The mission of the Foundation is to help create a society that values young people and enables them to reach their full potential.
The 2006–2007 Annual Report and Resource Guide reflects our interest in the social settings that influence youth. Included are schools, other youth-serving organizations, neighborhoods, families, and peer groups.

As the essays in this report show, grantees and staff are making important progress on questions of how such settings function, how they affect youth, and what it takes to improve schools and other youth-serving organizations.

We continue to spend most of our grantmaking and staff time on research because we believe it can provide data that help answer such questions. However, research is only a tool.

I have always believed the most important research questions and insightful interpretations of data come from people who have deep experience with the phenomena being studied. Given our research interests, we added two Board members in 2006 who have such experience: Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of the Great City Schools, and Christine James-Brown, the newly appointed president and chief executive officer of the Child Welfare League of America, and formerly the president and chief executive officer of United Way International when she first joined our Board. Both define themselves as practitioners who say that they have a lot to learn from researchers. I suspect it is more accurate that researchers have much to learn from them.

While we became stronger in several ways during the past year, we also end the year needing to fill Bob Boruch’s large shoes on the Board. Bob reached his term limit and we miss his high standards and good humor.

Robert C. Granger, Ed.D.
President
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Chair’s Report

The last year was productive for the William T. Grant Foundation, with substantially increased assets, an increasingly focused and promising grants program, and new Board membership. Christine James-Brown, newly named president and chief executive officer of the Child Welfare League of America and former president and chief executive officer of United Way International, brings to the Foundation a deep understanding of the funding and practices of youth organizations. Michael Casserly, who heads the Council of the Great City Schools, also joined the Board and brings expertise in the policies and practices surrounding K–12 education. Together they strengthen the Foundation’s focus on these primary settings that influence youth development.

That focus on primary settings presents many challenges. The settings themselves are not hard to list: family, school, after-school programs, community institutions, and peers. But our knowledge about how to improve those settings to achieve better youth outcomes is limited; our institutional and legal capacity to improve them varies widely across the settings, but is in no case substantial. Further, the research methodologies to capture improvements to settings are at an early stage of development, thus limiting our ability to recognize—and spread—successful improvements.

Thus, although the potential payoff of a “settings improvement” strategy is considerable in terms of the number of youth affected—especially in contrast to the historically dominant focus on improving outcomes for youth one by one or small group by small group—it is largely unexplored territory.

Our grantmaking has aimed to accelerate the development of appropriate research methodologies; to sponsor training and other approaches to speed the under-use of those methodologies; and to fund research on improving settings that has strong policy and funding interest—or should, because of its potential to improve youth outcomes.

The following essays detail the progress made in each of these areas. The early signs are very positive. This progress has also made clear that it will require interest by other foundations and public agencies to hasten the learning curve about settings improvement and to implement at scale what we learn. Some of that
interest has already taken place, in both philanthropy and the public sector. We at the William T. Grant Foundation are very pleased by that involvement—and by the progress in our agenda—and will work over 2007 to continue this promising forward movement in improving the key settings where youth develop their character and skills.

Gary Walker
February 2007
Why Try to Understand and Improve Social Settings?

In 2003 the Foundation announced it would focus all of its research grantmaking on the everyday social settings where young people spend their time. We would try to understand and improve youth development by considering their experiences in schools, youth-serving organizations, neighborhoods, families, and peer groups. Any study assessing the effects of a reform on youth outcomes would need a simultaneous examination of how the reform affected youth settings.

In the past three years we have begun building a portfolio of strong research studies that fit this focus. We now have enough experience to be clearer about why this work is relevant to all who are interested in helping young people do better.

This essay describes the rationale for our focus. At minimum, we want to help other funders, researchers, policymakers, and practitioners understand why our work is important to their efforts. At best, we hope to encourage others to increase the resources they devote to understanding how settings work, how they affect youth development, and how they can be improved.

What drives our work?

Like many others, we believe the status quo for young people in this country is unacceptable. We live in an economy designed to reward educational achievement, but in 2004 one-third of youth did not graduate from high school in four years and fewer than three in ten of 25–29-year-olds had a bachelor’s degree. Many youth also have health problems; in 2004, one in five teenagers was obese and one in six high schoolers thought seriously about committing suicide. These statistics are so ubiquitous that they are almost background noise; nevertheless, they translate into millions of young lives.

Data about the status of America’s youth motivate concern and sometimes action. What they do not do is provide clear suggestions for what policymakers, parents, teachers, youth workers, or others might do to make a difference for young people. When one looks closely at the available data, the reasons for these problems and the implications for action are even less clear. For example, the proportion of young adults who obtained a college degree increased from 17 percent to 29 percent between 1971 and 1996, but there has been almost no change in the last decade. Why has the completion rate stalled? Is it something about the nature of
college education? Policies in high schools? Family practices? It is difficult to hazard an intelligent guess because we have no related information on what is going on within these settings.

Why do we know so little about how to explain and solve such difficult problems? Our short answer is that while many agree “context matters,” too much social science work occurs at the individual level. Research journals and reports are full of findings about the patterns, trends, and individual-level predictors of youth motivation, identity, achievement, risk, and initiative. What is absent is a related emphasis on the immediate environments that influence such feelings, beliefs, and behaviors. This is what we are trying to change.

Six reasons why we complement our interest in youth outcomes with attention to youth settings

1. **Data and theory show that everyday social settings influence behavior.** Modern developmental theories emphasize how development is the product of interactions between youth and their immediate environments. Past research has focused on polarizing questions of how much development is caused by biology or the environment in gener-
al (nature vs. nurture debates), and certain settings in particular (family vs. school vs. peers). Most modern researchers agree that biology, environment, and all settings are important, as is the relationship among them at any particular developmental period.

The importance of immediate environments is evident in the findings from a number of our grantees. Jacquelynne Eccles, Sandra Simpkins, Jodie Roth, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Heather Weiss, and their colleagues have all shown that what young people do in after-school activities is related to various youth outcomes. For example, Eccles, Simpkins, and their colleagues found that the breadth of a young person’s participation in out-of-school activities was related to positive academic, psychological, and behavioral outcomes. Sean Reardon, Jeffrey Kling, Brian Jacob, Jens Ludwig, and others have demonstrated how moving from one neighborhood to another is related to changes in development. Karl Alexander, Doris Entwisle, Jeremy Finn, Jayne Boyd-Zaharias, and others have shown that patterns of course-taking in school predict changes in achievement.

Of course families also matter, and Cynthia García Coll, Susan Holloway, Diane Hughes, and Niobe Way have been examining how culture and immigration influence family processes and hence youth outcomes.

Most of this work is descriptive and non-experimental. It supports the contention that these settings are important, even though the estimates vary across the studies regarding how much particular settings influence youth. The research now needs to turn to understanding which aspects of settings matter most.

2. UNDERSTANDING HOW SETTINGS INFLUENCE YOUTH IS IMPORTANT FOR IMPROVING THOSE SETTINGS. Policymakers and practitioners accept the theory and data saying that settings are important, and they are ready to try to improve them. But they are not sure which aspects of settings to change. It is clear that schools, families, and neighborhoods matter, but why and how do they matter for youth development? If some schools or neighborhoods are better for youth than others, how much of the difference is due to differences in economic,
human, or other resources in the setting? What are the mechanisms and processes through which settings influence youth? Can policymakers or practitioners intervene to change setting processes in ways that help youth?

Research does not yet provide satisfying answers to these questions, but findings converge on the importance of the different types of resources and their arrangement in a setting. The Foundation is open to funding more work in this area because some studies are producing intriguing results. For example, Greg Duncan and Jacquelynne Eccles studied the consequences of various freshmen roommate pairings. While the study was not designed to illuminate why certain combinations mattered, it provided strong evidence that they did. Randomly putting Black and White freshmen together as roommates led to more tolerant attitudes, while the pairing of binge drinkers together produced more drinking and much lower grades.

A main reason that resources and their arrangement matter is because they can influence social relationships and interactions. For example, Reed Larson, Robin Jarrett, Barton Hirsch, David DuBois, Charles Smith, and others have data indicating that adult-youth relationships in after-school programs are key to shaping subsequent youth outcomes. This is the same finding in studies of formal and informal mentoring by Jean Rhodes, David DuBois, Michael Karcher, Jean Grossman, and Gene Brody. The emphasis on adult and peer relationships, too, is a main storyline emerging from more recent work on neighborhood effects by Kathy Edin, Susan Popkin, and Xavier de Souza Briggs.

This convergence of findings on the importance of relationships in these settings also rings true to policymakers and practitioners. They accept that we all benefit from supportive, caring connections with other people. Less clear is how such relationships can be created when they do not exist, and what adults and youth in a setting need to do together to achieve particular goals such as succeeding in school or the labor market. These questions are driving our annual Request for Proposals for Intervention Research to Improve Youth-Serving Organizations and are at the heart of newly funded intervention studies by Robert Pianta, Joseph Allen, Eric Schaps, David Pearson, Joshua Brown, Stephanie Jones, and colleagues. In all cases these researchers are trying to change the content and form of teacher-student interactions in schools. We are developing companion studies in out-of-school programs—a new intervention study led by Charles Smith is our first example. Like the other grantees, he is trying to improve staff-youth interactions, but in youth programs instead of classrooms.

3 **FOCUSBING ON SETTINGS IS KEY TO UNDERSTANDING WHY INTERVENTIONS SUCCEED OR FAIL**.

Many innovations in policy or organizational practice are intended to change how settings function in order to improve youth outcomes. High school exit examinations and grade-level promotion policies in education, performance standards for youth employment programs, and on-the-job staff training are examples of setting-change techniques available to policymakers and practitioners. Unfortunately, when such strategies are used the setting is treated as a “black box” and decision-makers and evaluators tend to focus only on subsequent changes in the “outputs,” such as school performance. Some argue this is appropriate: Who cares why things work as long as they do? The problem is that most attempts to improve youth outcomes do not make much of a difference, and we are never sure why. Did the reform fail to create the intended changes in schools, families, or neighborhoods, or did it create the intended setting changes but fail to improve youth outcomes? Without measuring what goes on at the setting level, it is impossible to know, and knowing is crucial to designing effective reforms.

4 **UNDERSTANDING SETTINGS HELPS IN ASSESSING THE GENERALIZABILITY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS**.

Any single research study has limited generalizability beyond the particular place and participants in the study. This means that findings are more trustworthy if they are replicated in several studies across places and participants. This also places a premium on understanding the participants and setting of any particular study. Only then can we understand how findings from a
study might apply elsewhere. Many scholars share the idea that the effects of a particular policy or practice may differ depending on who is involved and where they live. This concept is captured in the common phrase of “wanting to understand what works, for whom, and under what conditions." Most of the studies that we and others fund gather information in the first two areas: what is done and who the participants are. However, the third area, “under what conditions," gets short shrift. Why are many reforms effective in some sites but not others? Better information on how a study’s context shapes its findings is fundamental to understanding why so many efficacious reforms never produce effects at scale.

5. Changing settings is a powerful approach to social change.

Many intervention strategies focus on individuals or groups of individuals as the locus of change. Some of these succeed, but when they succeed, they do so by helping one person (or one group of people) at a time. In contrast, creating a durable change in the resources or practices of a setting has the power to improve outcomes for current and future cohorts of young people in that setting. Durable improvements in how children are grouped in school or how they are taught, for example, can remain as individual teachers and children move on.

In many studies we have funded, we support long-term follow-up of young people to see if and how their outcomes change over time. What we have not done well is look at the trajectory of change in setting-level practices. Do the same classrooms produce achievement effects year after year? How long do the changes in after-school program practices last following an intervention? What does it take to sustain improvement at the setting-level?

6. A focus on settings may improve the accountability systems for human services.

An emphasis on outcomes dominates human service policy and practice. Holding practitioners accountable for achieving certain outcomes may be a useful tool for motivating program improvement, but it is a limited tool for directing program improvement. We think the answer is to go beyond youth outcomes and also hold practitioners accountable for things that affect youth outcomes but are within practitioner control: how hard they work and how well they do the job. It is the role of policymakers and administrators to create the conditions that support such effort and effectiveness.

This approach to accountability needs several things from research, which the research community is only beginning to deliver. Practitioners need information on the practices that will create improved youth outcomes, and policymakers need to know how various policy options will shape settings in ways that make such practices occur widely.

For example, grantees Jean Rhodes and David DuBois recently summarized the current research on mentoring. Their summary shows that the length and quality of mentor-mentee matches are crucial in creating positive youth outcomes. The current studies, however, have very little to say about practices that would characterize or create a “high quality" match. What should volunteer mentors be told to do to create a caring, productive relationship? Furthermore, what program management practices will create the conditions that will make such relationships possible? In a prior review by DuBois, practices such as providing clear expectations about match duration and monitoring the mentor/mentee match were related to programs getting better effects. If programs did these things, would match quality improve? If clear expectations and match monitoring produce better effects, how can we get more programs to do such things?

A similar finding arose in a recent review by Joe Durlak and Roger Weissberg of the effects of after-school programs. They found that programs that made a positive difference were targeted on specific social skills, with sequential learning activities that had the young people actively involved. This research points toward potentially important practices. But why were such programs effective? Was it because they did these things? Or is it that such practices simply occur in
programs that make a difference? If these practices do improve outcomes, how can we get more programs to implement them?

In order to identify effective practices, and to document how public and organizational policies influence the occurrence of such practices, we need better measures of what is happening within classrooms and other youth settings. Grantees have made important progress in this area. Nicole Yohalem and colleagues recently released a report on nine instruments researchers and practitioners are using to observe and assess the quality of youth program practices. The instruments measure many of the same things, such as the staff behaviors that are related to youth’s perceiving programs as interesting and supportive. This is reassuring because it means that a consensus is emerging about effective practices. Similarly, Robert Pianta and colleagues have developed a measure of teacher-student interactions, which they and other grantees are using in various intervention studies. These interventions will tell us more about what it takes to alter teacher-student practices, and how much youth benefit when the practices are changed.

We are also going to commission additional work on measurement. For example, in the coming year Stephen Raudenbush, Howard Bloom, and colleagues are going to produce a series of conceptual and empirical papers that will help improve the reliability of measures in classrooms and youth programs. Robert Pianta and colleagues, meanwhile, are writing an analysis of the relative merits of direct observation, classroom logs, and other approaches to measuring classrooms.

**Implication for our work and the work of others**

We have argued in this essay that anyone interested in improving youth outcomes needs to focus on understanding and improving the everyday settings that are fundamental in producing these outcomes. Doing so, we believe, will lead to more effective reforms in policy and practice, a better understanding of the generalizability of research evidence, and more productive systems of accountability. This places us in league with the many parents, practitioners, policymakers, and funders working to improve schools, youth programs, and family life. We aim to contribute research that will advance their efforts.

**Senior Program Team**

February 2007

1 Bob Granger took the lead in this essay, joined by Rebecca Maynard, Ed Seidman, Vivian Tseng, Tom Weisner, and Brian Wilcox (in alphabetical order).

Information about the grants referenced in this essay is available on the Foundation’s website at www.wtgrantfoundation.org. Readers interested in publications and findings should contact the grantees directly.
Doing Social Setting Research

In our first essay in this report, the Foundation’s Senior Program Team discussed why we are interested in social settings. Here we highlight examples of the types of research studies on settings we support. We hope to elaborate on the social setting research questions, designs, and methods of interest to the Foundation. We discuss exemplars from amongst our grantees, noting the strengths of their work and suggesting how future studies could further extend theory, methods, and impact on policies and practices. Our grantees, other researchers, and other funders are doing and supporting work that is mapping the terrain for social settings research. It is an exciting time of growth and productivity in settings research, but there is more ground that needs to be covered.

Throughout this essay, and particularly towards the end, we discuss additional research questions for which we receive few requests but that are important for furthering our understanding of youth’s everyday settings.

Before delving into the work of our grantees, we should stress that these are examples—not templates. Additionally, we often are asked whether we prefer some research methods or designs over others. The short answer is that we always begin our application reviews by examining whether studies are pursuing important questions that can further theory as well as policy or practice. From there, we move to whether the methods and designs fit the research questions and would provide convincing evidence on those questions. Research questions, methods, and designs also should suit the current state of knowledge and theory about the area.

How do social settings affect youth development?

What are the key social processes in settings, and how do they affect youth development?

A key way in which youth programs, schools, neighborhoods, families, and peer groups promote youth development is through youth’s interactions, relationships, and engagement in activities with adults and other youth. Resources (or inputs) in settings are also important, but how those resources are used in interactions and activities is a key lever for improving youth outcomes. In classrooms, for example, curricular materials are important resources, but how teachers and students use those materials in their interactions is likely to be the critical lever for improving achievement. A number of our grantees are expanding our understanding of
social processes, particularly in terms of adult-youth and youth-youth interactions in after-school programs and classrooms.

Reed Larson, Robin Jarrett, and David Hansen are using a grounded theory approach to develop hypotheses about how high quality youth programs promote youth development. Their descriptive work allows them to home in on how programs promote teamwork, civic engagement, strategic thinking, and a sense of responsibility among youth, particularly through staff practices. The sampling of programs with varying content, designs, youth populations, and locations allows the researchers to explore whether high quality program practices differ across a range of programs. They use mixed methods, including participant observation, in-depth interviews, and other fieldwork techniques to get a well-rounded assessment of these programs. Observations are suited for assessing the nature of staff-youth interactions as they occur whereas qualitative interviews with staff and youth are suited for understanding how youth and adults’ experience and draw meaning from their interactions. Moreover, the study’s longitudinal design enables Larson et al. to learn about the natural life cycle of program activities and how interactions and youth’s and adults’ experience of those interactions change over time. Their longitudinal analyses elucidate how staff and youth relationships evolve as they confront challenges and successes in their work together and as youth’s skills and competencies grow.

Prudence Carter also is using a mixed-methods approach, but her study focuses on how ethnicity and
race influence social processes in mixed-race and predominantly minority high schools. Specifically, she examines how Black and Latino students are incorporated into the academic and social life of these different types of schools. Through intensive ethnographic observations and fieldwork, she is assessing how various groups of students interact in classrooms and extracurricular activities. How and to what extent are they incorporated into the school’s mainstream instructional and social activities? To what extent do students cross racial and ethnic boundaries in their interactions with one another? Through interviews and surveys, Carter also assesses how Black and Latino students make meaning of these experiences and how they affect students’ feelings of belonging and of being welcomed in schools. Semi-structured interviews with teachers and principals further allow her to assess school policies and practices such as cooperative versus competitive learning environments, ability grouping, the ethnic sensitivity of curricula, and the quality of teacher-student relationships. Analyses focus on how these features of schools affect Black and Latino students’ roles, relationships, and participation in the school.

The participant observations often used in descriptive theory-building studies are important, but researchers, practitioners, and policymakers also need standardized measurement tools that easily produce quantifiable data on social processes. Participant observations are useful for understanding the nature of social processes and their effects on youth whereas standardized observational measures codify these social processes to aid hypothesis-testing across a large number of settings. Charles Smith and his colleagues at High/Scope Educational Research Foundation developed and tested a structured observational measure of youth program quality: the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA). Smith’s validation study found that staff reports of their interactions correlated poorly with interactions observed by a third party. Independent observations are useful for assessing staff-youth interactions because they do not rely on staff or
youth’s recollections. (Of course, how youth and adults make meaning of their interactions also is important, but this is different from third-party assessments of their interactions.) With the YPQA and other quantitative, standardized measures, researchers are able to examine which aspects of quality (e.g., certain staff practices, activities) are more or less strongly associated with youth outcomes. They also can be used to test whether certain interventions and policy changes alter program quality in ways that improve youth development.

Standardized, quantitative observational tools also have benefits for policymakers and practitioners concerned with accountability and organizational improvement. These tools provide a metric for comparisons across a broad swath of programs and across time within the same programs. The tool’s scale points also give staff a sense of what a “5” versus a “1” on dimensions of quality (e.g., support for youth skill-building, adult-youth partnerships) looks like.

We have also awarded two grants to further measurement development work on social processes in classrooms. With William T. Grant and Spencer Foundation funding, Stephen Raudenbush has convened a multi-disciplinary group of scholars to compare various measurement approaches (e.g., standardized observations, teacher logs) to assessing classrooms. The goal is to understand what each measurement approach might contribute to our understanding of social processes and their effects on students. In addition, Robert Pianta will extend his measurement development work on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), a structured observational tool for measuring the quality of instructional, organizational, and relationship processes in classrooms. In the next two years, Pianta will be examining how observational measures can be improved for use by researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. He will examine how measurement choices about timing, frequency, and length of observations affect the reliability of assessments. Pianta will adapt CLASS to be more user-friendly and cost-effective for use by practitioners.

How do resources and the organization of resources affect social processes in settings?

Jeffrey Kling and Tama Leventhal are both William T. Grant Scholars examining how neighborhood-based economic, physical, and human resources affect youth through their influence on neighborhood, family, and peer social processes. Kling is using observational, survey, and interview data from the Moving to Opportunity experiment to understand how neighborhoods and the peer groups and families within them affect youth. Leventhal’s studies extend the findings from MTO and focus on gender differences in family and neighborhood processes. Specifically, she suggests that there are gender differences in family processes, with parents placing more protective restrictions on girls’ activities than boys’ in poor neighborhoods. She suggests the opposite when it comes to neighborhood processes, wherein residents are more likely to monitor the activities of boys than girls in their neighborhoods. Leventhal is not collecting data on these social processes, but testing her theoretical notions using data from three longitudinal datasets. These datasets include the administrative, structured survey and in-depth interview data from the Moving to Opportunity experiment; observational and interview data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods; and survey and administrative data in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health.

Key open questions.

More work is needed on the above topics and on additional key questions. Our existing portfolio on schools and youth programs focuses on interactions between adults and youth as key social processes, but there are other important social processes. We need further research examining interactions between youth in these programs, as well as studies on norms, activities, scripts for behavior, and social networks in these settings. We also seek measurement development work to produce rigorous, user-friendly, and cost-effective ways to measure these other aspects of social processes.
What are effective ways to improve social settings and their effects on youth development?

We are interested in whether, how, and under what conditions interventions and policy changes improve social settings in ways that promote youth development. Improving social processes may be a particularly strong lever for improving youth outcomes, be they interventions that directly target social processes or alter the availability, quality, or organization of resources in order to change social processes. In 2005 and 2006 we issued a Request for Proposals for Intervention Research to Improve Youth-Serving Organizations that focused on improving schools, classrooms, and community-based organizations (we will issue the RFP again in summer 2007). In addition to the RFP, we support intervention and policy studies on a wider range of settings through our investigator-initiated grants.

Which staff and program practices improve settings?

Many researchers and practitioners agree that short-term, off-site seminars and workshops are insufficient for improving the practices of staff, teachers, and youth workers (practices defined as the interactions between adults and youth). What is less understood is how to improve practices on a large scale across sites. Charles Smith and his colleagues at High/Scope and Joseph Allen and Robert Pianta at the University of Virginia are testing intervention packages that change staff practices to improve staff-youth interactions. Smith seeks to improve youth programs, whereas Allen and Pianta seek to improve classrooms. Both groups are testing interventions that give staff feedback from a well-validated standardized observational measure (YPQA and CLASS-Secondary, respectively) along with coaching to improve staff practices. Two additional sets of grantees, Eric Schaps and David Pearson and Joshua Brown and Stephanie Jones, are testing the effectiveness of curricular interventions in improving classroom processes and youth outcomes. Their interventions are highly scripted into curricula and lesson plans but, like the interventions by Smith and Pianta and Allen, they provide staff with ongoing coaching to improve teachers’ work with students in their classrooms.

The intervention studies described above are examples of well-designed setting-level experiments. We often are asked if we prefer experiments over other research designs. When it comes to research questions of whether an intervention or policy change effectively improves social processes, we believe field experiments are the strongest design. Of course, experiments must be well-designed, and project teams should have the expertise and foresight of field challenges to implement high quality large-scale experiments and the expertise to conduct the analyses.

Setting-level experiments are good platforms for studying other important research questions besides effects questions. Allen and Pianta, for example, are using their setting-level experiment to study whether certain aspects of their intervention are the more potent “active ingredients” that bring about improved setting-level outcomes for teachers and students. The experimental contrast between classrooms in the intervention and comparison conditions allows them to estimate whether the intervention is effective. Mediation analyses allow them to examine how and why their intervention improves student engagement and achievement. Does the intervention improve student outcomes by changing the instructional or relational aspects of classroom interactions? Or are they both equally effective routes to improving student outcomes?

Meta-analysis is another approach to generating hypotheses about how program practices affect settings and thereby affect youth outcomes. Joe Durlak and Roger Weissberg’s meta-analysis examines whether after-school programs seeking to develop youth’s social and emotional skills actually improve youth outcomes. They analyzed published and unpublished evaluation studies of these types of after-school programs and found that, on average, these programs did affect youth outcomes. The researchers then drew on theory and prior meta-analytic work about the features of a program’s design that might cause it to be effective, and they coded programs for whether they had these design features.
Durlak and Weissberg found that programs that provided a structured sequence of active, focused, and engaging skill-building activities had positive effects on youth’s academic, social, and behavioral outcomes. Programs that were not designed in this way, however, did not as a group have any positive effects on any of the youth outcomes studied.

**Which policies improve settings?**

We are interested in how policy changes affect youth’s everyday settings and thereby affect youth development, whether the effects of a policy change differ depending on the setting’s characteristics, and whether the effects of a setting on youth differ depending on the policy context.

Greg Duncan, Aletha Huston, Tom Weisner, Hiro Yoshikawa, and their colleagues have been examining how a package of policies meant to encourage parental employment affected family interactions and children’s after-school activities. This policy experiment, called New Hope, tested the effects of offering an earnings supplement, child care and health subsidies, and subsidized jobs to low-income adults who would work full-time. The investigators integrated a mix of survey, ethnographic, and observational data. Their experimental analyses indicated that New Hope had increased work and reduced poverty among adults, increased parents’ use of after-school programs and other structured activities for kids, improved their children’s school achievement, and reduced children’s behavior problems. In addition, their non-experimental analyses of successful work pathways, program implementation, and family experiences contributed to an understanding of the path between the policy intervention and the effects on the children whose parents were in the study.

**Key open questions.**

Few researchers conduct substantive data collection and analyses of settings in the comparison condition of their experiments, but doing so would allow researchers to use their experiments as platforms for extending setting theory of how settings evolve over time. In turn,
stronger setting theory would help researchers understand why their interventions succeed or fail in changing processes within settings. Further descriptive research on how settings function across time and policy contexts would help researchers generate hypotheses about how policies influence settings. This might include ethnographic studies that collect descriptive data on settings across various policy contexts.

**What are the important ways in which settings vary?**

While our grantees and others in the field are making good progress on the questions discussed above, there are more questions for which we have few answers. Many of these questions center on understanding the ways that social settings vary, and the implications of these variations for making sampling decisions, generalizing findings from setting research, and understanding variations in intervention effectiveness and setting change.

First, theoretical and empirical work is needed to identify the important setting characteristics on which to base sampling plans. In research focused on individuals, researchers often sample people using category labels (e.g., individuals’ ethnicity or race, gender, and socioeconomic status) or outcomes (e.g., achievement, psychological well-being). Similarly, researchers studying settings often use category labels such as percent of students who receive free and reduced lunch and percent of youth who are identified as Black, White, Asian, and Latino. Less commonly, researchers sample programs or classrooms that are high and/or low in “quality” or achievement. Future research needs to identify the theoretically important characteristics for sampling settings and for interpreting the generalizability of findings. These setting characteristics might include the setting’s level of organization or disorganization, resources, norms, activities, and networks. One approach would be to include sophisticated setting measures in large-scale national datasets. For example, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development’s Early Child Care Research Network included in its study observational measurement of almost 900 classrooms, allowing researchers to study variation in classroom quality across many sites.

Second, the field needs stronger methodological guidance on how to sample settings and individuals in settings. One approach is to sample individuals and to collect data on the settings they move through. Another is to sample settings and then individuals within those settings. The first approach is exemplified by Melissa Roderick’s research on the transition from high school to college, and how students’ interactions and experiences in various settings influence their trajectories. Roderick’s work includes multiple methods and multiple sources of data for assessing youth’s settings. The second approach is sampling settings along theoretically important dimensions, and to focus data collection on the setting and a sample of youths within it. For example, in Reed Larson’s qualitative study described above, “high quality” programs and the staff and youth within them were sampled. For quantitative research, Stephen Raudenbush and Howard Bloom’s work suggests that the traditional tactic of maximizing the sample size of individuals within settings hits diminishing returns fairly quickly, therefore the shift to focusing on settings as the unit of analysis means that the sample size of settings becomes more important.

Third, we need to better understand how settings vary in their responses to external and internal pressures for change. How and why does intervention effectiveness differ across sites? Charles Smith’s and Joseph Allen and Robert Pianta’s studies have a fairly large number of settings (100 youth programs and 80 classrooms, respectively), and they may have enough power to detect large variations in their interventions’ effectiveness across different types of teachers, programs, and schools. They focus on static markers of teachers, programs, and schools as sources of setting variation, and future work would benefit from examining intervention effectiveness across settings that operate differently in terms of their organizational practices and processes. Changes in the characteristics of students and adults who populate settings are another source of pressure for setting change. For example, the U.S. is witnessing
the largest influx of immigrants in our history, and schools and youth programs are struggling to understand how to serve new immigrants. How do schools and youth-serving organizations differ in their responses to this new group of students? What makes some schools and organizations more successful in incorporating immigrant youth into peer, program, and instructional activities?

Conclusion

As we wrote at the outset of this essay, we are heartened that our grantees and others in the field are beginning to lay out a roadmap for better understanding youth’s everyday settings. They are identifying key social processes in settings as well as improving our understanding of these social processes, how settings affect youth development, and how settings can be improved. There is still more terrain to be covered and we hope to receive future requests for studies that can contribute to filling gaps in our understanding of youth’s settings. We encourage research that builds off of existing platforms, such as adding setting measurement and analyses to existing cluster-randomized trials, and adding setting measures to large national and regional datasets.

Senior Program Team
February 2007

Vivian Tseng took the lead in this essay, joined by Bob Granger, Rebecca Maynard, Ed Seidman, Tom Weisner, and Brian Wilcox (in alphabetical order).

Information about the grants referenced in this essay is available on the Foundation’s website at www.wtgrantfoundation.org. Readers interested in publications and findings should contact the grantees directly.
**History Makes a Comeback**

As far back as the early twentieth century, rich individuals from the manufacturing and retail industries have used philanthropy as a means to contribute their money to improve the public good. The list includes the Rockefellers, Henry Ford, Andrew Carnegie, and others, including William T. Grant, our founder. In 2006 this type of giving saw a major resurgence from the private sector, though with money earned chiefly in the technology and investment areas. Warren Buffett’s unprecedented gift to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation was a major injection for that foundation and for the sector as a whole, and is but one example of the type of giving that is resulting in overall dramatic growth of the sector, according to Steve Gunderson, chief executive officer of the Council on Foundations.

Indeed, charitable giving by the very wealthy broke a record in 2006, according to the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, which also reported that 15 donors gave gifts or pledges of at least $100 million (totaling $30 billion) last year, compared to only 10 gifts of that size in 2005 (and totaling only $2 billion). It is fair to say that interest in philanthropy is growing and that charitable giving continues to be considered an important value for many Americans.

The question now, as it was in the early twentieth century, is whether such mega-giving is actually good for society. Suspensions sometimes arise regarding motives for such generosity—undue influence? control? financial or tax manipulation, or something else other than “good”—drawing interest from the public at large, government, and even beneficiaries of the giving. Mr. Gunderson believes that with this increased interest in philanthropy will come a sharpened focus by regulators, making more urgent the need for the sector to govern itself wisely.

Good governance should result from appropriate and fair policies and procedures and from transparency in all aspects of a foundation’s operations. The William T. Grant Foundation has made significant progress in all of these areas over the last few years. We now have policies for whistleblowers, record retention/destruction, conflicts of interest, and business continuity, to name but a few. We have revised and tightened our board bylaws, employee handbook, and performance evaluation system as well as reviewed (and in some cases changed) major vendor relationships. We continue to be vigilant about the ways we can strengthen our operations. Here are some of the issues we’ve addressed in recent years:
Should we compensate board members, and if so, why, how, and at what level?

We believe that volunteer board members are entitled to financial recognition for the time and effort they give to the Foundation, and for the value they bring with them to the board. We have historically paid a modest amount to our board members, and following a review we continue to do so. We want to attract board members who cannot afford to serve for free. Modest compensation helps. Our payments are at the low end of the benchmark data for comparable foundations of a medium size and similar mission. Members are compensated via an honorarium for each board and committee meeting attended, and the total average compensation for 2006 was about $6,000 per member. That was for four board meetings and multiple committee meetings. Given what we ask of our board members, this is a bargain.

Do we consider the IRS’ 5% payout requirement a minimum or a maximum payout?

The Foundation needs to balance our obligation to operate in perpetuity with a desire to support as many good projects as we can. To that end, we have implemented a spending (payout) policy that preserves our endowment yet still allows us to make the best use of our assets. That policy targets a 6% payout rate—rather than the 5% required by law—and will be reviewed by our Board every year or two.
**How transparent should our operations and organization be?**

We believe foundations should be very transparent about all aspects of their work. Transparency helps with accountability and we are open about governance, grantmaking, and the management of our financial resources. For example, in our grantmaking, when we recently discontinued the Youth Service Grant (YSG) program and created the Youth Service Improvement Grants (YSIG) program, we fielded opinions from current grantees as part of the process. When we announced the YSIG program we posted detailed funding criteria and guidelines on our website and distributed the materials via email. We also now share thorough reviews of each YSIG proposal with the applicant so they can understand our decision-making. Regarding other types of transparency, we post our audited financial statements on our website, along with our conflict of interest policies for our Board and staff.

**Guidance and other resources**

There are many organizations that serve the philanthropic community in the United States, which includes nearly 69,000 foundations. These groups take the pulse of our sector and help us and others grapple with governance and other issues. Many of these organizations are membership organizations, and therefore they are we. They include the Council on Foundations, New York Regional Association of Grantmakers, Foundation Financial Officers Group, The Foundation Center, Philanthropy Roundtable, and Grantmakers for Children, Youth & Families. The constituencies of these membership organizations may overlap, but the organizations are not redundant; each serves its particular constituency uniquely. Yet these organizations also represent us as a “voice of one” in some ways—such as advocacy—and provide assistance—such as training, conferences, and workshops—that individual foundations do.
not or cannot provide for themselves. The organizations do much more, but the point here is to acknowledge that they are an integral thread in the philanthropic fabric. For their important work, the membership organizations deserve our thanks.

THE ENDOWMENT AND PERFORMANCE
One of the more important and basic governance issues is the wise investment of resources. In this regard we have just completed another good year.

On December 31, 2001, our portfolio/endowment stood at $245 million, mostly the result of the downturn the markets experienced in the preceding 14 months—a decline that would continue for about 24 more months. At the end of 2006, our total assets stood at $303.5 million; that’s an increase of 23.9% (compounded) over those five years, and for the first time in history we broke the plane of $300 million (nominal dollars, unadjusted for inflation). Just as important is that we have beaten our overall (annual at December 31) benchmark for the last several years. Kudos again to our Finance and Investment Committee, which held 24 meetings with current and potential investment managers in order to achieve our results. And very honorable mention to our 25 investment managers, who manage the 35 funds that collectively resulted in a solid investment performance during the year.

Taking a longer historical look, Figure 1 depicts our total assets at year-end for the last 10 years (nominal dollars, not adjusted for inflation).

The Committee continued its process of researching and considering an array of asset classes and sub-classes, and rebalancing the Foundation’s investment portfolio accordingly and when necessary; this process has proven to be successful. For instance, the allocation to U.S. equity asset classes was decreased by 10 percentage points (vs. end-of-year 2005) and that to private equity and hedge funds increased by 4 percentage points. It worked. At the end of 2006, our asset allocation looked like this (see Figure 2).
Our total assets put us squarely in the mid-to-large size range of U.S. foundations. Of the almost 69,000 foundations, only 98 have assets exceeding $500 million, 435 have assets between $100 and $500 million, leaving the vast majority with assets under $100 million. We are proud to be a professionally run, independent, private foundation fulfilling a crucial mission, one that marked its 70th anniversary during 2006.

It is estimated by the Foundation Center that in 2007 America’s foundations must, by law, spend approximately $35 billion—the vast majority on grant-making endeavors. There can be no mistake that philanthropy is an integral part of U.S. society. We will spend about $16.4 million at the William T. Grant Foundation in 2007, which is 6.3% of our rolling 36-month total assets average. Our true investments, however, are not those we make for our investment portfolio, but are those we make to our grantees. Awarding 188 new grants in 2006 to these top-notch organizations and individuals, adding to our already-impressive grant-making portfolio, is what really drives our organization and sparks the passion of our employees and Board members.

Lawrence (“Larry”) D. Moreland, M.B.A.
February 2007
Current Research Interests

The Foundation supports research to understand and improve the settings of youth ages 8 to 25 in the United States. Important settings include schools, youth-serving organizations, neighborhoods, families, and peer groups. Our interests in youth’s settings fit into two areas. First, we are interested in studies that strengthen our understanding of how settings work; how they affect youth development; and how they can be improved. Second, we are interested in studies that strengthen our understanding of how and under what conditions research is used to influence policies and practices that affect youth’s settings.

Below are examples of research questions that fit our interests.

- How do instructional practices affect racial achievement gaps?
- Do welfare policies affect youth’s well-being because they change family processes?
- Do youth program activities have different influences on engagement for Mexican, Chinese, Black, and White youth?
- Does a professional development intervention improve staff relationships with youth in after-school programs?
- What factors influence the reliability and validity of classroom and school observational measures?
- Under what circumstances are evidence-based practices adopted, implemented, and sustained in schools?
- How is research on neighborhoods interpreted and used by policymakers? And vice versa, how do policy priorities shape what neighborhood researchers study?

Applicants and other interested parties should visit our website at www.wtgrantfoundation.org for more information on our research interests. Our website also contains up-to-date funding guidelines and application procedures for all of our grantmaking programs and features any open Requests for Proposals.
The William T. Grant Scholars Program supports promising early career researchers from various disciplines. The award is intended to facilitate the professional development of early career scholars who have demonstrated success in conducting high quality research and are seeking to further develop their skills and research. Studies from these Scholars contribute to theory and policy/practice for improving the lives of young people. The program, now in its 27th year, has funded 124 Scholars since its inception.

Award recipients are designated William T. Grant Scholars. Every year four to six Scholars are selected, and each receives $350,000 distributed over five years. Awards are made to the applicant’s institution, providing support of $70,000 per year.

The Foundation holds several events each year that encourage collaboration and conversation among the Scholars, Selection Committee, and Foundation staff. These events contribute to the professional development of the Scholars and they play a prominent role in organizing them.

William T. Grant Scholars are selected by a committee and process separate from the Foundation’s other grantmaking. Applications for 2008 are due July 11, 2007. A brochure outlining the criteria, required documents, and application procedures is available on the Foundation’s website, www.wtgrantfoundation.org. Hard copies may also be requested. Please direct inquiries to:

William T. Grant Scholars Program
William T. Grant Foundation
570 Lexington Avenue
18th Floor
New York, NY 10022-6837
212-752-0071
info@wtgrantfdn.org
Seated, left to right: Xavier de Souza Briggs, P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale, LaRue Allen, Jane Brown, Michael Wald. Standing, left to right: Mercer Sullivan, W. Thomas Boyce, Robert Granger, Sara McLanahan, William Beardslee, Timothy Smeeding, Greg Duncan, Cynthia García Coll. Not pictured: John Reid, Carol Worthman

**William T. Grant Scholars Selection Committee**

LaRue Allen, Ph.D., Chair  
Raymond and Rosalee Weiss Professor of Applied Psychology  
Department of Applied Psychology  
The Steinhardt School of Education  
New York University

William Beardslee, M.D.  
George P. Gardiner/Olga M. Monks Professor of Child Psychiatry,  
Harvard Medical School  
Academic Chair, Department of Psychiatry, Children’s Hospital Boston

W. Thomas Boyce, M.D.  
Sunny Hill Health Center-BC Leadership Chair in Child Development  
Professor of Pediatrics  
Faculties of Graduate Studies and Medicine  
University of British Columbia

Xavier de Souza Briggs, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Sociology and Urban Planning  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Jane D. Brown, Ph.D.  
James L. Knight Professor  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
William T. Grant Scholars
Selection Committee, continued

P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale, Ph.D. 2
Professor, Program in Human Development and
Social Policy
School of Education and Social Policy
Director, Cells to Society (C2S): The Center on Social
Disparities and Health, Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University

Cynthia García Coll, Ph.D.
Charles Pitts Robinson and
John Palmer Barstow Professor
Professor of Education, Psychology, and Pediatrics
Brown University

Greg J. Duncan, Ph.D.
Edwina S. Tarry Professor, Program in Human
Development and Social Policy
School of Education and Social Policy
Faculty Fellow, Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University

Robert C. Granger, Ed.D.
President
William T. Grant Foundation

Sara S. McLanahan, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs
Director, Bendheim-Thoman Center for Research on
Child Wellbeing
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and
International Affairs
Princeton University

John Reid, Ph.D.
Director,
Oregon Translational Prevention Research Center
Senior Scientist,
Oregon Learning Center & Center for Research to Practice

Timothy Smeeding, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor of Economics and
Public Administration
Director, Center for Policy Research
Maxwell School
Syracuse University

Mercer L. Sullivan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Criminal Justice
Rutgers University

Michael S. Wald, J.D.
Jackson Eli Reynolds Professor of Law
Stanford University

Carol M. Worthman, Ph.D.
Samuel Candler Dobbs Professor of Anthropology
Director, Laboratory for Comparative Human Biology
Department of Anthropology
Emory University

1 Through May 2007
2 Through April 2007
### Current William T. Grant Scholars

#### Class of 2007

- **Kristen Harrison, Ph.D.**  
  University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- **Ariel Kalil, Ph.D.**  
  University of Chicago
- **Jeffrey Kling, Ph.D.**  
  The Brookings Institution
- **Clea McNeely, Dr.P.H.**  
  Johns Hopkins University
- **Sean F. Reardon, Ed.D.**  
  Stanford University

#### Class of 2008

- **Edith Chen, Ph.D.**  
  University of British Columbia
- **Patrick Heuveline, Ph.D.**  
  University of Chicago
- **Marguerita Lightfoot, Ph.D.**  
  University of California, Los Angeles
- **Elizabeth Miller, M.D., Ph.D.**  
  University of California, Davis

#### Class of 2009

- **Emma K. Adam, Ph.D.**  
  Northwestern University School of Education and Social Policy
- **Robert Crosnoe, Ph.D.**  
  The University of Texas at Austin
- **Lisa Diamond, Ph.D.**  
  University of Utah
- **Pamela Morris, Ph.D.**  
  MDRC
- **Jacob L. Vigdor, Ph.D.**  
  Duke University
- **V. Robin Weersing, Ph.D.**  
  San Diego State University

#### Class of 2010

- **Rachel Dunifon, Ph.D.**  
  Cornell University
- **Tama Leventhal, Ph.D.**  
  Johns Hopkins University
- **Clark McKown, Ph.D.**  
  University of Illinois at Chicago
- **Lisa D. Pearce, Ph.D.**  
  University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- **Renée Spencer, Ed.D.**  
  Boston University

#### Class of 2011

- **Valerie Leiter, Ph.D.**  
  Simmons College
- **Emily Ozer, Ph.D.**  
  University of California, Berkeley
- **Devah Pager, Ph.D.**  
  Princeton University
- **Laura Romo, Ph.D.**  
  University of California, Santa Barbara
- **Kevin Roy, Ph.D.**  
  University of Maryland
Youth Service Improvement Grants Program

In late 2006 the William T. Grant Foundation restructured its Youth Service Grants program from one that supported youth services to a program that supports efforts to improve these services. The Youth Service Improvement Grants (YSIG) program, as it is now called, focuses on activities conducted by community-based organizations in the New York metropolitan area to improve the quality of services for young people ages 8–25. To be eligible for consideration, organizations must have 501(c)(3) tax-exemption, provide services to youth located in the New York metropolitan area, serve youth ages 8–25 years, and have an operating budget between $250,000 and $5 million.

Organizations should identify aspects of their current services that need improvement and propose a project with two main elements: (1) a plan of activities to improve the program services, and (2) an assessment plan to track the implementation of the improvement plan and its short-term results.

The Foundation will support the improvement activities themselves; evaluation proposals, needs assessment, or planning will not be considered. Additionally, the YSIG program does not support ongoing service delivery, general operating support, organizational development activities not directly related to improving the quality of youth services, service expansion or program growth, building campaigns, scholarships, endowments, lobbying, or awards to individuals.

Applicants may request up to $25,000 and we anticipate that most awards will be at or near the maximum; we expect to make between 20 and 25 awards per year. Projects may be between six months and two years long. When an organization is funded under these guidelines, it must wait three years from the end-date of its grant before submitting a proposal for a new YSIG-funded project.

For more information, including detailed eligibility criteria, application procedures, deadlines, and summaries of current grants, please visit our website at www.wtgrantfoundation.org.
New and Active Grants in 2006
Understanding and Improving How Settings Affect Youth

Descriptive Research

- “Everyday Experiences, Physiological Stress, and the Emergence of Affective Disorders Over the Transition to Early Adulthood”
  Emma K. Adam, Ph.D.
  William T. Grant Scholar
  Northwestern University
  2004–2009 $300,000
  2006–2009 $20,000

- “Qualitative Coding of Diary Reports”
  Emma K. Adam, Ph.D.
  Northwestern University
  2004–2006 $22,518

- “Next Steps after High School for the Non-B.A. Bound”
  Karl L. Alexander, Ph.D.
  Doris R. Entwisle, Ph.D.
  Johns Hopkins University
  2003–2006 $150,000

- “Cool Schoolmates as Agents of Cultural Change”
  Joshua Aronson, Ph.D.
  New York University
  2003–2006 $25,000

- “After-School Time: Programs, Activities, and Opportunities”
  Jeannie Brooks-Gunn, Ph.D.
  Jodie Roth, Ph.D.
  Teachers College, Columbia University
  2003–2006 $378,958

- “Student Incorporation and the Sociocultural Contexts of Schools”
  Prudence Carter, Ph.D.
  Harvard University
  2006–2009 $456,582

- “Assessing Juvenile Psychopathy: A Longitudinal Follow-Up”
  Elizabeth Cauffman, Ph.D.
  Edward Mulvey, Ph.D.
  University of California, Irvine
  University of Pittsburgh
  2003–2006 $404,455

- “Asian Immigrant Youth and Families”
  Ruth Chao, Ph.D.
  University of California, Riverside
  2005–2006 $25,000

- “Socioeconomic Status, Stress, and Asthma in Childhood”
  Edith Chen, Ph.D.
  William T. Grant Scholar
  University of British Columbia
  2003–2006 $300,000
  2006–2008 $10,000

- “Adolescent Outcomes of Social Functioning in Chinese Children: Follow-Up Studies of the Shanghai Longitudinal Project”
  Xinyin Chen, Ph.D.
  William T. Grant Scholar
  University of Western Ontario
  1997–2006 $260,000

End dates include no-cost extensions on all grants.

Denotes that all or a portion of grant is new in 2006.
“Fathers’ Contributions to Adolescent Well-Being”
Rebekah Levine Coley, Ph.D.
Boston College
2003–2007 $180,690

“Documenting and Understanding the Emergence of the Immigrant Paradox in Childhood and Adolescence”
Cynthia García Coll, Ph.D.
Amy Kerivan Marks, Ph.D.
Brown University
2006–2009 $350,000

“The Evolution of and Relationship between Ethnicity/Racial Identity and School Engagement with Minority Children”
Cynthia García Coll, Ph.D.
Brown University
2003–2006 $292,974

“Adolescence to Adulthood in Rural American Indian and Anglo Youth”
E. Jane Costello, Ph.D.
Duke University
Carol M. Worthing, Ph.D.
Emory University
2002–2006 $555,434

“Outcomes for Former Foster Youth during the Transition to Independence”
Mark E. Courtney, Ph.D.
Gina Miranda, Ph.D.
Thomas E. Keller, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
2004–2007 $341,083

“Education as a Developmental Phenomenon”
Robert Crosnoe, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
The University of Texas at Austin
2004–2009 $300,000
2006–2009 $20,000

“Positive Emotions in Parent-Child Interactions”
Lisa Diamond, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of Utah
2004–2006 $300,000
2004–2006 $60,000
2006 $20,000

“The Role of Grandparents in the Lives of Adolescent Grandchildren”
Rachel Dunifon, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Cornell University
2005–2010 $300,000
2006–2010 $30,000

“Activity Involvement and Pathways to Educational Attainment”
Jacquelynne S. Eccles, Ph.D.
Stephen Peck, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
2005–2008 $174,998

“Identity and Activities”
Jacquelynne S. Eccles, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
2002–2007 $271,768

“Pilot Study for the Mixed-Method Analysis of the Long-Term Effects of Neighborhoods on Low-Income Youth”
Kathryn Edin, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania
2006–2007 $25,000

“Fear of Failure and the Middle School Transition”
Andrew Elliot, Ph.D.
University of Rochester
2004–2007 $178,419

“One Hundred Families: Growing Up in Rural Poverty”
Gary W. Evans, Ph.D.
Cornell University
2005–2008 $315,583

“School- and Community-Based Social Network Closure as Predictors of Child Well-Being”
Anne C. Fletcher, Ph.D.
Andrea G. Hunter, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
2003–2007 $170,555

“Coaching Course for After-School Staff Supervisors”
Lucy Friedman, Ph.D.
The After-School Corporation
2006–2007 $25,000

“The Transition to Adulthood among Youths from Immigrant Families”
Andrew Fuligni, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
2003–2006 $265,031

“Fragile Families and Child Well-Being”
Irwin Garfinkel, Ph.D.
Columbia University
Sara S. McLanahan, Ph.D.
Princeton University
1998–2006 $733,882

“The Role of Family and Community-Related Experience in the Development of Young People’s Economic Understanding”
Lawrence J. Gianinno, Ph.D.
Tufts University
2005–2007 $199,961

“Reclaiming Communities: Diversity, Equity, and Access in the Post-busing Era”
Ellen B. Goldring, Ph.D.
Vanderbilt University
Adam Gamoran, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin, Madison
2001–2006 $536,994

“Understanding the Sociobiologic Translation: Subjective Social Standing in Adolescents”
Elizabeth Goodman, M.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Brandeis University
2001–2007 $300,000
2004–2006 $60,000

“Neighborhood Context and Youth Development: Current Knowledge and Future Recommendations”
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
2006–2007 $25,000

“Peer Victimization across the Middle School Years: Context and Consequences”
Sandra Graham, Ph.D.
Jaana Juvonen, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
2001–2006 $596,353

“Outcomes for Adopted Youth”
Harold Grotevant, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota
2005–2008 $100,000

Denotes that all or a portion of grant is new in 2006.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator(s)</th>
<th>Institution(s)</th>
<th>Grant Years</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Body Electric (and Print): Mass Media, Physical Identity, and Health”</td>
<td>Kristen Harrison, Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>2002–2007, 2004–2006</td>
<td>$300,000, $60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “Newcomer Children in America” | Donald J. Hernandez, Ph.D. | University at Albany | 2004–2006 | $18,000 |


| “An Examination of Teacher Hiring Practices in the Chicago Public Schools” | Brian A. Jacob, Ph.D. | Harvard University | 2006–2007 | $25,000 |


| “Consequences of Parental Job Loss for Adolescents’ School Performance and Educational Attainment” | Ariel Kalil, Ph.D. | University of Chicago | 2002–2007 | $300,000 |

| “Promoting Social and School Adjustment of Immigrant Latino Adolescents: An Ecological Model” | Gabriel Kuperminc, Ph.D. | Georgia State University | 2001–2006, 2004–2006 | $300,000, $60,000 |

| “Building Youth Development Theory: A Qualitative Longitudinal Study of 12 Programs” | Reed Larson, Ph.D. | University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign | 2003–2006 | $484,913 |

| “Processes of Developmental Change in Youth Development Settings” | Reed Larson, Ph.D. | Robin L. Jarrett, Ph.D. | University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign | 2005–2007 | $302,241 |


| “Transitions to Adulthood Among Youth with Disabilities” | Valerie Leiter, Ph.D. | Simmons College | 2006–2011 | $340,000 |


| “Capitated Managed Health Care, Service Costs, and Access for Youth” | Anne Libby, Ph.D. | University of Colorado Health Sciences Center | 2000–2007 | $290,000 |


| “Vulnerability and Competence among Suburban Youth: A Seven-Wave Longitudinal Study” | Suniya Luthar, Ph.D. | Teachers College, Columbia University | 2006–2007 | $17,345 |

| “Out-of-School Influences on Black-White Test Score Gaps for 4th and 8th Graders” | Katherine Magnuson, Ph.D. | University of Wisconsin, Madison | 2006–2010 | $30,000 |


| “School Social Structure, School Connectedness, and Health-Related Behaviors” | Clea McNeely, Dr.P.H. | Johns Hopkins University | 2002–2008 | $300,000 |

| “An Ethnographic Study of Adolescent Dating Violence: Developmental and Cultural Considerations” | Elizabeth Miller, M.D., Ph.D. | University of California, Davis | 2003–2008, 2006–2008 | $300,000, $10,000 |
“Making 'Makin' It' Possible”
Elizabeth B. Moje, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of Michigan
2000–2006 $290,000

“Title IX Compliance and Affirmative Action for Men”
James Monks, Ph.D.
University of Richmond
2005–2006 $25,000

“Adolescent Development and Social Organization in Schools”
Chandra Muller, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin
2005–2006 $10,856

“Developmental Risk in Native American Youth: The Nature of School Transition for Mental Health and Achievement Outcomes”
Denise L. Newman, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Tulane University
2000–2007 $290,000

“Black Identity, School Performance, and the Transition to Adulthood”
Carla O'Connor, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
2002–2006 $323,404

“Children's Responsibilities as Family Translators”
Marjorie Faulstich Orellana, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
2004–2006 $20,500

“Barriers in the Pathway to Adulthood: The Role of Discrimination in the Lives of Young Disadvantaged Men”
Devah Pager, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Princeton University
2006–2011 $340,000

“Race, Youth, and the Digital Divide”
Manuel Pastor, Jr., Ph.D.
Robert Fairlie, Ph.D.
University of California, Santa Cruz
2003–2006 $249,449

“Religion's Role in the Shaping of Self-Image, Aspirations, and Achievement in Youth”
Lisa D. Pearce, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
2005–2010 $300,000
2006–2010 $30,000

“The Latino Adolescent Migration, Health, and Adaptation Project”
Krista Perreira, Ph.D.
Mimi Chapman, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
2003–2007 $356,519
2005–2007 $21,062

“The Achievement/Adjustment Paradox: Understanding Psychological Adjustment of High-Achieving Chinese American High School Students”
Desiree Qin, Ed.D.
Michigan State University
2006–2007 $25,000

“Resilience in the Context of Welfare Reform: Longitudinal Relations between Employment, Psychological Well-Being, and Parenting among Low-Income Families”
Cybele Raver, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of Chicago
1999–2006 $255,000
2004–2006 $60,000

“Adolescence to Adulthood in Chicago Neighborhoods”
Sean F. Reardon, Ed.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Stanford University
2002–2007 $300,000
2006–2008 $60,000

“The Chicago Post-secondary Transition Project”
Melissa Roderick, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
2004–2007 $317,394

“Studies in School Experience and Patterns of Motivation and Achievement among Diverse Samples of Adolescents”
Robert Roeser, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Tufts University
2001–2006 $300,000

“Intergenerational Influences on Men's Transitions to Adulthood”
Kevin Roy, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of Maryland
2006–2011 $340,000

“Adolescent Sexual Orientation, Health, and Competence”
Stephen T. Russell, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of Arizona
2001–2006 $300,000
2004–2006 $60,000

“Assimilation among Children of Immigrants”
Robert C. Smith, Ph.D.
Baruch College
2005–2007 $199,031

“Understanding the Mentoring Process: A Longitudinal Study of Mentoring Relationships between Adolescents and Adults”
Renée Spencer, Ed.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Boston University
2005–2010 $300,000
2006–2010 $30,000

“The Impact of Stepfamilies on the Well-Being of Children”
Megan Sweeney, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of California, Los Angeles
2001–2006 $300,000

“Linking Developmental Trajectories of Media Use and Obesity from Childhood to Young Adulthood”
Elizabeth Vandewater, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin
2007–2009 $384,891

■ Denotes that all or a portion of grant is new in 2006.
“Peer and Neighborhood Influences on Youth and Adolescent Development”
Jacob Vigdor, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
Duke University
2004–2009 $300,000
2006–2009 $20,000

“Best Practices in Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs”
Victoria Wagner
National Network for Youth
2005–2006 $10,000

“Individual and Contextual Predictors of Participation in Out-of-School Activities”
Heather Weiss, Ph.D.
Harvard University
Sandra Simpkins, Ph.D.
Arizona State University
Eric Dearing, Ph.D.
University of Wyoming
2004–2006 $356,000

“Trends in the Incomes of Never-Married Mothers”
Nicholas Wolfinger, Ph.D.
University of Utah
Matthew McKeever, Ph.D.
Mount Holyoke College
2004–2006 $61,629

“Transition to Middle School: Changes in Aggression”
Hongling Xie, Ph.D.
Temple University
2005–2007 $252,478

Hiro Yoshikawa, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
New York University
2001–2006 $300,000
2004–2006 $60,000
2006 $24,865

“Creating the Conditions for Youth-Adult Partnerships”
Shepherd Zeldin, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin, Madison
2005–2006 $25,000

Intervention Research

“Reading, Writing, Respect, and Resolution: The Causal Effects of a School-Wide Social-Emotional Learning and Literacy Intervention on Teachers and Children”
J. Lawrence Aber, Ph.D.
Joshua Brown, Ph.D.
New York University
Stephanie Jones, Ph.D.
Fordham University
2004–2007 $450,000

“Evaluating the Effectiveness of the School Success Profile (SSP) Intervention Package on School-Level Performance”
Gary L. Bowen, Ph.D.
Natasha Bowen, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

“Opening Doors to Earning Credentials”
Thomas Brock, Ph.D.
MDRC
2003–2006 $300,000

“Informal Mentoring, Rural African American Emerging Adults, and Substance Use”
Gene H. Brody, Ph.D.
Velma McBride Murry, Ph.D.
Steven M. Kogan, Ph.D.
University of Georgia
2006–2008 $500,000

“Changing Classroom Climate and Other School Micro-contexts: The 4Rs Setting-Level Study”
Joshua Brown, Ph.D.
New York University
Stephanie Jones, Ph.D.
Fordham University
2006–2008 $524,340

“Reversing the Summer Slide: Experimental Evidence”
Duncan Chaplin, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Jane Hannaway, Ph.D.
The Urban Institute
2004–2007 $358,483
2005–2007 $136,210
2006 $21,500

“The SOURCE Program: An Intervention to Promote College Application and Enrollment among Urban Youth”
Tiffani Chin, Ph.D.
EdBoost Education Corporation
Johannes Bos, Ph.D.
Berkeley Policy Associates
Thomas Kane, Ph.D.
Harvard Graduate School of Education
2005–2007 $400,000

“Addressing the Academic Performance Gap between Minority and White Students”
Geoffrey L. Cohen, Ph.D.
University of Colorado, Boulder
Valerie Purdie-Vaughns, Ph.D.
Julio Garcia, Ph.D.
Yale University
2005–2007 $286,738

“Firearm Safety Counseling and Safe Storage: Strategies for Utilizing Youth to Reduce Firearm Injury among Children and Adolescents”
Tamera Coyne-Beasley, M.D., M.P.H.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
2000–2007 $290,000
2004–2006 $60,000

“Dissemination of Positive Youth Development Findings”
Joseph Durlak, Ph.D.
Loyola University Chicago
2006–2007 $25,000

“Neighborhood Variation in the Effects of Prevention Programs on Positive Youth Outcomes”
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
Sean F. Reardon, Ed.D.
Stanford University
2003–2006 $438,090
“An Evaluation of School-Based Mentoring”
Jean Grossman, Ph.D.
Carla Herrera, Ph.D.
Public/Private Ventures
2004–2007 $575,000

“A Multi-university Evaluation of Educational Effects of Intergroup Dialogues”
Patricia Gurin, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
Biren Nagda, Ph.D.
University of Washington
Ximena Zuñiga, Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
2005–2008 $605,419

■ “Challenging Under-Served Children to Achieve Academic Excellence”
Maureen Holla
Richard Tagle
Higher Achievement Program
Jean Grossman, Ph.D.
Princeton University
2006–2009 $750,000

■ “Effective Mentoring Interactions”
Michael Karcher, Ed.D., Ph.D.
The University of Texas at San Antonio
2003–2006 $282,124
2004–2006 $100,000

■ “Moving to Opportunity and Youth Well-Being”
Jeffrey Kling, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
The Brookings Institution
2002–2007 $300,000

■ “The Effects of Maternal Employment on Low-Income Adolescents: An Investigation of Contextual Factors”
Virginia Knox, Ph.D.
Lisa Gennetian, Ph.D.
Pamela Morris, Ph.D.
MDRC
2003–2006 $350,000

■ “Maintenance Strategies for Homeless Youth’s Reduction in HIV Risk Acts”
Marguerita Lightfoot, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of California, Los Angeles
2003–2008 $300,000
2006–2008 $10,000

■ “Effective Prevention of Antisocial Behavior: Using Research Synthesis to Support Evidence-Based Practice”
Mark Lipsey, Ph.D.
Vanderbilt University
2003–2006 $250,878

■ “Phase One Project Examining Setting-Level Capacity Building on After-School Programs”
Greg Meissen, Ph.D.
Scott Wituk, Ph.D.
Wichita State University
2006–2007 $100,000

■ “Mental Health Treatment in the Context of Welfare Reform Policy: An Experimental Examination of the Effects of Maternal Depression on Children and Youth”
Pamela Morris, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
MDRC
2004–2009 $300,000
2006–2009 $20,000

■ “Trial of Intervention to Increase Participant Retention in Home Visiting”
David L. Olds, Ph.D.
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
2005–2008 $574,977

■ “Twelve-Year Follow-Up of Women and Children Enrolled in Trial of Prenatal and Infancy Nurse Home Visitation”
David L. Olds, Ph.D.
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
Robert Cole, Ph.D.
Harriet Kitzman, Ph.D.
University of Rochester Medical Center
2003–2006 $437,934

■ “Adolescents as Resources in School-Based Prevention: Effects on Program Outcomes and Youth Development”
Emily Ozer, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of California, Berkeley
2006–2011 $340,000

■ “Designing Contextually Relevant Workshops to Enhance Latina Mother-Daughter Communication about Sexual Topics”
Laura Romo, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
University of California, Santa Barbara
2006–2011 $340,000

■ “Comprehensive Evaluation of the Making Meaning™ Reading Comprehension Program”
Eric Schaps, Ph.D.
Developmental Studies Center
P. David Pearson, Ph.D.
University of California, Berkeley
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■ “Evaluation of a Strategic Reading Approach for At-Risk Adolescents”
Robert E. Slavin, Ph.D.
Nancy A. Madden, Ph.D.
Success for All Foundation
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■ “The High/Scope Youth Program Quality Intervention for After-School Programs”
Charles Smith, Ph.D.
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
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■ “Improving the Behavioral Environment of After-School Settings”
Emilie Phillips Smith, Ph.D.
Daniel Perkins, Ph.D.
Pennsylvania State University
Howard Rosen, Ph.D.
Hempfield Behavioral Health
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■ “Youth Sport Social Systems”
Ronald E. Smith, Ph.D.
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University of Washington
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Ardice Hartry, Ph.D.
Mary G. Visher, Ph.D.
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■ Denotes that all or a portion of grant is new in 2006.
“Developing and Disseminating Effective Interventions for Depression and Anxiety in Youth”
V. Robin Weersing, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
San Diego State University
2004–2009 $300,000
2006–2009 $20,000

Other
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Karl L. Alexander, Ph.D.
Doris R. Entwisle, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University
2004–2006 $50,318

Gordon Berlin
MDRC
2004–2006 $25,000

“A Data Archive for Project STAR and Beyond”
Jayne Boyd-Zaharias, Ed.D.
Health Education Research Operative Services (HEROS)
Jeremy D. Finn, Ph.D.
University at Buffalo
2005–2006 $149,115

“Development of an Informal Mentoring Curriculum”
Gene H. Brody, Ph.D.
University of Georgia
2005–2006 $25,000

“Adding it Up: Public and Private Costs of Teen Childbearing”
Sarah Brown, M.P.H.
National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy
Saul D. Hoffman, Ph.D.
University of Delaware
Rebecca A. Maynard, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania
2005–2007 $317,315

“Changing Child Welfare Systems to Serve Children and Families”
Olivia Golden, Ph.D.
The Urban Institute
2005–2006 $25,000

“Book on Apprenticeship as a Framework for Supporting Child and Adolescent Development”
Robert Halpern, Ph.D.
Erikson Institute
2005–2007 $25,000

“Building Capacity for Evaluating Group-Level Interventions: Year 3”
Stephen W. Raudenbush, Ed.D.
University of Michigan
Howard Bloom, Ph.D.
MDRC
2006 $250,000
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New York University
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Society for Research in Child Development
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Understanding and Improving the Use of Evidence


Descriptive Research

“Evidence Use in the Sex Education Debates: The Interacting Roles of Values, Beliefs, and Collateral Information”
Norman Constantine, Ph.D.
Carmen R. Nevarez, M.D., M.P.H.
Public Health Institute
2006–2008 $338,796

“Effective Online Research Abstracts for a Policy Audience”
Fred Rothbaum, Ph.D.
Tufts University
2004–2006 $25,000

Intervention Research

None

Fellowships

“Child, Family, and Youth Policymaking from behind the Scenes”
Rob Geen
William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow
Child Trends, Inc.
2005–2007 $175,000

“Advancing Evidence-Based Reforms in Federal Programs Affecting Youth”
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow
University of Illinois at Chicago
2005–2007 $198,350

“Congressional Fellowship Program”
John W. Hagen, Ph.D.
Mary Ann McCabe, Ph.D.
Society for Research in Child Development
2003–2006 $338,083
2006–2009 $374,073

“Improving Conditions of Children and Youth in Distressed Urban Areas: National Framework, Local Experience”
Martha Holleman
William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow
Safe and Sound: Baltimore’s Campaign for Children and Youth
2006–2007 $178,725

Denotes that all or a portion of grant is new in 2006.
### Transforming the Child Welfare System to Improve Outcomes for Children and Youth Whose Parents Have Mental Illness

**Joanne Nicholson, Ph.D.**  
*William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow*  
University of Massachusetts Medical School  
2005–2007 $212,657

#### Other Initiatives
- **“Making the Case for Extending Foster Care and Transition Services Beyond Age 18”**  
  Robin Nixon  
  *William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow*  
  National Foster Care Coalition  
  2006–2008 $199,902

### Getting to the Heart and Soul of Mentoring: Advancing Research, Theory, and Practice through Match Supervision

**Jean E. Rhodes, Ph.D.**  
*William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow*  
University of Massachusetts, Boston  
2005–2006 $165,713

#### Additional Initiatives
- **“Communicating Research Findings to National AfterSchool Association Conference”**  
  Victoria Carr  
  National AfterSchool Association  
  2006–2007 $5,000

### Bridging Domains: The Intersection of Child and Youth Health and Well-Being and Public Policy

**Lauren A. Smith, M.D., M.P.H.**  
*William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow*  
Boston Medical Center, Boston University School of Medicine  
2005–2007 $175,000

#### Other Initiatives
- **“Designing Systems to Support Learning and Teaching Grounded in Evidence-Based Practice”**  
  Constance M. Yowell, Ph.D.  
  *William T. Grant Distinguished Fellow*  
  University of Chicago  
  2005–2007 $197,001

### Communications and Advocacy

#### Advancing Evidence-Based Reforms in Social Programs Affecting American Youth

**Jonathan Baron, J.D.**  
The Council for Excellence in Government  
2005–2007 $150,000  
2006–2007 $50,000

#### Additional Initiatives
- **“Advancing the Evidence: Quality and Accessibility in After-School Programs”**  
  Betsy Brand  
  American Youth Policy Forum  
  2004–2006 $150,000
- **“Using Research to Inform the Policy Process to Enhance the Quality of After-School Programs”**  
  Betsy Brand  
  American Youth Policy Forum  
  2007–2009 $150,000
- **“Communicating Research Findings to National AfterSchool Association Conference”**  
  Victoria Carr  
  National AfterSchool Association  
  2006–2007 $5,000
- **“Improving the Quality, Use, and Utility of Social Science Research”**  
  Michael Feuer, Ph.D.  
  National Academy of Sciences  
  2006–2008 $350,019
- **“Advancing Quality After-School Programs”**  
  Jodi Grant, J.D.  
  Afterschool Alliance  
  2006–2008 $500,000
- **“News Coverage of Youth on NPR’s Newsmagazines”**  
  Barbara A. Hall  
  National Public Radio  
  2005–2007 $250,000
- **“Quality After-School Programs in California”**  
  Ted Lempert, J.D.  
  Children Now  
  2006–2007 $25,000
- **“Raising the Visibility of Children and Youth Issues in the 2007–2008 Presidential Campaign”**  
  Michael Petit  
  Every Child Matters Education Fund  
  2006–2008 $300,000
- **“Virginia After-School Campaign”**  
  Michael Petit  
  Every Child Matters Education Fund  
  2005–2006 $150,000
“Study Group on Supplementary Education”
Edmund Gordon, Ph.D.
Teachers College, Columbia University
2006–2007 $25,000

“Will Power to Youth”
Jon Gossett
American Public Media
2006 $25,000

“Campaign for Youth”
Linda Harris
Center for Law and Social Policy
2006–2007 $25,000

Doug Imig, Ph.D.
University of Memphis
2003–2007 $206,885

“Proposition 49 Implementation”
Ted Lempert, J.D.
Children Now
Linda Segre
Boston Consulting Group
2006 $105,000

“Children’s History and Welfare Conference”
Kriste Lindenmeyer, Ph.D.
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
2006 $5,000

“Lessons, Links, and Levers: Bridging Research, Policy, and Practice in the Allied Youth Fields”
Karen J. Pittman
Nicole Yohalem
Impact Strategies, Inc.
2005–2006 $85,000
2006–2007 $580,000

Karen Rosa
New York Regional Association of Grantmakers (NYRAG)
2006–2007 $7,500

“William T. Grant Foundation Archive Materials at the Rockefeller Archive Center”
Darwin Stapleton, Ph.D.
Rockefeller University
2006–2009 $169,000

“Presidential Reception at the 2006 SRA Biennial Meeting”
Elizabeth Susman, Ph.D.
Society for Research on Adolescence
2005–2006 $7,500

“Book on School-Age Child Care in America”
Edmund Zigler, Ph.D.
Yale University
2006–2007 $25,000

Other Research Topics

“Children’s Emotional Competence: Pathway to Mental Health?”
Susanne A. Denham, Ph.D.
George Mason University
2002–2007 $300,000

“Genetically Informed Studies of Family Transitions: Effects on Adults and Children”
Robert Emery, Ph.D.
University of Virginia
2005–2006 $25,000

“Stress and the Emergence of Psychological Symptoms among Low-Income Urban Youth”
Kathryn Grant, Ph.D.
William T. Grant Scholar
DePaul University
2004–2006 $60,000
2006 $10,000

“Contributors and Threats to Adolescents’ Sense of Positive Self-Worth”
Susan Harter, Ph.D.
University of Denver
2003–2006 $299,385

“The Development of Citizenship”
Lonnie R. Sherrod, Ph.D.
Fordham University
2002–2007 $100,000

* Denotes that all or a portion of grant is new in 2006.
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Downtown Community Television Center

Downtown Community Television Center (DCTV) provides the tools, instruction, mentorship, and facilities that help aspiring, emerging, and established filmmakers create documentary works of social import. DCTV strives to advance the public well-being through improved communication and encourages the development of more effective ways to share ideas and knowledge. In 2006, its award-winning media arts program for youth, PRO-TV, served over 590 teenagers (ages 14–21) from many of New York City’s most challenged communities and public schools. Through programs held in and after school, youth in the PRO-TV program harness the power of media to express themselves about issues that affect them and their communities. Students’ works are screened at film festivals throughout the U.S. and worldwide, at schools, youth organizations, and cultural venues, and online. For more information, visit www.dctvny.org.

Groundswell Community Mural Project

Groundswell Community Mural Project is a Brooklyn, New York-based organization. Founded in 1996, it brings together professional artists, grassroots organizations, and communities in partnership to create high quality murals in underrepresented neighborhoods. Groundswell encourages youth, communities, and artists to take active ownership of their future and equips them with the tools necessary for social change. The Teen Empowerment Mural Apprenticeship (TEMA) program is an after-school apprenticeship designed to teach young people leadership skills along with civic responsibility by helping them work with their own community to create murals. The program offers an opportunity for youth to become familiar with the process of researching, designing, and making a mural and to take on a leadership role within this process. For more information, visit www.groundswellmural.org.