficacy of trauma-informed very early intervention is needed to eliminate this obstacle.”

A systems perspective also facilitates an understanding of how people individually and collectively engage with research evidence. This includes considering systems over time and investigating the dynamics of various components. One such study is being led by Joanne Nicholson. Nicholson and colleagues are developing a tool to guide observations of interagency workgroup meetings. The tool will assess how agency resources and relationships support the productive exchange of knowledge about research within a comprehensive system of behavioral health care for youth. The tool stands in contrast to approaches that reduce a system to a single aspect and provide a snapshot.

Conclusion

The study of the use of research evidence is a good place to start to better link research with policy and practice in the child welfare system. Some of our grantees are making important advances in this area, but additional studies are needed. If you are interested in contributing to this important topic, we encourage you to talk to leaders within the child welfare system. Learn about the decisions they make and how these affect the structure and delivery of services. Consider the role of research in this process. Articulate clear research questions. Anchor these ideas in strong theory about the conditions that affect their use and interpretation of research. Offer hypotheses about levers for improving its uses and potential impacts. Connect your research questions to the existing literature on research use. Use our
portfolio as a starting point and spend time with the resources we developed, including our updated Use of Research Evidence Guidance. Build a strong team to investigate your questions. Have stakeholders from the child welfare system react to your ideas and use their responses to strengthen your proposal.

Together, we think we can move one step closer to improving the usefulness and use of research within the child welfare system.
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BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER: RESEARCH-PRACTICE PARTNERSHIPS

Demand for evidence-informed policy and practice has been mushrooming, so much so that the term “use of research evidence” has been making its way into the public vernacular. Certainly, at the William T. Grant Foundation, we’ve had a longstanding interest in supporting research that can inform policy and practice, and in 2008 launched an initiative to better understand when, how, and under what conditions research is used.

As Vice President Vivian Tseng wrote in her article, “The Uses of Research in Policy and Practice,” for the Society for Research in Child Development’s Social Policy Report, “Our ultimate goal is to understand how to develop better research, improve its use, and build stronger bridges across those notorious gaps between research and policy, and research and practice.” To that end, the Foundation has been committed to building bridges between the research community and practitioners. And in 2011, to complement our Use of Research Evidence initiative, the William T. Grant Foundation launched an initiative to improve the connections between research and practice.

Our main tool toward building these connections has been the creation of a learning community for research-practice partnerships in education. This national network convenes twice a year and serves as an intimate forum for networking, problem-solving, and ultimately creating stronger partnerships. The network has attracted a diverse array of 10 committed partnerships and has shown significant promise.

Chris Mazzeo, director of REL Northwest, has been involved with research-practice partnerships since 2007. He has been an active participant in the Foundation’s learning community since the inaugural meeting. “It’s been invaluable to hear from policymakers and practitioners and how they work with the partnerships,” he says. “There’s a strength in our diversity.”

Speaking of diversity, in their 2012 white paper, “Research-Practice Partnerships: A Strategy for Leveraging Research for Educational Improvement in School Districts,” Cynthia Coburn, William Penuel, and Kimberly Geil described three different types of popular partnership designs. Research alliances are place-based partnerships that focus on local policy and practice and emphasize collaboration at the beginning and end of the process. Design-research partnerships are also place-based, but focus equally on informing practice and research, emphasize co-design, and collaboration throughout the process. Networked Improvement Communities, on the other hand, are groups of school districts who collaborate to identify solutions that can work across their localities.

Through our learning community, Mazzeo met Faith Connolly from the Baltimore Educational Research Consortium and Laura Wentworth of the Stanford/San Francisco United School District. The three discovered that they were all in the midst of creating different tools to measure the success of research-practice partnerships.

“It’s comforting to know that other people are struggling with the same things we’re struggling with,” says Connolly. They are now working together to develop a survey for this purpose, which they will continue to workshop with their colleagues in the learning community.

“People have been really generous with sharing their experiences,” says Chris Tebben, who works with the learning community as a consultant. “There’s a really strong community of support.” Tebben admits that her work with the community deepened her appreciation for research-practice partnerships and their promise for the future.

“Before, I thought of these as pure research, but now I have a deep appreciation for other factors like politics and economics.”

“Partnerships are hard work, especially if you want to have an impact,” said Mazzeo. “[Through the learning community], I’ve seen a growing number of people working in this space and that’s gratifying. I think the potential of partnerships is to increasingly change the mindset of research and practice so that researchers are more practice-minded and practitioners are more evidence-minded. I think I was always hopeful, but after the learning community, I’m more positive than I was before.”
Spending

In the 25 years since the publication of *The Forgotten Half* in 1988, the William T. Grant Foundation has spent $327 million to further our mission to improve the lives of young people. More than 94 percent of those funds—$308 million—went directly to researchers and other program expenditures.

Asset Growth

Over that same 25-year period—1988 to 2013—the Foundation’s assets have more than doubled, growing from $131 million to $312 million, an increase of $181 million.
The Foundation was established to last in perpetuity. This means that we must balance spending to advance our mission with our need for an endowment that lasts forever. Our Finance and Investment Committee, composed of four Board members with investment expertise, works extremely hard to balance risk and return. The task is harder today than in 1988, when investment choices were fewer and simpler. A comparison of the Foundation’s investments then and now tells the tale.

Historical Investment Returns

The Finance and Investment Committee makes all final decisions regarding our investment portfolio without the aid of consultants. The Committee takes its work seriously. In 2013, the committee met 19 times—at our regular quarterly meetings and 15 other meetings with current or prospective investment management firms. Their hard work has yielded good returns on our portfolio. Over the past 10 years, the average annual return on the endowment has beaten our internal target of 9%, and puts us in the top 5% of foundations and endowments as measured by the Wilshire Trust Universe Comparison Services (TUCS).

### Historical Investment Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Average Annual Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Return

Asset Allocation

**Asset Allocation in 1988**

- Cash: 37%
- US Equity: 55%
- Fixed Income: 8%
- Global Equity: 3%
- Emerging Markets: 7%
- Hedge Funds: 23%
- Private Equity: 24%

**Asset Allocation in 2013**

- Cash: 6%
- US Equity: 15%
- Fixed Income: 22%
- Global Equity: 7%
- Emerging Markets: 19%
- Hedge Funds: 24%
- Private Equity: 8%
For more than 75 years, the William T. Grant Foundation has supported research with the intention of improving the lives of youth in the United States.

To that end, one of our research interests is understanding the conditions surrounding the use of research evidence in policies and practices that affect youth. We are also deeply concerned about the connections between research and practice and ways to improve them.

For the past 10 years, we supported stellar work on everyday youth social settings. In his farewell essay, then-President Bob Granger wrote, “Our thinking was that while improved individual outcomes were (and remain) our goal, an important path to those outcomes is through the social settings in which youth spend their days—classrooms, households, youth programs, and neighborhoods.” This initiative supported such innovations as the groundbreaking Optimal Design software, which helps researchers design powerful studies; the RULER, which teaches and measures emotional intelligence; and the CLASS, which assesses the quality of classroom interactions. To learn more about these accomplishments, please review past Annual Report essays like “Improving the Quality of Classroom Interactions” and “Doing Social Setting Research,” which can be found on the Foundation’s website.

In 2013, we retired the social settings initiative to launch a new initiative on understanding and reducing inequality. The new focus on inequality builds on our contributions to understanding and improving social settings since those systems are a key vehicle for understanding inequality. President Adam Gamoran discusses our new initiative in depth in “Inequality Is the Problem” in this Annual Report.
The majority of our grants support high-quality social science research, but we also devote a small portion of our funds to direct-service organizations. Each of our funding programs is described below.

**RESEARCH GRANTS** support projects that demonstrate a rigorous and original examination of either of our current research interests: (1) reducing inequality and (2) understanding the use of research evidence. We accept letters of inquiry three times each year in winter, spring, and summer. Our website includes information for potential applicants, including funding guidelines, application procedures, and eligibility requirements.

The **WILLIAM T. GRANT SCHOLARS PROGRAM** is tailored to early-career researchers in the social, behavioral, and health sciences who have demonstrated success in conducting high-quality research, but want to pursue a significant shift in their trajectories as researchers. The program promotes the careers of promising researchers who are tackling important questions that will advance theory, policy, and practice related to youth.

Through our **DISTINGUISHED FELLOWS PROGRAM**, we strengthen bridges between the research, practice, and policy communities to increase the supply of and demand for high-quality research on youth. Influential mid-career researchers, policymakers, and practitioners learn first-hand about the work environments and demands of their colleagues in different fields. Researchers immerse themselves in policy and practice environments; conversely, policymakers and practitioners immerse themselves in research settings.

**YOUTH SERVICE IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (YSIG)** support youth programs in New York City. This program is open to mid-sized, youth-serving nonprofits that are making improvements in an effort to have an even greater impact on young people.
William T. Grant Scholars Program

The William T. Grant Foundation is dedicated to building the capacity of the research field to produce high-quality, empirical, interdisciplinary work. One of the best ways to do that is by investing in the emerging generations of researchers. Our signature program, the William T. Grant Scholars program, has been doing just that for more than 30 years.

Our Scholars Program supports promising early-career researchers who are within seven years of the receipt of their terminal degree. These five-year awards of $350,000 enable Scholars to push the boundaries of their current skills and disciplines. Scholars also benefit by guidance from senior researchers who sign on as mentors. These senior colleagues provide training in new skills, but they also facilitate access to professional networks and recommend readings and other courses of study that help Scholars progress in their fields. They receive further guidance at our annual Scholars retreat where Scholars network and workshop with one another, Foundation staff, and guest presenters.

Since 2005, William T. Grant Scholars have also been able to apply for smaller grants to support their own mentoring relationships with junior researchers of color. These awards reflect the Foundation’s commitment to our Scholars’ professional development as well as to promoting diversity within the research field. In 2013, we awarded four mentoring grants to Scholars Jason Fletcher, Amanda Guyer, Micere Keels, and Bic Ngo.

More information about the Scholars Program is available on our website.
# Scholars Selection Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edith Chen, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of Clinical Psychology, Faculty Fellow, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Gamoran, Ph.D.</td>
<td>President, William T. Grant Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia García Coll, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Chair, Scholars Selection Committee, Director of Institutional Center for Scientific Research, Carlos Albizu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan M. Kegeles, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of Medicine, Co-Director, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, University of California, San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonnie C. McLoyd, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ewart A.C. Thomas Collegiate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Birr Moje, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Arthur F. Thurnau Professor of Language, Literacy, and Culture and Associate Dean for Research, School of Education, Faculty Associate, Institute for Social Research, Faculty Affiliate, Latino/a Studies, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Murnane, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Juliana W. and William Foss Thompson Professor of Education and Society, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Albert G. and Frances Lomas Feldman Professor of Social Policy and Health, School of Social Work, University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Pattillo, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Harold Washington Professor of Sociology and African American Studies, Faculty Affiliate, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C. Pianta, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Dean, Curry School of Education, Novartis US Foundation Professor of Education, Director, Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning, Director, National Center for Research in Early Childhood Education, University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew C. Porter, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate School of Education, George and Diane Weiss Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Waldfogel, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Compton Foundation Centennial Professor of Social Work and Public Affairs, School of Social Work, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Courtney Sale Ross University Professor of Globalization and Education, Co-Director, Institute on Globalization and Education, New York University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Current William T. Grant Scholars

## CLASS OF 2013

**Renee Boynton-Jarrett, M.D., Sc.D.**  
Assistant Professor of Pediatrics  
Boston University School of Medicine  
*The Social Ecology of Adolescent Obesity: Defining the Role of Adverse Social Settings and Social Stress*

**Stefanie DeLuca, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
Johns Hopkins University  
*Moving Matters: Residential Mobility, Neighborhoods, and Family in the Lives of Poor Adolescents*

**Alisa Hicklin Fryar, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
University of Oklahoma  
*Minority Student Success in Higher Education*

**Brian Mustanski, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Director of the IMPACT LGBT Health and Development Program  
Department of Medical Social Sciences  
Northwestern University  
*The Internet as a Setting for Sexual Health Development Among Gay Youth*

## CLASS OF 2014

**Guanglei Hong, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Comparative Human Development  
University of Chicago  
*Causal Inference Methods for Studying Instruction Effects on Language Minority Students*

**Derek Kreager, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology and Crime, Law and Justice  
Pennsylvania State University  
*Peer Networks and Adolescent Sexual Development*

**Candice L. Odgers, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Associate Director, Center for Child and Family Policy  
Sanford School of Public Policy  
Duke University  
*Macro-to-Micro Contextual Triggers of Early Adolescent Substance Exposure*

**Craig Schwalbe, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
School of Social Work  
Columbia University  
*Social Processes in Juvenile Probation*

## CLASS OF 2015

**Elizabeth Oltmans Ananat, Ph.D.**  
Assistant Professor  
Sanford School of Public Policy  
Duke University  
*Economic and Social Determinants of the Educational, Occupational, and Residential Choices of Young Adults*

**Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.**  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Psychology  
University of California, Los Angeles  
*Broken Windows, Broken Youth: The Effect of Law Enforcement on Non-White Males’ Development*

## CLASS OF 2016

**Sara Goldrick-Rab, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
*Rethinking College Choice in America*

**Patrick Sharkey, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
New York University  
*The Impact of Acute Violence and Other Environmental Stressors on Cognitive Functioning and School Performance*

**Joshua L. Brown, Ph.D.**  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Psychology  
Fordham University  
*The Impact of School and Classroom Environments on Youth Mental Health: Moderation by Genetic Polymorphisms*

**Amanda E. Guyer, Ph.D.**  
Assistant Professor  
Associate Director, Center for Child and Family Policy  
Sanford School of Public Policy  
Duke University  
*Minority Student Success in Higher Education*

**Bic Ngo, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
University of Minnesota  
*Innovating Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Insights from Arts Programs Serving Immigrant Youth*
Elizabeth Levy Paluck, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
Princeton University
Creating Tolerant School Settings: A Proposal for a Social Networks-based Field Experimental Intervention

Dallas Swendeman, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Executive Director
Center for HIV Identification, Prevention, and Treatment Services (CHIPTS)
University of California, Los Angeles
Mobile Phone Ecological Momentary Assessment for Family Functioning, Daily Routines, and Settings

CLASS OF 2017

Jason Fletcher, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
La Follette School of Public Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Interconnected Contexts: The Interplay Between Genetics and Social Settings in Youth Development

Micere Keels, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Comparative Human Development
Faculty Affiliate, Center for the Study of Race, Politics and Culture
University of Chicago
Consequences of the Within-Race/Ethnicity Gender Imbalance in the College Campus Setting

Tamara G.J. Leech, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
Director, Survey Research Center
Purdue University-Indianapolis
Pockets of Peace: Investigating Urban Neighborhoods Resilient to Adolescent Violence

Monica Tsethlikai, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Utah
An Examination of Cultural and Cognitive Processes Facilitating Positive Youth Development in American Indian Communities

Tuppett Yates, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Director, Adversity and Adaptation Lab
Department of Psychology
University of California, Riverside
Settings for Success Among Emancipating Foster Youth: Youth and Workers in Communication and Collaboration

CLASS OF 2018

Aprile Benner, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Population Research Center
University of Texas at Austin
Adolescents and the Social Contexts of American Schools

Donald Chi, DDS, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Dental Public Health Sciences
Investigator, Northwest Center to Reduce Oral Health Disparities
University of Washington
Neighborhood Social Capital and Oral Health for Publicly Insured Adolescents

David Deming, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University Graduate School of Education
The Long-Term Influence of School Accountability: Impacts, Mechanisms, and Policy Implications

Adriana Galván, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
University of California, Los Angeles
Predictors and Outcomes of Insufficient Sleep in Disadvantaged Youth: A Study of Family Settings and Neurobiological Development

Phillip Hammack, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Psychology Department
University of California, Santa Cruz
Subverting the Impact of Stigma and Subordination: Toward Empowering Settings for Sexual Minority Youth
The William T. Grant Foundation is committed to promoting research that matters.
Distinguished Fellows

The William T. Grant Foundation is committed to promoting research that matters. We launched the Distinguished Fellows Program in 2004 in an effort to create connections between the research, practice, and policy communities. Through these Fellowships, researchers immerse themselves in policy or practice settings, and policymakers and practitioners dive into research settings.

The program is open to mid-career professionals who are influential in their fields. Our intention is that these professionals will return to their original jobs with more insight into “how the other half lives.” We hope that this will encourage researchers to produce research that is more user-friendly and that speaks better to the challenges faced by their colleagues in the practice and policy communities. In turn, we hope that practitioners and policymakers will emerge from their Fellowships with a deeper understanding of how the research process works and its implications for their work.

In 2013, we reviewed a total of 25 Letters of Inquiry and seven full proposals and awarded four Fellowships—three researchers and one practitioner. Complete program and eligibility information is available on our website.

2013 Distinguished Fellows

Lisa Chamberlain, M.D., M.P.H.
Assistant Professor, Pediatrics
Stanford University
Improving the Well-being of California’s Youth: Understanding the use of high-quality evidence in policy formation

Nancy Hill, Ph.D.
Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study
Professor, Education
Harvard University
Improving Adolescents’ Academic Adjustment Holistically: Inter-agency collaborations at the state and local levels

Jeffrey Kaczorowski, M.D.
President
The Children’s Agenda
Associate Professor of Pediatrics,
University of Rochester
The Real World Test: Integration of evidence-based research into urban public schools’ disciplinary practices

Sumie Okazaki, Ph.D.
Professor, Applied Psychology
New York University
Asian American Students in an Urban Public School District: Bridging research, policy, and practice
Youth Service Improvement Grants

While the vast majority of our funding is allocated to research, our Youth Service Improvement Grants (YSIG) program stands out. Though a relatively small portion of our grantmaking efforts, these grants allow us to put our philosophy—improving the lives of young people—into action.

Each YSIG provides $25,000 over the course of two years to mid-sized organizations in the five boroughs of New York City as they improve their programs for youth. Grants are awarded twice each year, in the spring and fall. All Youth Service Improvement Grantees provide direct services to youth ages 8–25. In 2014, the age range will expand to 5–25.

In 2013, Grantees included arts education organizations, a science museum, community centers, summer camps, and others. Among other goals, their improvements will tackle issues like college and career preparation, sexual health, and crisis management.

This program is administered by a dedicated volunteer committee of non-senior Foundation staff. Grantees are offered optional consulting services through the Youth Development Institute to help them make sustainable improvements. Additional information about the YSIG program is available on our website.
Rocking the Boat
Sail and Powerboat Training • Bronx, NY

Located in the Hunts Point neighborhood of the South Bronx, Rocking the Boat promotes environmental awareness, carpentry, and sailing to low-income youth. Participants work together to build wooden boats, learn to row and sail, and restore local urban waterways. Founded in 1996 as a volunteer project, Rocking the Boat has grown into an independent nonprofit organization that serves up to 3,000 youth and community members each year.

Through its Youth Service Improvement Grant (YSIG) award, Rocking the Boat will improve its sail training program, which currently needs more skilled staff to safely and effectively operate the program. This will allow participants to have more time on the water with hands-on support for students. To accomplish this, Rocking the Boat will engage State University of New York (SUNY) Maritime to provide sailing and powerboat training to 15 of its program assistants. The program assistants are Rocking the Boat alumni, and the training will allow them to build on skills they developed as participants in the program. In addition to staffing the sail training program, some program assistants will go on to obtain instructor certification, which will enable them to train Rocking the Boat staff in the future.

In 2005, Rocking the Boat received another YSIG to support its boatbuilding and education program. In fact, the program was featured in our 2005 Annual Report. The new grant will build on these previous improvements, allowing Rocking the Boat to empower more youth.
New York Hall of Science
Queens, NY

Founded as part of the 1964 World’s Fair, the New York Hall of Science is a hands-on science and technology learning center. The Hall’s mission is to bring the excitement of science and technology to visitors by galvanizing their curiosity and offering creative, participatory learning opportunities.

The Science Career Ladder, the Hall’s signature program, recruits and trains high school students as Explainers. These young people greet visitors and encourage them to interact with the exhibits. Explainers are trained in methods of inquiry, science content, the scientific method, and how to communicate with the public. They also receive college and career readiness services that foster interest in STEM careers.

New York Hall of Science will use its YSIG award to create a stronger focus on critical thinking, authentic investigation, and discovery in Explainer training. The Hall will hire consultants with expertise in inquiry and design-based activities to develop curricula for the Science Career Ladder. Staff and Explainers will participate in a week-long summer inquiry institute on the theory and practice of inquiry and design-based activities. The Hall will also revamp its promotion process and create benchmarks more in line with 21st century skills.
In 2013, after successfully recruiting Adam Gamoran as the Foundation’s president, the Board of Trustees moved to the next step: ensuring a smooth transition. As Board Chair Henry Gooss said in last year’s Annual Report, “Bob Granger will retire as our president in September and Adam Gamoran will succeed him. While that is easily said, the process is much more complex.”

Before bidding farewell to Bob Granger in August, the Board acknowledged his accomplishments over the last 10 years, especially his research initiative on youth social settings. At the same time, they groomed Dr. Gamoran to take the reins in September. With both the incoming and outgoing presidents, the Board engaged in several stimulating conversations about the Foundation’s future directions before mobilizing around Dr. Gamoran’s new research initiative: reducing inequality.

In June, Program Committee Chair Melvin Oliver left the Board after four years of service. He was replaced by longtime Committee member Andrew Porter. At the same time, Sara McLanahan and Lisa Hess retired after serving the maximum of three terms. In October, the Foundation welcomed two new Trustees—Prudence Carter and Scott Evans. Dr. Carter is a leading scholar on inequality and Mr. Evans brings a wealth of finance expertise both through his career as an investment professional and his service on the Boards of several other nonprofit organizations.

The full Board meets four times per year, in addition to attending separate meetings as part of four committees: Audit and Budget, Executive, Finance and Investment, and Program.
OLIVIA GOLDEN, PH.D., is an institute fellow at the Urban Institute, where she focuses on child and family programs, specifically service providers. She previously served as director of state operations for New York and as director of the Child and Family Services Agency of the District of Columbia. She earned her doctorate at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

NANCY GONZALES, PH.D., is a Foundation professor of clinical psychology at Arizona State University. She has done significant research regarding the well-being of youth, particularly Mexican immigrant youth. Dr. Gonzales earned her doctorate at the University of Washington in Seattle.

HENRY E. GOOSS (Chair) is a senior advisor of Investor Growth Capital, Inc., the venture capital arm of Investor AB, a Swedish industrial holding company, where he also served as president from 2005 through 2008. Prior to joining Investor AB in 1998, he had been chief investment officer of Chase Manhattan Bank and its predecessors since 1986. He began his career at Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., and earned his M.B.A. from New York University.

ADAM GAMORAN, PH.D. (President), joined the William T. Grant Foundation as president in 2013. Previously, he held the John D. MacArthur Chair in Sociology and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His research focuses on educational inequality and school reform. He received his doctorate in education from the University of Chicago.

LISA HESS is president and managing partner of SkyTop Capital Management LLC. She is also a regular contributor to Forbes magazine. From 2002 to 2008, she served as chief investment officer for the Loews Corporation. Ms. Hess also previously held positions at Goldman Sachs, Odyssey Partners, and First Boston. She was a founding partner of Zesiger Capital Group, and was a member of the U.S. Treasury Debt Management Advisory Committee. She earned her M.B.A. at the University of Chicago.

CHRISTINE JAMES-BROWN (Vice-Chair) is president and CEO of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA). She previously served as president of United Way International since 2004, and before that spent 10 years as president and CEO of United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania.

SARA MCLANAHAN, PH.D., is the William S. Tod Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs at Princeton University, where she also founded the Bendheim-Thoman Center for Research on Child Wellbeing. She is editor-in-chief of the journal The Future of Children. She earned her doctorate at the University of Texas at Austin.

MELVIN OLIVER, PH.D., is the SAGE Sara Miller McCune Dean of Social Sciences and a professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Dr. Oliver also served as vice president of the Asset Building and Community Development Program at the Ford Foundation and has spent 18 years as a faculty member at the University of California, Los Angeles. He earned his doctorate at Washington University in St. Louis.

RUSSELL PENNOYER (Secretary, Treasurer) is a partner at Benedetto, Gartland & Company. He was formerly an executive of American Exploration Company and also served as an associate with Davis Polk & Wardwell. He earned his J.D. at Columbia University School of Law.

ANDREW C. PORTER, PH.D., is dean of the University of Pennsylvania’s Graduate School of Education, where he also serves on the faculty as the George and Diane Weiss Professor of Education. Dr. Porter has also taught at Michigan State, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Vanderbilt University. He earned his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

KENNETH PREWITT, PH.D. is the Carnegie Professor of Public Affairs and special advisor to the president at Columbia University. He is also the director of Columbia’s Knowledge Project. He previously taught at the University of Chicago, Stanford University, Washington University, the University of Nairobi, Makerere University, and The New School. Dr. Prewitt has also served as the director of the United States Census Bureau and senior vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation. He is author of The Hard Count: The Political and Social Challenges of Census Mobilization (2006) and co-editor of the recent National Academy Report, “Using Science as Evidence in Public Policy,” which was completed with Foundation support. Dr. Prewitt earned his doctorate from Stanford University.

JUDSON REIS, M.B.A., is the president of Sire Management Corporation, which manages several multi-manager investment partnerships. He is an active supporter of several private primary and secondary schools, a trustee at the Skowhegan School of Painting and Sculpture, and a trustee at the Pomfret School. Mr. Reis earned his M.B.A. at Harvard Business School.
Active Grants in 2013
RESEARCH GRANTS

Organizing Schools and Classrooms to Engage Latina/o Youth in Academically Challenging Work
Betty Achinstein, Ph.D.
Rodney Ogawa, Ph.D.
University of California, Santa Cruz
$580,000, 2010–2014

Recasting the Secondary School Classroom as a Context for Positive Youth Development
Joseph Allen, Ph.D.
Robert Pianta, Ph.D.
University of Virginia
$1,251,445, 2006–2010
$150,000, 2009–2013

Project SCOPE: Summer Counselor Outreach for Improving Postsecondary Enrollment
Christopher Avery, Ph.D.
Lindsay Page, Ed.D.
Harvard University
Benjamin Castleman, Ed.D.
University of Virginia
$24,956, 2012–2013

Observing the Setting-level Impact of a High School Behavioral Change Intervention: A 60 School Randomized Trial
Catherine Bradshaw, Ph.D.
Debra Furr-Holden, Ph.D.
Philip Leaf, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University
$750,000, 2011–2014

Changing Classroom Climate and Other School Micro-Contexts: The 4Rs Setting-Level Study
Joshua Brown, Ph.D.
New York University
Stephanie Jones, Ph.D.
Harvard University
$524,340, 2006–2010
$14,107, 2008–2013

Activity Space, Social Network, and Community Influences on Adolescent Risk
Christopher Browning, Ph.D.
Catherine Calder, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Cooksey, Ph.D.
Mei-Po Kwan, Ph.D.
Ohio State University
$599,952, 2012–2014

Research Use by Federal Policymakers on Student and School Success
Prudence Carter, Ph.D.
Linda Darling-Hammond, Ed.D.
Stanford University
$596,258, 2012–2014

From Users to Coproducers of Research Evidence: A Study of Place-Based Research Partnerships
Cynthia Coburn, Ph.D.
William Penuel, Ph.D.
University of Colorado, Boulder
$322,315, 2010–2014

Understanding Consequential Assessment of Teaching (UCAST)
Courtney Bell, Ph.D.
Educational Testing Service
Nathan Jones, Ph.D.
Boston University
Jennifer Lewis, Ph.D.
Wayne State University

Determinants and Impact of Academic Grades: What Grading Strategies Work Best, for Whom, and Why
Harris Cooper, Ph.D.
Duke University
$56,955, 2013

Statewide Performance Based Assessments in Mathematics: Understanding Tennessee’s Efforts to Scale-Up Reform
Richard Correnti, Ph.D.
Zahid Kisa, M.A.
University of Pittsburgh

Early Social Settings and Pathways to Economic Opportunity in Uncertain Times
Robert Crosnoe, Ph.D.
University of Texas at Austin
Margaret Burchinal, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Tama Leventhal, Ph.D.
Tufts University
Kathleen McCartney, Ph.D.
Harvard University
$322,315, 2010–2014
**Marital Conflict-Focused Parent Education for Families with Adolescents**
E. Mark Cummings, Ph.D.
Jennifer Cummings, Ph.D.
W. Brad Faircloth, Ph.D.
Julie Schatz, Ph.D.
University of Notre Dame
$405,995, 2008–2009
$150,000, 2010–2011
$99,999, 2012–2013

**Understanding Social Network Structure in Schools Under Corrective Action: A Longitudinal Comparative Analysis of Research Definition Use and Diffusion in Urban Districts**
Alan Daly, Ph.D.
University of California, San Diego
Kara Finnigan, Ph.D.
University of Rochester
$342,246, 2009–2011
$599,916, 2011–2014

**Who Builds the Village? Examining Youth-Adult Relationships Across Contexts and Time**
Nancy Deutsch, Ph.D.
Valerie Futch, Ph.D.
University of Virginia

**Development and Validation of Scalable, Multi-Method Approaches to Measuring Teacher-Student Interactions**
Jason Downer, Ph.D.
Bridget Hamre, Ph.D.
Megan Stuhlman, Ph.D.
University of Virginia
$98,998, 2009–2014

**The Role of Youth Settings in Young Adult Development: The Ecological Context of Rural Poverty**
Gary Evans, Ph.D.
Cornell University
$406,399, 2009–2014

**Contextual Predictors of Research Evidence Use among High and Low Minority Concentrated Areas**
Antonio Garcia, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania
$25,000, 2012–2014

**State Education Agency Use of Research Evidence to Improve Schooling for Youth**
Margaret Goertz, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania
Diane Massell, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Moje, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
$596,823, 2010–2013

**Refining and Validating a Measure of Classroom Quality for English Language Learners**
Claude Goldenberg, Ph.D.
Edward Haertel, Ph.D.
Stanford University
$99,999, 2009–2013

**The Causes of Truancy and Dropout: A Mixed-Methods Experimental Study in Chicago Public Schools**
Jonathan Guryan, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$400,000, 2009–2013

**Changing Familial Processes to Promote Youths’ Well-Being: An Embedded Daily Diary Study of Family Life**
JoAnn Hsueh, Ph.D.
MDRC
E. Mark Cummings, Ph.D.
University of Notre Dame
$550,000, 2010–2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Investigator(s)</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Awards, Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation and Use of Research Evidence in Bilingual Education</td>
<td>Eric Johnson, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Youth Programs and Settings: An Experimental Evaluation of</td>
<td>Thomas Keller, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Quality Mentoring Systems Initiative</td>
<td>Carla Herrera, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out with the Old, In with the New: When Are Principal Successions</td>
<td>William Marinell, Ed.D.</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>$25,000, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Transitions: A Longitudinal, Multilevel Social Network</td>
<td>Katherine Klein, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$592,110, 2013–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>N. Andrew Cohen, Ph.D.</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Daly, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Kara Finnigan, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Self-Direction in Youth-Program-Family Interaction</td>
<td>Reed Larson, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>$640,034, 2010–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adolescents’ Experiences of Continuity and Discontinuity of</td>
<td>Maria LaRusso, Ed.D.</td>
<td>Strategic Education Research Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Micro-contexts: Implications for Place-Based Treatment Effects</td>
<td>Joshua Brown, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>$500,000, 2009–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotropic Medications</td>
<td>Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>$405,643, 2011–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Instability, Family Processes, and Youth Development</td>
<td>Laurel Leslie, M.D.</td>
<td>Tufts Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Ideas, Entrepreneurs, and Education Research</td>
<td>Christopher Lubienski, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Effects of a Workplace Intervention on the Family Settings and</td>
<td>Elizabeth DeBray, Ed.D.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health of Employees’ Children</td>
<td>Janelle Scott, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the Viability of Staff Surveys as a Measure of Afterschool</td>
<td>Joseph Mahoney, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>$249,998, 2012–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Quality</td>
<td>Neil Naftzger, M.P.A.</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research</td>
<td>$125,000, 2011–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Start: Children as Targets for Preventing Disease in Adult</td>
<td>John Santelli, M.D.</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>$528,239, 2012–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Institution(s)</td>
<td>Amount(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of the Family Setting in Young Adult Outcomes during Economically Turbulent Times</td>
<td>Sandra Newman, Ph.D. C. Scott Holupka, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Evidence to Improve Medicaid Mental Health Services for Massachusetts Children and Youth</td>
<td>Joanne Nicholson, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and the Use of Research Evidence in Public Youth-Serving Agencies: Phase I</td>
<td>Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing Gay-Straight Alliances: Who They Serve and Variability in How They Function as Youth Settings</td>
<td>Paul Poteat, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Experimental Study of Neighborhood Stigma and the Penalty of Place</td>
<td>Patrick Sharkey, Ph.D. Jacob Faber, M.S.</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Disciplinary Climate and Educational Outcomes for African American Students: Phase II, School-Level Analyses</td>
<td>Russell Skiba, Ph.D. Robin Hughes, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active Grants in 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Funding Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning Summer Learning and Afterschool</td>
<td>Charles Smith, Ph.D.</td>
<td>The Forum for Youth Investment</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Settings on Relational and Academic Engagement for Latino Community College Students</td>
<td>Sarah Pitcock, M.A.</td>
<td>National Summer Learning Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Social Ecology of Adolescent Obesity: Defining the Role of Adverse Social Settings and Social Stress</td>
<td>Robert Teranishi, Ph.D.</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>$25,000, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprile Benner, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impact of School and Classroom Environments on Youth Mental Health: Moderation by Genetic Polymorphisms</td>
<td>Joshua Brown, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>$350,000, 2011–2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Matters: Residential Mobility, Neighborhoods and Family in the Lives of Poor Adolescents</td>
<td>Stefanie DeLuca, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>$350,000, 2008–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Long-Run Influence of School Accountability: Impacts, Mechanisms, and Policy Implications</td>
<td>David Deming, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnected Contexts: The Interplay between Genetics and Social Settings in Youth Development</td>
<td>Jason Fletcher, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>$350,000, 2012–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Validation Study II: Improving Rater Reliability</td>
<td>Allison Tracy, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
<td>$300,000, 2013–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Big Are Summer Learning Gaps? Using Seasonal Comparisons to Understand Whether Schools or Other Settings Are the Primary Source of Test-Score Inequality</td>
<td>Paul von Hippel, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>$299,671, 2013–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Big Are Summer Learning Gaps? Using Seasonal Comparisons to Understand Whether Schools or Other Settings Are the Primary Source of Test-Score Inequality</td>
<td>Doug Downey, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiving Data from a 70-Year Longitudinal Study of Human Development</td>
<td>Robert Waldinger, M.D.</td>
<td>Massachusetts General Hospital</td>
<td>$90,996, 2010–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiving Data from a 70-Year Longitudinal Study of Human Development</td>
<td>Barbara Wolfe, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>$24,956, 2012–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining the Importance of Health Spillovers Between Siblings: Magnitudes and Mechanisms</td>
<td>Jason Fletcher, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining the Importance of Health Spillovers Between Siblings: Magnitudes and Mechanisms</td>
<td>Marsha Seltzer, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$355,742, 2010–2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2010–2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2008–2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2011–2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2008–2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2011–2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000, 2013–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Minority Student Success in Higher Education
Alisa Hicklin Fryar, Ph.D.
University of Oklahoma
$350,000, 2008–2014

Causal Inference Methods for Studying Instruction Effects on Language Minority Students
Guanglei Hong, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$350,000, 2009–2014

Consequences of the Within-Race Gender Imbalance in the College Campus Setting
Micere Keels, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$350,000, 2012–2017

Peer Networks and Adolescent Sexual Development
Derek Kreager, Ph.D.
Pennsylvania State University
$350,000, 2009–2014

Pockets of Peace: Investigating Urban Neighborhoods Resilient to Adolescent Violence
Tamara Leech, Ph.D.
Indiana University/Purdue University
$350,000, 2012–2017

The Internet as a Setting for Sexual Health Development Among Gay Youth
Brian Mustanski, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
$350,000, 2008–2014

Innovating Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Insights from Community Arts Programs Serving Immigrant Youth
Bic Ngo, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
$350,000, 2011–2016

Executive Functions and Biological Sensitivity in Classroom Settings
Jelena Obradovic, Ph.D.
Stanford University
$350,000, 2012–2017

Macro-to-Micro Contextual Triggers of Early Adolescent Substance Exposure
Candice Odgers, Ph.D.
Duke University
$350,000, 2009–2014

The Role of Community-Based Organizations in the Lives of Immigrant and Second-Generation Youth
Dina Okamoto, Ph.D.
University of California, Davis
$350,000, 2007–2013

Promoting Tolerant School Settings: A Social Networks Field Experimental Intervention
Elizabeth Paluck, Ph.D.
Princeton University
$350,000, 2011–2016

Social Processes in Juvenile Probation
Craig Schwalbe, Ph.D.
Columbia University
$350,000, 2009–2014

The Impact of Acute Violence and other Environmental Stressors on Cognitive Functioning and School Performance
Patrick Sharkey, Ph.D.
New York University
$350,000, 2010–2015

The Determinants of Mexican-Origin Adolescents’ Participation in Organized Activities: The Role of Culture, Settings, and the Individual
Sandra Simpkins, Ph.D.
Arizona State University
$350,000, 2007–2013

Mobile Phone Ecological Momentary Assessment for Family Functioning, Routines, and Settings
Dallas Swendeman, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
$350,000, 2011–2016

An Examination of Cultural and Cognitive Mechanisms Facilitating Positive Youth Development in American Indian Communities
Monica Tsethlikai, Ph.D.
University of Utah
$350,000, 2012–2017

Settings for Success among Emancipating Foster Youth: Youth and Workers in Communication and Collaboration
Tuppett Yates, Ph.D.
University of California, Riverside
$350,000, 2012–2017

WILLIAM T. GRANT SCHOLARS MENTORING GRANTS

Mentoring Dania Francis
Elizabeth Ananat, Ph.D.
Duke University
$60,000, 2011–2013

Mentoring Norma Padrón
Jason Fletcher, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison
$85,000, 2013–2015

Mentoring Jesus Renteria
Sara Goldrick-Rab, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison
$60,000, 2011–2013

Mentoring Roberta Schriber
Amanda Guyer, Ph.D.
University of California, Davis
$85,000, 2013–2015

Mentoring Myles Durkee and Elan Hope
Micere Keels, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$85,000, 2013–2015
Mentoring Brian Lozenski
Bic Ngo, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
$59,970, 2013–2015

Mentoring Lin (Victor) Wang
Candice Odgers, Ph.D.
Duke University
$85,000, 2012–2014

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNICATIONS, AND ADVOCACY

Developing Creative, Practical Policy Tools to Assist Federal Officials in Implementing New Federal Evidence-Based Reforms
Jonathan Baron, J.D.
Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy
$100,000, 2013–2014

Planning for Long-Term Sustainability for an Effective Model of Building Evidence-Based Youth and Family Policy
Karen Bogenschneider, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison
$50,000, 2013–2014

Learning About the Use of Research to Inform Policymaking
Betsy Brand
American Youth Policy Forum
$175,019, 2012–2014

Catalyzing a Network of Educational Networks to Learn How to Improve
Anthony Bryk, Ed.D.
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
$100,000, 2012–2014

Qualitative Consulting Service for Supporting Mixed-Methods Research and Workshops
Eli Lieber, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
$80,825, 2012
$76,322, 2013

OTHER

Archiving of Beginning School Study Data with the Murray Research Center
Karl Alexander, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University
$17,500, 2013–2014

Promoting Children’s Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Health Forum
Kimber Bogard, Ph.D.
The National Academies
$25,000, 2013–2014

Field Notes: Supporting Practitioners to Research, Document, and Disseminate Promising Practices
Sandra Escamilla-Davies
Youth Development Institute/Fund for the City of New York
$25,000, 2013–2014

NPR Coverage of Youth-Related Issues
Lorraine Ross, M.A.
National Public Radio
$275,000, 2011–2013

NPR’s Coverage of Issues Affecting Children, Youth and Families
Lorraine Ross, M.A.
National Public Radio
$275,000, 2013–2015

SERVICE GRANT PROGRAM

Robert Acton, J.D.
The Taproot Foundation
$25,000, 2013–2014

Field Notes: Supporting Practitioners to Research, Document, and Disseminate Promising Practices
Sandra Escamilla-Davies
Youth Development Institute/Fund for the City of New York
$25,000, 2013–2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Principal Investigator(s)</th>
<th>Grant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Use of Evidence-Based Observational and Improvement Tools in K-12</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Bridget Hamre, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$24,983, 2011–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are We Learning from K-12 Philanthropic Investments?</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Jeffrey Henig, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$20,000, 2012–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Youth Who Drop Out: Pathways or Merely Stops along the Way?</td>
<td>Good Shepherd Services</td>
<td>Peter Kleinbard, M.A.</td>
<td>$25,000, 2011–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Design Phase for the Center for Evidence-based Policymaking</td>
<td>National Association of State Boards of Education</td>
<td>James Kohlmoos</td>
<td>$25,000, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy and Youth Voting</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>Peter Levine, D.Phil.</td>
<td>$24,873, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Meta-Analytic Exploration of Variability in the Effects of Youth Programs</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Mark Lipsey, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$150,000, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>Joseph Durlak, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$300,000, 2011–2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Sandra Wilson, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$300,000, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing Social Policy</td>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore County</td>
<td>Kenneth Maton, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to Success for Junior and Mid-Career Faculty of Color</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Rashmita Mistry, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Studies of the Impact of Group Level Interventions on Program Quality and Youth Outcomes</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Stephen Raudenbush, Ed.D.</td>
<td>$150,000, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-University Partnerships to Improve English Learner Instructional Policies and Practices</td>
<td>MDRC</td>
<td>Howard Bloom, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$300,000, 2011–2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRCD Congressional Fellowship Program</td>
<td>MDRC</td>
<td>Lonnie Sherrod, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher-Policymaker Interactions</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Cheryl Smithgall, Ph.D.</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers on Teacher Evaluation Reform</td>
<td>Education Writers Association</td>
<td>Thomas Toch, M.A.</td>
<td>$19,140, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUTH SERVICE IMPROVEMENT GRANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Summer Pilot Program</td>
<td>Harlem Junior Tennis and Education Program, Inc.</td>
<td>Katrina Adams</td>
<td>$25,000, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Benchmarking Framework</td>
<td>The Go Project</td>
<td>Erica Ahdoot</td>
<td>$25,000, 2012–2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Improvements to DTE’s Arts for Under-Served Youth Program</td>
<td>Dance Theatre Etcetera</td>
<td>Martha Bowers</td>
<td>$25,000, 2013–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casita Maria smART Kids Staff Training</td>
<td>Casita Maria, Inc.</td>
<td>Sarah Calderon</td>
<td>$25,000, 2011–2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Year Curriculum Development Project
Claudette C’Faison
New York Youth at Risk
$25,000, 2012–2013

Teaching 21st Century Skills in After School
Philip Courtney
Urban Art Partnership
$25,000, 2013–2014

Technology Service Corps Staff Training Initiative
Stephanie Cuskley
NPowernY
$25,000, 2013–2014

Young Adult Program Improvement Project
Jill Eisenhard
Red Hook Initiative
$25,000, 2012–2014

Queens Teens: A Tiered Approach
Tom Finkelpearl
Queens Museum of Art
$25,000, 2012–2014

Sail and Powerboat Training
Adam Green
Rocking the Boat, Inc.
$25,000, 2013–2014

ALLL Teaching Artist Training:
Higher Expectations for Learning
Ila Gross, M.Ed.
Learning through an Expanded Arts Program, Inc. (Leap)
$25,000, 2012–2013

Gender-Specific Program for Middle School Boys
Christopher Hanway
Jacob A. Riis Neighborhood Settlement House
$25,000, 2012–2013

Science Career Ladder: Training for Design-Based Learning
Margaret Honey, Ph.D.
New York Hall of Science
$25,000, 2013–2014

Tribeca Teaches
Beth Janson
Tribeca Film Institute
$25,000, 2012–2013

Camp Fiver Curriculum Improvement
Christie Ko
Fiver Children’s Foundation
$25,000, 2013–2014

Basic Skills Boot Camp, Summer 2013
Amanda Kraus, M.A.
Row New York, Inc.
$25,000, 2012–2013

Create Success: College Bound
Joyce Mattera
Children of the City
$25,000, 2013–2014

Writing Improvement Project
John McIvor, Ph.D.
Summer On the Hill
$25,000, 2012–2013

Curriculum Development Project for Coro’s Mayor’s Youth Leadership Council (MYLC)
Scott Millstein, M.P.A.
Coro New York Leadership Center
$25,000, 2012–2013

LEAP for Girls Curriculum Update
Jasmine Nielsen, M.P.H.
Love Heals Inc.
$25,000, 2013–2014

College Access Project
Randolph Peers
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow
$25,000, 2011–2013

Managing Crisis in Turbulent Times
Lyn Pentecost, Ph.D.
The Lower Eastside Girls Club
$25,000, 2013–2014

Spring and Fall SAT Prep
Darren Quinlan
Renaissance-E.M.S.
$25,000, 2013–2015

Applying Program Quality Self-Assessment to Build a Sustainable Program to Train and Support Youth Workers
Margarita Rosa
Grand Street Settlement
$25,000, 2013–2014

Merit Badge System of Achievement
Amy Sananman
Groundswell Community Mural Project
$25,000, 2013–2014

College Bound
Ted Smith
New Heights Youth Inc
$25,000, 2012–2013

Vital High School Voices: Technical Theatre Curriculum
Stephen Sunderlin
Vital Theatre Company
$25,000, 2013–2014

Teaching Creative Writing across the Curriculum
Amy Swauger
Teachers & Writers Collaborative
$25,000, 2013–2014

Social Worker in Residency (SWR) Project
Kellie Terry-Sepulveda
THE POINT Community Development Corporation
$25,000, 2012–2014
## Foundation Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Bracken, M.A.</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Brewster</td>
<td>Grants Coordinator, Discretionary Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Collado</td>
<td>Receptionist/Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Diharce</td>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim DuMont, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ferra</td>
<td>Senior Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Gamoran, Ph.D.</td>
<td>President Officer of the Foundation (as of September 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C. Granger, Ed.D.</td>
<td>President Officer of the Foundation (through August 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Annaïse Heglar</td>
<td>Communications Specialist (through April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Louie, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lui</td>
<td>Coordinator, Human Resources and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah McGinn</td>
<td>Vice President, Finance and Administration and Assistant Treasurer Officer of the Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenore Neier</td>
<td>Manager, Communications (as of January 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth G. Nolan</td>
<td>Assistant to the President and Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Rivera-Torres, M.P.A.</td>
<td>Grants Coordinator, Major Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Rosano</td>
<td>Director of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPhail Simon</td>
<td>Staff Accountant II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damisela Taveras</td>
<td>Senior Program Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Tseng, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Vice President, Program Officer of the Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Williams</td>
<td>Grants Coordinator, William T. Grant Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Wong</td>
<td>Manager, Grantmaking Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carola Suárez-Orozco, Ph.D.</td>
<td>SENIOR PROGRAM ASSOCIATES (as of May 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Seidman, Ph.D.</td>
<td>(through April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas S. Weisner, Ph.D.</td>
<td>(through April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian L. Wilcox, Ph.D.</td>
<td>(through April 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our reviewers represent the policy, practice, and—of course—research communities. They all play a critical role in ensuring that we fund high-quality proposals that demonstrate strong potential to have impact. We are grateful for their service in 2013.
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The photographs in this Annual Report were taken at Rocking the Boat and the New York Hall of Science, described on pages 42–43, which were funded by the Foundation through the Youth Service Improvement Grants program.