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Letter from the President

The past year has presented serious challenges to America’s young people, their families, and the schools, communities, and organizations that shape their lives. Now is the time to ask hard questions about the relevance and effectiveness of efforts designed to support our nation’s youth.

The William T. Grant Foundation has a history of bucking major policy trends and trying to account for gaps from other funding streams. For example, we launched our William T. Grant Scholars Program at a time of considerable federal cuts for research, and we have pressed for effectiveness in services when times were good and the predominant call was for increased supply.

We will continue to employ these strategies as we face the economic downturn. As this Annual Report describes, we plan to contain expenses so we can maintain our funding levels despite a sharp drop in assets. We will launch new initiatives to improve the effectiveness and relevance of our activities, and both of the programmatic essays that follow focus on this topic. Senior Program Associate Brian Wilcox describes our mid-career Fellows program, which is designed to improve the usefulness of research for policy and practice. From the experiences of the first two cohorts of Fellows, the early news is positive. In our second essay, Program Officer Vivian Tseng describes how our thinking has evolved regarding the ways in which policymakers and practitioners acquire, interpret, and use research evidence. Better understanding these processes should help us and other funders support more relevant, useful research that ultimately impacts policy and practice.

We hope that others find the ideas and projects described in this report valuable as we all confront these difficult times.

Robert C. Granger, Ed.D., President
The Foundation’s research aims directly at increasing the effectiveness of youth programs, classrooms, and other settings by understanding what it is that makes some of them effective.

Chair’s Report

For the William T. Grant Foundation—as for most organizations—the past year brought financial uncertainty and a decline in assets. We have, for several years, been spending more than six percent of our assets, with most of it going to grants. One of the Board’s most consequential decisions in 2008 was to maintain this level of grantmaking. Although it is the Board’s duty to keep a watchful eye on assets, we also feel it is critical to maintain current projects, while also moving forward in several key areas of work that we have initiated.

The Foundation’s trustees are a mix of academic researchers, practitioners, and business executives. This mix ensures that the research the Foundation funds is not easily accepted by the Board as important in itself—there must be the potential of positive, practical outcomes for youth. The Foundation’s research aims directly at increasing the effectiveness of youth programs, classrooms, and other settings by understanding what it is that makes some of them effective, and how these successful practices can best be made to occur broadly.

In 2008, we focused on communicating our research in more useful and concise ways. We also began exploring the largely unexamined question of how research evidence is acquired, interpreted, and used by policymakers and practitioners to affect young lives, and thus our country’s future.

Although no one wants to make the hard decisions financial contraction brings, the Board understands that during such times, the importance of making effective expenditures is highlighted, which reinforces our decision to maintain grantmaking levels in these areas.

In 2009, the Board continues its vital role under the leadership of new chair Hank Gooss. I welcome Hank and look forward to working with him and all of my fellow Board members on Foundation priorities.

Gary Walker, Board Chair, March 2009
Impact and Relevance: Bridging Research, Policy, and Practice

The William T. Grant Foundation is dedicated to “supporting research to improve the lives of young people.” This aspiration drives the work of the Foundation’s staff—we devote a great deal of our time, effort, and other resources to increasing the quantity and quality of research that can advance theory and positively affect the well-being of youth.

Over the past several years, the Foundation has been increasingly focused on the impact of our work. We ask ourselves whether the research we support is relevant to policymakers and practitioners, and whether it is being used to improve the lives of young people. Asking these questions raises many others, including those described by Vivian Tseng in her essay in this Annual Report. How can we—and our colleagues—be more effective in getting research findings used in policy and practice settings? How can we more successfully bridge the gaps that seem to exist between the research community and practitioners and policymakers?

Our experiences in working at the intersection of research, policy, and practice led us to three initial assumptions. First, researchers are frequently too far removed from policy and practice to frame and pursue research that meets the needs of those fields. Second, policymakers and practitioners are not always discerning in their use of research. In some cases, the findings from a weak piece of research are accepted without due skepticism. And there are examples of high-quality, relevant research findings that could have influenced policy and practice, but didn’t. Third, communication among researchers, practitioners, and policymakers can be challenging, because each operates within a distinct sphere, with differing jargons, values, incentives, priorities, and norms.

Fostering Connections
As we explored the accuracy of our assumptions, we noted that there were some exceptional researchers whose work was as relevant as it was rigorous and who were successful at connecting with policymakers and practitioners. Similarly, there are practitioners who have a well-developed sense of how to commission and use research effectively. However, these people were rare exceptions in their fields—many of their colleagues, terrific in their own roles, were not good at working with those outside it.

Consequently, several years ago we asked the Forum for Youth Investment to identify and interview a wide array of individuals who have effectively worked at the intersection of research, policy, and practice. The Forum asked these “bridgers” to describe their work and the factors which led them to reach across these communities, and to suggest ideas about how to create a larger cadre of professionals with their distinctive skills.

Through the interviews, we learned that most of the bridgers had spent time at some point in their careers working outside their role or very closely with individuals in other roles. We also discovered that many of the influential researchers and practitioners whose work had a narrower reach had not had such cross-role experiences, but felt such an experience would be useful. Virtually all of those who had worked across roles and settings highly valued those experiences.

The responses offered in these interviews convinced us to pilot a program aimed at creating opportunities for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers to embed themselves in another role.
We wanted to see if these experiences made the participants better in their main role, and if prominent professionals would even have time to commit to such an effort. Also, would these people in turn be able to influence the work of their colleagues, creating a reverberating impact? Four years later, we have some encouraging findings that may be instructive to others who share our interests.

The Distinguished Fellows Program
The goal of the Distinguished Fellows program is not to turn practitioners and policymakers into researchers, or vice versa, but to help them understand enough about the others’ work to fuel an increase in the supply of and demand for high-quality research in policy and practice settings. Based on our review of the literature on use of evidence and our interviews with successful bridgers, we knew that this would require changes in the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of members of all three communities. Consequently, we decided to open the program to researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. We also decided early on to focus on mid-career "influentials," since one key goal was to have Fellows who are likely to remain in their fields and have a radiating impact on the work of their colleagues and peers. We defined influential as a policymaker, practitioner, or researcher who was seen as particularly knowledgeable and well-connected to others in their discipline and who used knowledge, access, and connections to influence colleagues on matters important to youth. This is a more constrained definition of "influential" than the one the Foundation usually uses. Our usual definition includes the ability to influence people beyond one’s primary role. It is that sort of ability that we hoped to create through the program.

Research is at the center of the Distinguished Fellows program, principally because the Foundation’s strength lies in our focus on research. Several features of the program are worth noting. First, Fellows are given considerable flexibility in structuring their work around their professional needs. They can spread the experience out over two years, working part-time in their new role, or work more intensively over a shorter period of time. Fellows propose one or more mentors to provide guidance within the new settings. The Foundation also supports the Fellows through biannual meetings, which allow them to share experiences and information and receive feedback and encouragement. Finally, the mix of researchers, practitioners, and policymakers is proving to be a valuable element of the program, enriching the experiences of all the Fellows.

The structure of the Fellows program is simple: we provide opportunities for researchers to work as staff in practice or policy settings, and for practitioners and policymakers to work on teams with researchers. We believe that achieving improvements in both the quality and use of research evidence depends on these three communities developing an understanding of the other’s work and perspective. Scholars need to grasp the daily contexts of policy and practice in order to frame their research questions in ways that will generate relevant findings. Similarly, to demand, discern, and use good research, practitioners and policymakers must understand the strengths and limits of particular research findings, as well as how to communicate their needs to researchers.

Getting Off the Ground
Sixteen individuals from four annual cohorts, a mix of researchers, practitioners, and policymakers, have participated in the program so far. The Fellows have immersed themselves in a wide variety of practice, policy, and research settings. For example, Jean Rhodes, a researcher who studies mentoring, worked in two large mentoring organizations in Boston, where she participated in all aspects of the mentor-mentee matching process. She devoted much of her time to screening and matching mentors and mentees, providing ongoing support to matched pairs, and discussing her observations with the staff of the organizations. Martha Holleman, a youth policy advisor in Baltimore, partnered with researcher Beth Weitzman at New York University to participate in an evaluation of the Baltimore...
Safe and Sound Campaign. Holleman attended research methods seminars and colloquia at NYU, participated in meetings of the research team, and contributed to the overall evaluation effort, including writing and presenting findings at national meetings. Deborah Gorman-Smith, a researcher at the University of Illinois at Chicago, spent her time with the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy in Washington, D.C., an intermediary organization. There, she worked on projects with the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Education, among others, to promote the understanding and use of high-quality evidence in policy settings. Robin Nixon, a D.C.-based policy advocate, worked with researchers at the University of Chicago’s Chapin Hall on a large-scale study of youth aging out of the foster care system and another study testing interventions to improve the outcomes for youth aging out of foster care.

Lessons Learned (So Far)

Our first two cohorts of Fellows—six researchers, one practitioner, and one policy advocate—have completed their fellowships. We had a third party interview each Fellow several times during and after their fellowships. All eight reported that their Fellows experience led to important changes in the way they now think about other roles, their own work, and their interactions with professional colleagues. These early results are encouraging; our logic for the program demands that we see changes in these benchmarks.

Understanding the needs and realities of other roles. The researchers in the Fellows program all described significant shifts in their understanding of policy and practice work. Our Fellows learned relatively simple lessons, such as the frequent misalignment of research timelines with the pressing information needs of the policy and practice worlds, and more complex ones, such as the tensions that arise when the measures researchers trust are inconsistent with those that drive the work and funding of practitioners and policymakers.

Rob Geen, a child welfare researcher working in the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means, said he gained an understanding of the ways policymakers become aware of research information. As Geen noted, “The role of intermediaries is critical in getting research to policymakers. I never thought of the American Academy of Pediatrics as a strong resource, but they can get a meeting with a staffer immediately. It would serve me well to speak to them about my research.” He and other Fellows noted the need to develop connections with these intermediary organizations in order to facilitate research use.

Two of the Fellows working in research settings spoke of their growing appreciation for why developing credible research findings on the problems of interest to their colleagues takes so long. Robin Nixon told us that working in a research setting gave her a better sense of the perspective of researchers and the language needed to communicate about research. “Having the knowledge to speak in a more articulate way about research principles enabled me to have more effective conversations with both my constituents and the targets of our policy work.” According to Martha Holleman, “policy and practice work could greatly benefit from the culture of constructive criticism so present in academic research settings.”

Changing their work: producing, demanding, and using high-quality research. While still too early to assess this benchmark, the Fellows program seems to be triggering shifts in the interests and emphases of the Fellows’ core work. Deborah Gorman-Smith says, “A significant part of my focus will be on bolstering the science of dissemination. The history is that these interventions fall apart when they get out into the real world. I will focus more of my energy on understanding what happens when they move to the real world and in pushing other scientists to approach those from another way.” Joanne Nicholson, a research psychologist and former Fellow, is committed to using mixed-methods more extensively in her work, both because of their methodological virtues and because
findings from such studies are often more readily understandable to practitioners and policymakers. These are lessons she's now sharing with her colleagues at the University of Massachusetts Medical Center. Jean Rhodes, a professor of psychology at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, and the first person to complete the program, reports that her research efforts have become more applied and designed specifically around the program practices she saw as a mentoring match coordinator.

Martha Holleman told us that she is initiating a new project, “that will bring researchers together with the Baltimore Department of Social Services to assess the status of children pending adoption and to make recommendations about how to expedite permanency.” She goes on to note that, “my role in this effort is to ‘be the bridge.’” She will work with the Department to help them shape the questions for the research team, and with the research team to keep the work grounded in the needs of the Department. She will also help translate the findings for the practice and policy communities.

**Influencing the work of colleagues.** Our interviews indicate that Fellows are thinking intentionally about their spheres of influence, and how to expand the reach of their fellowship experiences. Deborah Gorman-Smith, for example, has assumed a leadership role in the Society for Prevention Research and has already influenced the strategic direction of the organization and made dissemination more central to its mission. Jean Rhodes (and current Fellow David DuBois) published the paper, “Understanding and facilitating the youth mentoring movement,” which draws heavily on Rhodes’s Fellows work. The paper provides guidelines for researchers and practitioners working in that field. Rhodes also drew on her Fellows experience for a forthcoming paper she co-authored on ethical issues for researchers and practitioners working with mentoring programs. Nixon described her plans for workshops to help her advocacy colleagues understand the value of research and the elements that distinguish high-quality research. All of the Fellows spoke of efforts, planned or in place, to bring the lessons from their experience back to their home institutions and their fields.

**Take-Away Messages**

The Fellows who have completed their work, or are close to doing so, shared some of the important lessons they’ve carried away from their experiences. Humility and respect for the perspectives of others was a common theme. Watching her mentor working in highly charged political environments, Gorman-Smith learned a great deal about relationships and respect. “It’s incredibly important to be respectful, to listen, to respond, and to genuinely consider the perspective of the other person, especially when you disagree with them,” she explained.

The realization that the challenges of being effective across roles is more than a communication issue was echoed by David DuBois, a researcher working in a mentoring organization during his fellowship. DuBois spoke of developing a much richer appreciation for the day-to-day demands faced by staff members of youth organizations: “One of my major ‘take-away’ learnings is that decision-making in the realm of practice is legitimately concerned with and shaped by non-research factors to a substantially greater extent than many scholars . . . have tended to recognize. Whereas, prior to my Fellows experience I was inclined to view considerations such as practical logistics of programming, operational efficiency, fundraising, mission relevance, and staff morale as being of secondary importance, I now have a much richer appreciation of their value and importance to the long-term sustainability, reach, and impact of mentoring and other youth programs. As I see it, those of us coming from the research side need to do a better job at granting currency to the full range of complexities and demands that are encountered by youth-serving programs and organizations on a day-to-day basis and, accordingly, approach our efforts to influence practice not only with greater conceptual sophistication, but also a due measure of humility.”
bridge the research-theory-practice divide was one of the most powerful lessons learned by Constance Yowell, a researcher and funder whose Fellows time was spent with the National Writing Project, a program designed to improve instructional quality. Discussions with her mentor helped Yowell deepen her understanding of the connections between instructional theory and practice as applied to participatory forms of learning. In turn, this influenced significant changes in the education grantmaking program she leads at the MacArthur Foundation.

These reports from some of our Distinguished Fellows suggest that the program is imparting valuable lessons. From understanding the importance of respecting those working in other settings to learning practical lessons about timing and the demands and perspectives of another’s role, the Fellows have already achieved many of the goals established for the program.

Martha Holleman stated this well: “People in practice and policy settings crave the knowledge and expertise that folks in the research settings can bring. People in research settings commit to their work because they hope the knowledge they generate will have implications in the broader world. Differences in language, incentives, work pace, and work products can keep practitioners and researchers from working together effectively. With access, support, mutual dedication, and time, these differences can be overcome.”

For more information about the Distinguished Fellows Program, visit our website: http://www.wtgrantfoundation.org

Being effective across roles is more than a communication issue . . .

It’s understanding the importance of respecting those working in other settings,

Or, learning practical lessons about timing and the demands and perspectives of another’s role
Introduction
In last year’s Annual Report essay, we discussed our initial thoughts about studying the use of research evidence in policy and practice affecting youth. Since then, we have been engaged in efforts to further focus our interests in this area. We have commissioned work and talked with influential researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and funders. We also received significant external input for developing an RFP, which we released in early 2009. These activities convinced us to concentrate our RFP on increasing understanding of what affects policymakers’ and practitioners’ acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence.

Market metaphors (i.e., supply vs. demand) are often used to describe the production and use of research evidence, and the RFP is an effort to improve our understanding of the demand side.

As illustrated here, we are interested in how policymakers’ and practitioners’ acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence are affected by the nature of policy and practice settings; the intermediary organizations that broker and distribute research evidence; the characteristics of the research evidence and the researchers and research organizations who produce it; and the broader political, economic, and social contexts in which these settings and organizations are embedded.

Research Users
We want to better understand the demand side because doing so will inform our efforts to support research that is ultimately used in policy and practice affecting youth. We and other research funders and researchers have focused on supply-side issues and devoted less attention to understanding intended users. On the supply side, we have worked to improve the quality of research evidence, but we know little about whether improving the quality of research evidence—where quality is defined by social science canons—affects its use. We also know little about how policymakers and practitioners appraise quality. We want to know how they interpret research evidence as they apply it to particular issues, and why some agencies and organizations rely more on research evidence than peer institutions.
We often draw upon our experiences working with policymakers and practitioners to guide our supply-side work, but what happens on the demand side is not well understood. For example, we fund studies of settings such as schools and classrooms, including descriptive work on what contributes to the achievement gap, measurement work on classroom quality, and intervention work on professional development and curricula. We encourage investigations that focus on issues important to education policy and practice, and we have examples of the research we fund being used in policy and practice, but we do not have strong understanding of why some research gets used and other research does not.

To make progress, we want to better understand the nature of policy and practice work and what affects the use of research evidence in that work. In education, for example, we know that school districts are under increasing demands by No Child Left Behind to use scientifically based research to improve test scores and that a large array of organizations are rushing to provide such information. But we know little about what types of research evidence enter into district deliberations and decisions, how districts think about the evidence, and how they make use of it. The organizations that seek to provide research evidence differ widely in their goals, interests, and research expertise, and include commercial vendors, advocacy groups, state agencies, universities, foundations, and the Institute for Education Sciences. They provide districts with research evidence to understand problems such as the causes of the achievement gap or reading challenges for English language learners. They also try to convince districts to use products (e.g., curricula, textbooks, professional development programs) that have been developed using research evidence and/or tested in research studies. District decision-makers also learn about promising reforms, some of which are backed by research evidence, from their colleagues. As districts make decisions about professional development, curricula, and school reform, what role does research evidence play in their deliberations and decisions? When they adopt reforms that proponents say are backed by research evidence, were they swayed by the research evidence or other considerations such as cost, ease of implementation, the advice of colleagues, and political considerations?

**Acquisition, Interpretation, and Use of Research Evidence**

The new RFP will support studies of how policy and practice settings; intermediary organizations; the interactions between them; and broader political, economic, and social contexts influence acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence. We define *research evidence* as empirical findings derived from systematic research methods and analyses. This includes descriptive studies, intervention or evaluation studies, meta-analyses, and cost-effectiveness studies done by researchers working within or outside policy or practice organizations. Some researchers are concerned with the adoption of tools and programs that are developed using research evidence and/or tested in research studies—in these cases, we are interested in how policymakers and practitioners acquire, interpret, and use the research evidence on these products.

We consider acquisition, interpretation, and use to be dynamic social processes and think these processes should be studied within the context of how things work in policy and practice settings, intermediary organizations, and social networks. For example, practitioners often receive information from colleagues in their networks, so it makes sense to study network processes as mechanisms for acquiring research evidence. Policymakers can also develop their positions through interactions with advocates and colleagues, and thus studying lobbying activities and professional interactions lends insight into how research evidence affects policymaking.

What is sometimes overlooked is how research evidence is interpreted as it is acquired and used. A common assumption is that a research finding has a particular meaning that does not, or
We want because doing so will inform
to better understand the demand side our efforts to support research that is ultimately used in policy and practice.
should not, change. However, policymakers and practitioners are continuously interpreting new information and integrating it into their tacit knowledge. This occurs as they acquire new pieces of research evidence and as they use that evidence to understand problems and inform decisions. For example, as policy ideas influenced by research evidence are diffused across social networks, those in the networks are interpreting (and reinterpreting) the ideas and research evidence. As research evidence is used in organizational decision-making, its meaning is being interpreted in relation to local needs and constraints.

We are interested in three overlapping sets of research questions related to these social processes.

1. How do policymakers and practitioners acquire research evidence? Through what channels, processes, and vehicles does research evidence come into their hands? In cases in which they initiate the acquisition, we are interested in the strategies and sources they employ. Acquisition may also be initiated by others, and policymakers and practitioners may not be fully cognizant of the research bases for the products, tools, or policy ideas that come into their hands.

2. How do policymakers and practitioners use research evidence? What role does research evidence play in policy or practice work? We are interested in better understanding the various ways research is used. Carol Weiss, Sandra M. Nutley, and Huw T.O. Davies offer descriptions of several types of research use. *Instrumental use* refers to instances in which research evidence is directly applied to decision-making. *Conceptual use* refers to situations in which research evidence influences or informs how policymakers and practitioners think about issues, problems, or potential solutions. *Tactical use*, related to strategic and symbolic uses, occurs when research evidence is used to justify existing positions such as supporting a piece of legislation or challenging a reform effort. *Imposed use*—recently defined by Carol H. Weiss—refers to situations in which there are mandates to use research evidence, such as when government funding requires that practitioners adopt programs backed by research evidence.

3. How do policymakers and practitioners interpret or make sense of research evidence? This includes understanding how research evidence is interpreted along with other sources of information (e.g., management information data, administrative records, test scores, practitioner knowledge, and expert opinions) and other considerations (e.g., values, fiscal constraints, and political context), and how these other factors affect interpretations of the relevance, validity, meaning, or implications of research evidence. This also includes how policymakers and practitioners appraise research evidence of different types and quality.

**Settings and Contexts**

The Foundation is focused on understanding how acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence of different types and qualities are shaped by the nature of policy and practice settings, intermediary organizations, and broader social, political, and economic contexts. These studies should be grounded in a strong understanding of policy and practice work (i.e., the demands and incentives of policy and practice work, the forces that impel and impede change, the role of intermediaries). For example, better understanding if and how research evidence influences policy ideas may require understanding the role of advocacy groups, legislative service agencies, and the broader political and economic contexts in which they operate. Better understanding how school districts acquire and use research evidence in making decisions may require knowledge of how decision-making is influenced by organizational culture and capacity, state and federal policy, and local context.
We are interested in four sets of research questions about settings and contexts.

1. What aspects of policy and practice settings affect acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence? Policy and practice settings include, but are not limited to federal, state, and local agencies, legislatures, and courts. We are particularly interested in understanding the organizational and institutional processes and conditions that affect research acquisition, interpretation, and use. Why are some organizations better able to acquire, interpret, or use research evidence than others? Studies might examine organizational culture, policies, capacity, and structure.

2. How do intermediary organizations affect the acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence? We define intermediary organizations as those that package and distribute research evidence for policymakers and practitioners and/or broker relationships between researchers and policymakers or practitioners. Intermediaries differ significantly in their missions, constituencies, target audiences, and brokering activities and include advocacy groups, professional associations, think tanks, governmental and non-governmental research organizations, commercial vendors, news organizations, and funders. Why are some intermediaries more effective than others in fostering the acquisition and use of research evidence?

3. How do interactions among policy or practice settings and intermediary organizations affect the acquisition, interpretation, and use of research evidence? Studies might examine how communication, relationships, or social networks across organizations affect research use. How does the composition of professional networks influence access to research evidence? How do networks facilitate the diffusion of policy ideas backed by research evidence across localities?

4. How do the broader political, economic, and social contexts in which policy and practice settings and intermediary organizations are embedded affect research acquisition, interpretation, and use? Studies might examine how a high-stakes accountability environment affects school districts’ use of research evidence and how state economies and budgets affect social service agencies’ acquisition and use of research about evidence-based programs.

Conclusion
We are grateful to the researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and funders who have helped shape our thinking and look forward to learning more as we begin to review applications from the RFP. We know that scholars working in this area need networks for learning and collaborating with others. As we begin to fund more research in this area, we plan to regularly bring together our grantees and other relevant experts. As we gain further insights, we will continue to share what we learn with others in the field. We encourage interested applicants to propose studies via our RFP, investigator-initiated grants, and Scholars program.

Vivian Tseng, Ph.D.,
Program Officer with the Senior Program Team

1. We are not focused on frontline practice as the focal unit of analysis in studies of research use. However, we are interested in those organizations and actors (e.g., school districts, agency leaders) whose roles include determining if and how research evidence gets used by the frontline practitioners (e.g., teachers, social workers) who interact directly with youth.
### Meeting Challenges: Year in Review

#### Functional Allocation of Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investment/Taxes</th>
<th>Program Services</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 1* Functional Allocation of Expenses
Meeting Challenges: Year in Review

Reflections
The past year came to a close in the middle of one of the worst economic downturns in recent history, and those of us in the philanthropic community who rely on the positive upsurge of the market to strengthen our endowments had reason to be concerned, as did our colleagues who depend on charitable donations. In 2007, I wrote that philanthropy was “alive and well.” That year, the top 50 U.S. donors gave record amounts of money. This renewed focus on philanthropy has given nonprofits new energy and resources for tackling current challenges. If there was any time for the momentum of giving to fall off, it would have been 2008. However, I am pleased to report that the philanthropic community has so far managed to maintain its successes, and with cooperation and strategic planning, will continue to do so.

During 2008, the upward trend in giving continued: America’s 50 most generous philanthropists donated record sums of more than $15.5 billion, in spite of the recession. The increase in donations from these philanthropists, as well as those from smaller donors, outpaced inflation last year.

We have entered an unprecedented era: baby boomers—though their retirement accounts may have been hit hard—have begun to spend their accumulated assets, and many are doing so in the form of donations to charitable causes. Together with more socially conscious young people, these donors and their record giving to philanthropic causes will likely continue for years to come.

Responding to the Challenge
During these tumultuous times, we can be sure that charities will be requesting increases in the aid they receive from philanthropic organizations, especially considering that most state and local governments will be cutting back on their funding to charities and other nonprofits. It is also clear that not all funders will be able to answer this call—approximately 25 percent of corporate giving has come from foundations tied to the banking and finance sector, and we expect a significant decrease in grantmaking by those organizations. Furthermore, because most large foundations look back at asset values over several years to determine their budgets (and hence grantmaking), overall giving may drop off in 2010 as well.

To counter this potential decrease, the Council on Foundations, the national umbrella organization of American foundations, has urged all who are able to follow the example of the Gates Foundation by increasing grantmaking in 2009. (Gates has pledged to increase its giving from $3.3 billion to $3.8 billion.) Other strategies being discussed by leaders in the field to combat the recession include revolving loan funds from foundations to charitable organizations, making fewer program-specific and more general support grants, and encouraging collaborations between charities to reduce costs and redundancy.

Some foundations have responded quickly and directly to the current economic environment, despite a steep decline in their own assets. For example, almost 50 foundations have committed more than $100 million to organizations that assist with foreclosure reduction, provide financial counseling, and provide services for the jobless and homeless. The Foundation Center, a research and educational authority on philanthropy, “expects that the commitment of foundations to their mission and grantees will remain strong throughout the current economic crisis, though the size of their grants budget will in many cases be affected.” A survey conducted by the Council on
Foundations quantifies this hypothesis, reporting that 47 percent of survey respondents plan to maintain current levels of funding or increase grantmaking in 2009.

The William T. Grant Foundation intends to continue our grantmaking at least at current levels and to maintain current commitments. We take seriously our mission and our responsibility to current and prospective grantees.

What We’re Doing
The Foundation’s annual budget is determined by taking 6 percent of the average of our total assets for the preceding 36-month period. For example, as of October 31, 2008, our assets averaged $302 million across the past 36 months, making our 2009 budget $18.1 million. Despite the significant downturn in the market in late 2008, this is actually larger than our 2008 budget of $17.3 million. We construct our budget on this 36-month cycle to mitigate the effects of normal market fluctuations.

Given the extraordinary nature of this downturn and the inevitable volatility in our portfolio performance, the board and staff have decided to review the market situation on a quarterly basis. If the Board of Trustees and management agree that a budget reduction is warranted during 2009, management has identified several budgeted
expenditures that can be reduced, delayed, or cancelled entirely. We will attempt to exhaust all viable cost-saving measures on administrative expenses before adjusting our grantmaking levels or our ongoing work with grantees. As you can see in Figure 1, since 2002 the Foundation has proudly put only 4 cents of each dollar toward administrative expenses, with 84 to 88 cents of each dollar spent on program services (mainly grantmaking). The remainder is spent on investment fees and taxes.

Our Finance and Investment Committee is composed of four sitting Board members plus two ex-officio members (president and Board chair) and is supported by the Foundation’s Finance and Administration staff. Sound investing principles including diversification, quality, and consistent oversight of managers are the hallmarks of the group’s work. The Committee makes the final decisions regarding our investment portfolio without the aid of consultants and takes its work seriously. During 2008, the Committee met 22 times—this includes regular quarterly gatherings and 18 other meetings with current or prospective investment management firms. The Committee abides by the asset allocation targets and ranges that it developed to optimize risk and return, but occasionally makes tactical rebalancing decisions outside of those ranges.

### Asset Allocation 2007 and 2008

- **US EQUITY** ........... 24.3%
- **GLOBAL EQUITY** ...... 15.4%
- **NON-US EQUITY** ...... 4.2%
- **EMERGING MARKETS** ... 7.3%
- **ALTERNATIVE** ........ 24.4%
- **PRIVATE EQUITY** ...... 9.0%
- **FIXED INCOME** ........ 14.6%
- **CASH** ................. 0.8%

$327,257,452
How We Fared
Despite the tireless efforts of the Committee, the Foundation was not immune to last year’s economic downturn. After managing a positive return through May of 2008, the portfolio’s value began declining in June and had lost 28.2 percent of its value by year-end. Unlike previous economic downturns, our portfolio experienced losses in almost every asset class: domestic and international equity, fixed income, and hedge funds. Only our private equity holdings showed positive performance for the year. That said, we are still performing as well, if not better than, our peers—a Council on Foundations survey revealed that the average decline for independent foundations was 28.7 percent and for foundations with assets exceeding $250 million, it was 28.5 percent.

Our asset allocation at December 31, 2008, (Figure 2) reflects the diversification for which we strive. This allocation did not change substantially in 2008, as the Committee has resisted making major changes in our asset allocation model that would amount to timing the market. (The Council on Foundations survey revealed that at least 60 percent of foundations have kept their target allocations steady since June 2008, and 25 percent of foundations reduced their equity target allocations in favor of fixed income and cash.) We are a perpetual foundation and want to be properly invested when this market downturn reverses, as it always does. Meanwhile, we constantly monitor our 40 funds across 29 different investment managers for performance, consistency, and assurance that they maintain a sound investment philosophy. Additionally, we are always looking for potential managers who might add value to our overall portfolio.

We are proud of the acumen of the Finance and Investment Committee. For annual periods 2004–2007, our portfolio fared very well against our peers. We ranked in the first decile for 2004, 2005, and 2006, and in the first quartile for 2007. Our actual portfolio performance and asset values for years 2004–2008 are shown in Figure 3.

Strategic Investments
During 2008, we continued to make strategic investments in our infrastructure. We are most proud to report that we made significant process in the ongoing upgrade of our online grants management system, making it more user-friendly for staff and grantees. In the coming year, we remain committed to supporting our current grantmaking and strengthening our infrastructure for the long run with technological upgrades to our grants management system, website, and phone system.

Outlook
The worldwide recession has ushered in an environment not seen in decades. There is no predicting how long we will have to endure these uncertain times. Now, more than ever, the William T. Grant Foundation is determined to maintain its presence in the philanthropic community. We believe that our financial and structural investments will help us weather the storm and enable us to withstand the volatility of the market. But that which truly sustains us is our work and our grantees. In that respect, we look forward to many happy returns.

Lawrence D. Moreland, M.B.A.
Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Assistant Treasurer
All of the Foundation’s funding mechanisms reflect our Current Research Interests, which focus on understanding and improving the settings of youth ages 8 to 25 in the United States. These settings include schools, youth-serving organizations, neighborhoods, families, and peer groups. Our interests in these settings are in two areas. We support studies of how settings work, how they affect youth development, and how they can be improved. We also fund research that strengthens our understanding of how and under what conditions research evidence is acquired, interpreted, and used to influence policies and practices that affect youth.

In the past year, we have refined our grantmaking strategy to better fit our interests and those of the field. Policymakers in Washington are focused on “what works,” specifically, supporting and implementing programs that have been proven through research evidence to have a positive impact on youth. We believe that this focus on “what works” is particularly constructive when it advances an understanding of why something works. We also believe the importance of our work and the “what works” agenda is in the ability of research to be clear about the processes and practices that cause improvements in important youth outcomes.

Funding Mechanisms
The relevance of research is determined by the user. To this end, in early 2009 we released an RFP for Understanding the Acquisition, Interpretation, and Use of Research Evidence in Policy and Practice. We issued this RFP with the goal of funding studies that will elucidate how policymakers and practitioners use research evidence in their work, with the hope that understanding these processes will help us and others support and encourage research that is ultimately useful to policymakers and practitioners.

The bulk of our grantmaking is devoted to high-quality empirical studies, which we solicit through our investigator-initiated grants program and RFPs. Letters of inquiry are accepted three times each year for our investigator-initiated grants and awards are made at our October and March
Board meetings. In 2008, we folded our RFP for Intervention Research into our investigator-initiated grants and wrote the above-mentioned RFP for the Use of Research Evidence.

We also awarded our first grants emanating from the RFP for Classroom Measurement. This RFP supports research on the quality and effectiveness of measurement tools. We believe that accurately measuring what goes on in classrooms is essential for identifying and then supporting the practices that are working for kids.

In 2008, we made our Distinguished Fellows Program, a pilot effort, a regular part of our grantmaking. This program supports influential mid-career researchers, policymakers, and practitioners by giving researchers the opportunity to immerse themselves in practice or policy settings and conversely, practitioners and policymakers the opportunity to work in research settings. The goal of the program is to help researchers understand the research needs of practitioners and policymakers, who in turn will gain the ability to discern and then use high-quality research.

Our second fellowship opportunity, the William T. Grant Scholars Program, supports promising early-career scholars from different disciplines who have demonstrated success in conducting high-quality research and are seeking to further develop their expertise. The Scholars choose mentors who can help them grow as researchers and expand their skill sets. The program’s goal is to enhance the training of the next generation of researchers and help them become more effective mentors as well.

Our Youth Service Improvement Grants (YSIG) program supports activities conducted by community-based organizations in the New York metropolitan area to improve the quality of services for young people ages 8 to 25. These are the only grants we offer for direct-service organizations.
Youth Service Improvement Grants

Our Youth Service Improvement Grants (YSIG) share the goal of our research grants: improving the lives of youth. Our YSIG grants support community-based organizations that have a direct impact on the daily experiences of young people ages 8 to 25. We focus on small to medium-size organizations that have already had some success, but lack the funds to make needed improvements.

Though the Foundation has been awarding small general-operating grants to local service organizations since 2000, it was this idea of more substantial grants dedicated to improvement projects that lead to the establishment of the YSIG program in 2006. Since then, we have awarded 26 grants of $25,000 each to youth-serving organizations in the New York metropolitan area. We remain impressed with the enthusiasm and ingenuity of these grantees, who are looking for ways to better serve their participants. In the current economic climate, local youth programs need more help than ever, and we are committed to keeping YSIG as a regular part of our grantmaking and continuing to improve the program’s guidelines and procedures.

We award YSIG grants twice a year, accepting applications each fall and spring. The YSIG grantees are a diverse group, offering services ranging from after-school arts, mentoring, and tutoring and college preparation programs, to support for youth with disabilities or those involved with the juvenile justice system. Grantees have proposed a wide variety of improvement projects, including training for staff working with difficult populations, curriculum development, and youth leadership training.

The YSIG program is also unique in that it is our only grant program administered entirely by Foundation staff members. A committee of non-senior staff reads all of the applications, discusses them thoroughly, and presents its recommendations to senior staff officers. As a Foundation that largely funds research, we believe that this program helps us stay grounded in the challenges and realities of those who are working every day to improve the lives of the youth.

In the current economic climate, local youth programs need more help than ever, and we are committed to keeping YSIG as a regular part of our grantmaking...
The William T. Grant Scholars Program, which began in 1982 as the Faculty Scholars, supports the professional development of promising early-career researchers. The program funds five-year research plans designed by the grantees and intended to help them expand their skills, knowledge, and abilities in a new discipline, content area, or method. The plans must be consistent with the Foundation’s Current Research Interests.

To help the Scholars in their research, the award also requires an accompanying mentoring plan, which will connect them to influential senior researchers. These mentoring relationships should help the Scholars develop the new skills, knowledge, and abilities described in their research plans.

The Foundation organizes several meetings each year for the grantees that focus on specific topics of interest (i.e., mixed-methods research, longitudinal studies, immigrant youth). The meetings further aid the Scholars’ development by providing a forum for discussion of their ongoing projects with Foundation staff, select consultants, and each other.

Since the program started, the Foundation has funded 134 early-career researchers from the social, behavioral, or health sciences. Many of these grantees have gone on to become influential in their fields and have significant impact on youth research, public policy, and practice.

Each year, four to six William T. Grant Scholars are selected by a committee of experts from different fields in a process separate from the Foundation’s other grantmaking. Each Scholar receives an award of $350,000 distributed over five years. Awards are made to the applicant’s institution, providing support of $70,000 per year.

Applications for 2010 awards are due on July 8, 2009. A brochure outlining the criteria, required documents, and application procedures is available on our website, www.wtgrantfoundation.org. You may also request a hard copy by emailing info@wtgrantfdn.org.
Scholars Selection Committee

Michael S. Wald, J.D., Chair
Jackson Eli Reynolds Professor of Law
Stanford 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.
(on leave in 2009)
Associate Professor of Sociology and
Urban Planning
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Greg J. Duncan, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor of Education
University of California at Irvine

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

Nancy Gonzales, Ph.D.
(new 2008-2009 Committee member)
Women and Philanthropy Dean’s
Distinguished Professor
Co-Director, Principal Research Core,
Prevention Research Center
Arizona State 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

Vonnie C. McLoyd, Ph.D.
(new 2008-2009 Committee member)
Stephen Baxter Distinguished Professor
Center for Developmental Science
University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill

Katherine S. Newman, Ph.D.
Malcolm Stevenson Forbes, Class of 1941
Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs
Director, The Global Network on Inequality
Princeton University

Robert C. Pianta, Ph.D.
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
on Early Childhood Education
Professor of Psychology
University of Virginia

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

Timothy Smeeding, Ph.D.
Director, Institute for Research on Poverty
Arts and Sciences Distinguished Professor
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Mercer L. Sullivan, Ph.D.
(term ended July 2008)
Associate Professor
School of Criminal Justice
Rutgers University

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

William T. Grant Scholars

2008–2013

Renee Boynton-Jarrett, M.D., Sc.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of General 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.
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
Johns Hopkins University
“Moving Matters: Residential Mobility, Neighborhoods and Family in the Lives of Poor Adolescents”

Alisa Hicklin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Political Science Department
University of Oklahoma
“Minority Student Success in Higher Education”

Brian Mustanski, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Departments of Psychiatry and Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago
“The Internet as a Setting for Sexual Health Development Among Gay Youth”

2007–2012

Christina Gibson-Davis, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy
Duke University
“Marriage and Parenthood in the Lives of Adolescents and Young Adults”

Nikki Jones, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
University of California, Santa Barbara
“Pathways to Freedom: How Young People Create a Life After Incarceration”

Nonie Lesaux, Ph.D.
Marie and Max Kargman Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
“Language Diversity and Literacy Development: Increasing Opportunities-to-Learn in Urban Middle Schools”

Dina Okamoto, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of California, Davis
“The Role of Community-Based Organizations in the Lives of Immigrant and Second-Generation Youth”

Sandra Simpkins, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Social and Family Dynamics
Arizona State University
“The Determinants of Mexican-Origin Adolescents’ Participation in Organized Activities: The Role of Culture, Settings, and the Individual”

2006–2011

Valerie Leiter, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Simmons College
“Transition to Adulthood Among Youth with Disabilities”

Emily Ozer, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
“Adolescents as Resources in School-Based Prevention”

Devah Pager, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Princeton University
“Barriers in the Pathway to Adulthood: The Role of Discrimination in the Lives of Young Disadvantaged Men”

Laura Romo, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara
“Designing Contextually Relevant Workshops to Enhance Latina Mother-Daughter Communication About Sexual Topics”

Kevin Roy, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Family Science Department
University of Maryland
“Intergenerational Influences on Men’s Transitions to Adulthood”

2005–2010

Rachel Dunifon, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Human Ecology
Cornell University
“The Role of Grandparents in the Lives of Adolescent Grandchildren”

Tama Leventhal, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Child Development
Tufts University
“Neighborhood Influences on Adolescent Development: Timing, Gender, and Processes”

Clark McKown, Ph.D.
Licensed Clinical Psychologist, Pediatrics
Associate Executive Director and Research Director
Rush University Medical Center
“The Social and Developmental Ecology of Academic Inequity”

Lisa D. Pearce, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
“Religion’s Role in the Shaping of Self-Image, Aspirations, and Achievement in Youth”

Renée Spencer, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Social Work
Boston University
“Understanding the Mentoring Process: A Longitudinal Study of Mentoring Relationships between Adolescents and Adults”

2004–2009

Emma Adam, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Education and Social Policy
Northwestern University
“Everyday Experiences, Physiological Stress, and the Emergence of Affective Disorders over the Transition to Early Adulthood”
Robert Crosnoe, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Texas at Austin
“Education as a Developmental Phenomenon”

Lisa Diamond, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Utah
“Positive Emotions in Parent-Child Interactions: Links to Psychological, Interpersonal, and Physiological Resiliency from Early to Late Adolescence”

Pamela Morris, Ph.D.
Director, Family Well-Being and Child Development Policy Area
MDRC
“Mental Health Treatment in the Context of Welfare Reform Policy: An Experimental Examination of the Effects of Maternal Depression on Children and Youth”

Jacob L. Vigdor, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy
Duke University
“Peer and Neighborhood Influences on Youth and Adolescent Development”

V. Robin Weersing, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Joint Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology
San Diego State University/
University of California, San Diego
“Developing and Disseminating Effective Interventions for Depression and Anxiety in Youth”

2003–2008

Edith Chen, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
Co-director, Psychobiology of Health Laboratory
University of British Columbia
“Socioeconomic Status, Stress, and Asthma in Childhood”

Patrick Heuveline, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Sociology
University of California, Los Angeles
“Family-State Alliances and their Impact on Youth Health and Well-Being: An International Perspective”

Marguerita Lightfoot, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Medicine
Center for Aids Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
“Maintenance Strategies for Homeless Youth’s Reduction in HIV Risk Acts”

Elizabeth Miller, M.D., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Pediatrics
University of California, Davis School of Medicine
“An Ethnographic Study of Adolescent Dating Violence: Developmental and Cultural Considerations”

Former William T. Grant Scholars
1982–2007

Kristen Harrison, Ph.D.
Ariel Kalil, Ph.D.
Jeffrey Kling, Ph.D.
Clea McNeely, Dr.PH.
Sean Reardon, Ed.D.

2002–2007

Elizabeth Goodman, M.D.
Gabriel Kuperminc, Ph.D.
Robert Roeser, Ph.D.
Stephen Russell, Ph.D.
Megan Sweeney, Ph.D.
Hiro Yoshikawa, Ph.D.

2001–2006

Tamera Coyne-Beasley, M.D.
Kathryn Grant, Ph.D.
Rukmalie Jayakody, Ph.D.
Anne Libby, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Moje, Ph.D.
Denise Newman, Ph.D.

2000–2005

Joshua Aronson, Ph.D.
Marilyn Augustyn, M.D.
Lisa Miller, Ph.D.
Cybele Raver, Ph.D.
Niobe Way, Ed.D.

1999–2004

William T. Grant Scholars

Many of these grantees have gone and have significant impact on youth
on to become influential in their fields research, public policy, and practice.
Distinguished Fellows Program

The use of research evidence is an important emerging theme of the Foundation’s work. Several years before we decided to specifically request proposals for studies on the use of research evidence, the Foundation developed a fellowship program that would use practical, on-site experience to educate policymakers, practitioners, and researchers about each other’s work and needs. Now in its fifth year, the William T. Grant Distinguished Fellows program facilitates cross-role understanding as a way to increase the likelihood that high-quality research will get produced and used.

Each year, the Foundation selects two to five William T. Grant Distinguished Fellows, all of whom are mid-career, influential researchers, policymakers, or practitioners. Fellows design their own fellowship experiences—researchers choose at least one policy or practice setting in which to immerse themselves for at least six months (though the fellowship activities can be spread out over a maximum of two years), and policymakers and practitioners choose research settings. Fellowship sites must agree to support the Fellows, giving them hands-on experience in unfamiliar terrain, as well as providing them with mentors and networks in the research or policy/practice fields. Fellows receive up to $175,000 for the duration of their fellowship, primarily to support their salary while they work in the new setting. To date, 16 Fellows have been funded to work in a new setting, including government agencies, advocacy organizations, and research institutions. Each has gained an understanding of the work of those in other fields that will help them be more effective when they return to their primary roles (see Brian Wilcox’s essay on page six for more grantee feedback and information on the program).

The Foundation expects that the Fellows program will contribute to the development of a growing group of well-rounded policymakers, practitioners, and researchers who will influence the way their organizations produce or use research. Armed with knowledge about what kind of research policymakers use and how they make decisions; the daily work of a practitioner and the ways in which they implement research; and/or the ins and outs of research production, each Fellow will return to her primary job with new ideas about how to create or use relevant research and will share that knowledge with their colleagues. The ultimate goal is that this sharing of information will facilitate stronger evidence-based policy and practice and have a positive impact on the everyday settings of American youth.

In 2008, the Foundation was pleased to award its most diverse group of Fellows yet, with two researchers, two policy professionals, and one practitioner. What started as a small pilot program in 2004 has grown into an important part of our grantmaking, and we look forward to its continued success. The fifth group of Distinguished Fellows will be awarded in November 2009.

The Fellows Program uses practical, on-site experience to educate policymakers, practitioners, and researchers about each other’s work and needs.
William T. Grant Distinguished Fellows

2005

Rob Geen, M.P.P.
*Child, Family, and Youth Policymaking from Behind the Scenes*
Child Trends
Fellowship site: Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives

Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
*Advancing Evidence-Based Reforms in Federal Programs Affecting Youth*
University of Illinois at Chicago
Fellowship site: Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy

Joanne Nicholson, Ph.D.
*Transforming the Child Welfare System to Improve Outcomes for Children and Youth Whose Parents Have Mental Illness*
University of Massachusetts Medical School
Fellowship sites: Massachusetts Department of Social Services and Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law

Jean Rhodes, Ph.D.
*Getting to the Heart and Soul of Mentoring: Advancing Research, Theory, and Practice Through Match Supervision*
University of Massachusetts, Boston
Fellowship sites: Big Sister of Greater Boston and Big Brother of Massachusetts Bay

Lauren Smith, M.D.
*Bridging Domains: The Intersection of Child and Youth Health and Well-Being and Public Policy*
Boston Medical Center, Boston University School of Medicine
Fellowship site: Office of the Speaker, Massachusetts State House

Constance Yowell, Ph.D.
*Designing Systems to Support Learning and Teaching Grounded in Evidence-Based Practices*
University of Chicago
Fellowship sites: National Writing Project and Chicago Public Schools

2006

Martha Holleman, M.A.
*Improving Conditions of Children and Youth in Distressed Urban Areas: National Framework, Local Experience*
Safe and Sound: Baltimore’s Campaign for Children and Youth
Fellowship site: Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, New York University

Robin Nixon, M.Ed.
*Making the Case for Extending Foster Care and Transition Services Beyond Age 18*
National Foster Care Coalition
Fellowship site: Chapin Hall Center for Children, University of Chicago

2007

Tamera Coyne-Beasley, M.D.
*The Prevention of School Violence: Creating Environments that are Safe and Conducive to Learning*
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Fellowship sites: National Students Against Violence Everywhere (SAVE) and Center for the Prevention of School Violence (CPSV), North Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

2008

Laurel Leslie, M.D.
*Addressing the Needs of Children in Child Welfare: Views from the Front Line*
Tufts Medical Center
Fellowship site: Massachusetts Department of Children and Families

Susan Maciolek, M.P.P.
*Improving Child Welfare Outcomes for Children and Families through Effective Service Systems*
Cutler Institute for Child and Family Policy, Muskie School of Public Service
University of Southern Maine
Fellowship site: Judge Baker Children’s Center

David Wallinga, M.D.
*Promoting Children’s Health by Building Healthier Food Environments*
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Fellowship site: University of Minnesota, School of Public Health: Division of Epidemiology and Community Health

Marc Wheeler, B.A.
Youth Mentoring Research Project
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Alaska
Fellowship site: Portland State University

Stanton Wortham, Ph.D.
*Involving Parents in the Schooling of Immigrant Mexican Students*
Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania
Fellowship site: Norristown Area School District
Children's PressLine

4.15 Follow-up question game
4.30 Write question writing
4.45 Interview (leave for interview)
5.01 Interview (interview)
5.15 Walk back
New and Active Grants in 2008

Capacity Building

William T. Grant Scholars

Everyday Experiences, Physiological Stress, and the Emergence of Affective Disorders over the Transition to Early Adulthood: A Longitudinal Study
Emma Adam, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
$300,000, 2004–2009
$20,000, 2006–2009

The Social Ecology of Adolescent Obesity: Defining the Role of Adverse Social Settings and Social Stress
Renee Boynton-Jarrett, M.D.
Boston Medical Center
$350,000, 2008–2013

Socioeconomic Status, Stress, and Asthma in Childhood
Edith Chen, Ph.D.
University of British Columbia
$300,000, 2003–2008
$10,000, 2006–2008

Education as a Developmental Phenomenon
Robert Crosnoe, Ph.D.
University of Texas at Austin
$300,000, 2004–2009
$20,000, 2006–2009

Moving Matters: Residential Mobility, Neighborhoods, and Family in the Lives of Poor Adolescents
Stefanie DeLuca, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University
$350,000, 2008–2013

Positive Emotions in Parent-Child Interactions
Lisa Diamond, Ph.D.
University of Utah
$300,000, 2004–2009
$60,000, 2004–2009
$20,000, 2006–2009

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

Marriage and Parenthood in the Lives of Adolescents and Young Adults
Christina Gibson-Davis, Ph.D.
Duke University
$350,000, 2007–2012

Family-State Alliances and Their Impact on Youth Health and Well-Being: An International Perspective
Patrick Heuveline, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$300,000, 2003–2008
$10,000, 2006–2008

Minority Student Success in Higher Education
Alisa Hicklin, Ph.D.
University of Oklahoma
$350,000, 2008–2013

Pathways to Freedom: How Young People Create a Life After Incarceration
Nikki Jones, Ph.D.
University of California, Santa Barbara
$350,000, 2007–2012

Transition to Adulthood Among Youth with Disabilities
Valerie Leiter, Ph.D.
Simmons College
$300,000, 2006–2011
$40,000, 2006–2011

Language Diversity and Literacy Development: Increasing Opportunities-to-Learn in Urban Middle Schools
Nonie Lesaux, Ph.D.
Harvard University
$350,000, 2007–2012

Neighborhood Influences on Adolescent Development: Timing, Gender, and Processes
Tama Leventhal, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University
$300,000, 2005–2010
$30,000, 2006–2010

Maintenance Strategies for Homeless Youth’s Reductions in HIV Risk Acts
Marguerita Lightfoot, Ph.D.
University of California, San Francisco
$300,000, 2003–2008
$10,000, 2006–2008

The Social and Developmental Ecology of Academic Inequity
Clark Mckown, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
$300,000, 2005–2010
$30,000, 2006–2010
$60,000, 2007–2009

An Ethnographic Study of Adolescent Dating Violence: Developmental and Cultural Considerations
Elizabeth Miller, Ph.D.
University of California, Davis
$300,000, 2003–2008
$10,000, 2006–2008

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.
MDRC
$300,000, 2004–2009
$20,000, 2006–2009

The Internet as a Setting for Sexual Health Development Among Gay Youth
Brian Mustanski, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
$350,000, 2008–2013

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, 2007–2012
$60,000, 2008–2010

Adolescents as Resources in School-Based Prevention: Effects on Program Outcomes and Youth Development
Emily Ozer, Ph.D.
University of California, Berkeley
$300,000, 2006–2011
$40,000, 2006–2011
$60,000, 2008–2010

Barriers in the Pathway to Adulthood: The Role of Discrimination in the Lives of Young Disadvantaged Men
Devah Pager, Ph.D.
Princeton University
$300,000, 2006–2011
$40,000, 2006–2011
Religion’s Role in the Shaping of Self-Image, Aspirations, and Achievement in Youth
Lisa Pearce, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
$300,000, 2005–2010
$30,000, 2006–2010

Designing Contextually Relevant Workshops to Enhance Latina Mother-Daughter Communication about Sexual Topics
Laura Romo, Ph.D.
University of California, Santa Barbara
$300,000, 2006–2011
$40,000, 2006–2011
$60,000, 2007–2009

Intergenerational Influences on Men’s Transitions to Adulthood
Kevin Roy, Ph.D.
University of Maryland
$300,000, 2006–2011
$40,000, 2006–2011

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, 2007–2012
$60,000, 2008, 2009

Understanding the Mentoring Process: A Longitudinal Study of Mentoring Relationships between Adolescents and Adults
Renee Spencer, Ed.D.
Boston University
$300,000, 2005–2010
$30,000, 2006–2010
$60,000, 2007–2009

Peer and Neighborhood Influences on Youth and Adolescent Development
Jacob Vigdor, Ph.D.
Duke University
$300,000, 2004–2009
$20,000, 2006–2009

Developing and Disseminating Effective Interventions for Depression and Anxiety in Youth
V. Robin Weersing, Ph.D.
San Diego State University
$300,000, 2004–2009
$20,000, 2007–2009

Distinguished Fellows

The Prevention of School Violence: Creating Environments that are Safe and Conducive to Learning
Tamera Coyne-Beasley, M.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
$197,199, 2007–2009

Promoting Evidence-Based Decision-Making in Youth Mentoring Programs
David DuBois, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
$196,917, 2007–2009

Child, Family, and Youth Policymaking from Behind the Scenes
Rob Geen, M.P.P.
Child Trends Incorporated
$175,000, 2005–2008

Advancing Evidence-Based Reforms in Federal Programs Affecting Youth
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago

Improving Conditions of Children and Youth in Distressed Urban Areas: National Framework, Local Experience
Martha Holleman, M.A.
Safe and Sound: Baltimore’s Campaign for Children and Youth
$178,725, 2006–2008

Addressing the Needs of Children in Child Welfare: Views from the Front Line
Laurel Leslie, M.D.
Tufts Medical Center
$174,975, 2008–2010

Improving Child Welfare Outcomes for Children and Families through Effective Service Systems
Susan Maciolek, M.P.P.
University of Southern Maine
$199,213, 2008–2010

Transforming the Child Welfare System to Improve Outcomes for Children and Youth Whose Parents Have Mental Illness
Joanne Nicholson, Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts Medical School
$212,657, 2005–2008

Making the Case for Extending Foster Care and Transition Services Beyond Age 18
Robin Nixon, M.Ed.
National Foster Care Coalition
$199,902, 2006–2008

Policy and Service Delivery for Youth in Probation, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Services
Abram Rosenblatt, Ph.D.
University of California, San Francisco
$199,940, 2007–2009

Promoting Children’s Health by Building Healthier Food Environments
David Wallinga, M.D.
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
$175,000, 2008–2010

Youth Mentoring Research Project
Marc Wheeler, B.A.
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Alaska
$164,581, 2008–2010

Youth Service Improvement Grants

Increasing Retention of Teen Reading Tutors
Anne Adler
Reading Excellence and Discovery (READ) Foundation
$25,000, 2008

Improving Global Issues Curriculum Comprehension and Regents Test Scores
Carole Artigiani
Global Kids
$25,000, 2008–2009

Improving Teen Leadership Curriculum
Susan Hall
Girls Quest
$25,000, 2008–2009
Improving Straight Talk and Emotional Health Prevention Program
Les Halpert
ICD-International Center for the Disabled
$25,000, 2008–2009

Improving the Relationship between Youth and Mentors
Robert Houck
Friends of the Children NY
$25,000, 2008–2009

Increasing GED Success for Teens and Young Women
Darlene Jeris
Grace Outreach
$25,000, 2008–2009

Improving Therapeutic Services Through Art and Computer Technology
Larry Lee
New York Asian Women’s Center
$25,000, 2008–2009

Improving Youth Leadership Capacity
Rachel Lloyd
Girls Educational and Mentoring Services (GEMS)
$25,000, 2008–2009

Math Curriculum Improvement Project
Matthew Mahoney
Operation Exodus-Inner City
$25,000, 2008–2009

Engaging Teens Through Structured Programming
Terry O’Connor
Cardinal Shehan Center
$25,000, 2008

Improving Reading Tutor Training
Tanya Ramos
Literacy, Inc. (LINC)
$25,000, 2008–2010

Educational Services Capacity Building Project
Isis Sapp-Grant
Youth Empowerment Mission
$25,000, 2008–2010

Improving Teens’ Journalism Skills Through Writing
Michael Schreibman
Children’s PressLine
$25,000, 2008

Middle Grades Improvement Project
Maria Torres
THE POINT Community Development Corporation
$25,000, 2008–2009

Research Methods and Infrastructure

A Proposal to Archive the Beginning School Study Qualitative Data
Karl Alexander, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University
$25,000, 2008
$13,000, 2008–2009

Analysis of Intra-Classroom Correlation: Implication for Random Assignment
Jane Hannaway, Ph.D.
Urban Institute
$54,299, 2008–2009

Design and Conduct Rigorous Impact Studies: Lessons from the What Works Clearinghouse
Rebecca Herman, Ph.D.
American Institutes for Research
$25,000, 2008–2009

Building Capacity to Evaluate Group-Level Interventions
Stephen Raudenbush, Ed.D.
University of Chicago
Howard Bloom, Ph.D.
MDRC
$250,000, 2006–2007
$250,000, 2006–2007
$280,000, 2007–2008
$57,500, 2008–2009
$270,000, 2008–2009

Qualitative Consulting Service for Supporting Mixed Method Research, William T. Grant Scholars Program
Thomas Weisner, Ph.D.
Eli Lieber, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
$11,643, 2008–2009
Other

Advancing Evidence-Based Reforms in Social Programs Affecting American Youth
Jonathan Baron, J.D., M.P.A.
Council for Excellence in Government
$150,000, 2005–2009
$50,000, 2006–2009
$200,000, 2007–2009

Indicators of Social Context and the Child Trends DataBank: A Midcourse Review
Brett Brown, Ph.D.
Child Trends Incorporated
$25,000, 2006–2008

NYRAG Diversity in Philanthropy Project
Ronna Brown
New York Regional Association of Grantmakers
$15,000, 2008–2009

Improving Adolescent Health—Training the Next Generation of Physician Scientists in Transdisciplinary Research
S. Jean Emans, M.D.
Children’s Hospital
$25,000, 2008–2009

Productive Measures of Program Features and Practices at Scale: A Convening
Lucy Friedman, Ph.D.
The After-School Corporation
$18,720, 2008

Society for Prevention Research 2008 Annual Meeting: Context in Prevention Science
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
Society for Prevention Research
$10,000, 2008–2009

Enhanced SBM Model Design
Keoki Hansen, M.A.
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
$25,000, 2008–2009

Theory to Practice—Connecting OST Theory and Methods: A Special Symposium and Reception at the AERA Conference
Sara Hill, Ed.D.
American Educational Research Association, Out-of-School Time Special Interest Group
$5,000, 2009

Workshop on Advancing InterAmerican Collaboration in Human Development Research, Methodology, and Training
Brett Laursen, Ph.D.
International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development
$4,500, 2007–2008

SRCD Fellowship Anniversary Event
Mary Ann McCabe, Ph.D.
Society for Research in Child Development
$6,500, 2008–2009

SRA Young Scholars Program
Vonnie Mcloyd, Ph.D.
Society for Research on Adolescence
Andrew Fuligni, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
Cleopatra Caldwell, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
$20,000, 2007–2008

Bridging Research, Policy and Practice in the Allied Youth Fields 2006–2008
Karen Pittman
Nicole Yohalem, M.Ed.
Impact Strategies, Inc.
$5,000, 2007–2008

Evaluating the Impact of Education Grants: A Seminar to Help Improve the Effectiveness of Education Philanthropy
William Porter
Chris Tebben
Grantmakers for Education

SRCD Congressional Fellowship Program
Lonnie Sherrod, Ph.D.
Mary Ann McCabe, Ph.D.
Society for Research in Child Development
$374,073, 2006–2009

Social Networks and EBP Implementation in Public Youth-Serving Systems
Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.
University of Southern California
$25,000, 2008–2009

Innovation and the Use of Research Evidence in Public Youth-Serving Agencies: Phase I
Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.
University of Southern California
$180,179, 2009

Use Of Research Evidence

Descriptive

Evidence Use in the Sex Education Debates: The Interacting Roles of Values, Beliefs, and Collateral Information
Norman Constantine, Ph.D.
Carmen Nevarez, M.D.
Public Health Institute Research
$338,796, 2006–2009

Improving the Quality, Use, and Utility of Social Science Research
Michael Feuer, Ph.D.
Martin Orland, Ph.D.
National Academy of Sciences
$350,019, 2006–2009

Determining the Role of Scientific Evidence in Educational Policy and Practice
Steven Nelson, Ph.D.
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Jim Kohlmoos
NEKIA Center for Knowledge
Use in Education

Social Networks and EBP Implementation in Public Youth-Serving Systems
Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.
University of Southern California
$25,000, 2008–2009

Innovation and the Use of Research Evidence in Public Youth-Serving Agencies: Phase I
Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.
University of Southern California
Patricia Chamberlain, Ph.D.
Oregon Social Learning Center
$180,179, 2009
Communications/Advocacy

League of California Afterschool Providers Best Practice Symposia
Steve Amick
LA’s BEST (fiscal agent)
$50,000, 2008–2009

From Child Welfare to Child Well-Being: A Book in Honor of Al Kahn
Asher Ben-Arieh, Ph.D.
Clemson University
$5,000, 2008–2009

Using Research to Inform the Policy Process to Enhance the Quality of After-School Programs
Betsy Brand
Caroline Christodoulidis, M.A.
American Youth Policy Forum
$150,000, 2007–2009

Dissemination of Positive Youth Development Findings
Joseph Durlak, Ph.D.
Loyola University
Roger Weissberg, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
$25,000, 2006–2007
$8,050, 2007–2008

Advancing Quality After-School Programs
Jodi Grant, J.D.
Afterschool Alliance
$200,000, 2006–2008
$300,000, 2006–2008
$300,000, 2008–2010

Policy and Practice in Education: Using Evidence for a Change
Jim Kohlmoos
NEKIA Center for Knowledge Use
$25,000, 2007–2008

Improving After-School Program Quality
Jennifer Peck
Bay Area Partnership
$120,314, 2008–2010

Raising the Visibility of Children and Youth Issues in the 2007–2008 Presidential Campaign
Michael Petit, M.S.W.
Every Child Matters Education Fund
$300,000, 2006–2008

Coverage of Youth-Related Issues on NPR
Melissa Thompson, M.A.
National Public Radio
$250,000, 2007–2009

Figuring out the Merit in Merit Pay: A Report on Public School Teacher Evaluation
Thomas Toch, M.A.
Education Sector
$25,000, 2007–2008
$15,000, 2008–2009

Strengthen Youth Today’s Investigative Research Capabilities
William Treanor, M.Ed.
Patrick Boyle, M.A.
American Youth Work Center
$150,000, 2007–2009

Dissemination of Research on Parental Employment and Youth Development to Policymakers and Influentials
Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Ph.D.
Harvard University
$24,210, 2007–2008

The Edward Zigler Center in Child Development and Social Policy
Edward Zigler, Ph.D.
Yale University
$25,000, 2009

Other

Protecting Students’ Records and Facilitating Education Research: A Workshop
Constance Citro, Ph.D.
The National Academies
$25,000, 2007–2008

Will Power to Youth
Jon Gossett, M.A.
American Public Media
$25,000, 2006–2008

Book on School-age Child Care in America
Edward Zigler, Ph.D.
Yale University
$25,000, 2006–2008
Understanding and Improving Youth Settings

Descriptive

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

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

Outcomes for Former Foster Youth During the Transition to Independence
Mark Courtney, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$341,083, 2004–2008

Children’s Emotional Competence: Pathway to Mental Health?
Susanne Denham, Ph.D.
George Mason University
$300,000, 2002–2008

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

Fear of Failure and the Middle School Transition
Andrew Elliot, Ph.D.
University of Rochester
$178,419, 2004–2008
$25,000, 2007–2008

The Role of Youth Settings in Young Adult Development: The Ecological Context of Rural Poverty
Gary Evans, Ph.D.
Cornell University
$315,583, 2005–2008
$406,399, 2009–2013

Fragile Families and Child Well-Being
Irwin Garfinkel, Ph.D.
Columbia University
$733,882, 1998–2008

The Role of Family and Community-Related Experience in the Development of Young People’s Economic Understanding
Lawrence Gianinno, Ph.D.
Tufts University
$199,961, 2005–2008

Legacies of Crime: Mechanisms Underlying Intergenerational Transmission
Peggy Giordano, Ph.D.
Bowling Green State University
$25,000, 2008–2009

Neighborhood Context and Youth Development: Current Knowledge and Future Recommendations
Deborah Gorman-Smith, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago
$25,000, 2006–2009

In Search of Structure: A Theory-Based, Mixed-Methods Examination of Parental Structure in Families of Young Adolescents
Wendy Grolnick, Ph.D.
Esteban Cardemil, Ph.D.
Clark University
$322,616, 2008–2011

Outcomes for Adopted Youth
Harold Grotevant, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota
$100,000, 2005–2009

Parental Socialization Influences on Academic Engagement and Performance Among African American, Chinese, and Dominican Adolescents
Diane Hughes, Ph.D.
New York University
$498,480, 2004–2008

Processes of Developmental Change in Youth Development Settings
Reed Larson, Ph.D.
David Hansen, Ph.D.
Robin Jarrett, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Growth Zones: Positive Development in Adolescence
Reed Larson, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
$25,000, 2007–2010

Estimating Neighborhood Effects on Low-Income Youth
Jens Ludwig, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
Brian Jacob, Ph.D.
Harvard University
Jeffrey Smith, Ph.D.
University of Maryland

Dreamers and Dropouts: Charting the Educational Trajectories of Inner City Students
Katherine Newman, Ph.D.
Nicholas Ehrmann
Princeton University
$25,000, 2007–2010

Social Context and Immigrant Adaptation
Krista Perreira, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Achievement/Adjustment Paradox: Understanding Psychological Adjustment of High-Achieving Chinese American High School Students
Desiree Qin, Ed.D.
Michigan State University
$25,000, 2006–2008

Everyday Life and Susceptibility to Upper Respiratory Infections
Theodore Robles, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
$500,000, 2009–2012

The Chicago Post-Secondary Transition Project
Melissa Roderick, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$317,394, 2004–2008

School Disciplinary Climate and Its Relationship to Educational and Community Outcomes for African American Students
Russell Skiba, Ph.D.
Dionne Danns, Ph.D.
Indiana University
$189,996, 2007–2009
Assimilation and Early Adulthood Among Children of Immigrants: Gendered Ethnicity, Moral Career Narratives, and Constructed Contexts
Robert Smith, Ph.D.
Baruch College
$199,031, 2005–2009
$25,000, 2008–2009

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

Transition To Middle School: Changes in Aggression
Hongling Xie, Ph.D.
Temple University
$252,478, 2005–2008

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.
New York University
$450,000, 2004–2008

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

Intervention RFP: Using Emotional Literacy to Improve Youth-Serving Organizations
Marc Brackett, Ph.D.
Susan Rivers, Ph.D.
Peter Salovey, Ph.D.
Yale University
$1,594,182, 2007–2011
$216,038, 2007–2011
$178,599, 2008–2011

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 Zuniga, Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts
$605,419, 2005–2009

After-School Programs for High School Students: An Evaluation of After School Matters
Barton Hirsch, Ph.D.
Larry Hedges, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
$843,729, 2007–2010

Challenging Under-Served Children to Achieve Academic Excellence
Maureen Holla
Robert Tagle, M.A.
Higher Achievement Program
Jean Grossman, Ph.D.
Public/Private Ventures
$750,000, 2006–2009

Project READS: Proposal for Multi-District Randomized Controlled Trial of a Voluntary Summer Reading Intervention
James Kim, Ed.D.
Harvard University
Jonathan Guryan, Ph.D.
University of Chicago
$520,968, 2007–2008
$88,033, 2008–2009

Phase One Project Examining Setting-Level Capacity Building on After-School Programs
Greg Meissen, Ph.D.
Scott Wituk, Ph.D.
Wichita State University
$100,000, 2006–2008
$150,000, 2007–2008

The Cost-Effectiveness of Project STAR
Peter Muennig, M.D.
Columbia University
$25,000, 2007–2008

Trial of Intervention to Increase Participant Retention in Home Visiting
David Olds, Ph.D.
University of Colorado
$574,977, 2005–2008
### Intervention RFP: The Impact of School-Based Prevention on Friendship Networks and Peer Influence

**D. Wayne Osgood, Ph.D.**  
Mark Feinberg, Ph.D.  
Scott Gest, Ph.D.  
Pennsylvania State University  
$500,000, 2007–2010

### Comprehensive Evaluation of the Making Meaning™ Reading Comprehension Program

**Eric Schaps, Ph.D.**  
Developmental Studies Center  
David P. Pearson, Ph.D.  
University of California, Berkeley  
$916,026, 2005–2009

### The High/Scope Youth Program Quality Intervention for After-School Programs

**Charles Smith, Ph.D.**  
Marijata Daniel-Echols, Ph.D.  
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation  
Laurie Van Egeren, Ph.D.  
Michigan State University  
$850,000, 2006–2009  
$202,644, 2007–2009

### Intervention RFP: Improving the Behavioral Environment of After-School Settings

**Emilie Smith, Ph.D.**  
Pennsylvania State University  
$125,000, 2006–2008

### Youth Sport Social Systems

**Ronald Smith, Ph.D.**  
Frank Smoll, Ph.D.  
University of Washington  
$483,387, 2002–2010  
$53,027, 2004–2010

### Intervention RFP: The Impact of Self-Assessment on After-school Program Quality

**Robert Stonehill, Ph.D.**  
Neil Naftzger  
Learning Point Associates  
Johannes Bos, Ph.D.  
Berkeley Policy Associates  
$100,000, 2007–2008  
$241,047, 2008–2009

### Measurement Development

**Assessing Instructional Content and Interactions At-Scale**  
**Richard Correnti, Ph.D.**  
**Lindsay C. Matsumura, Ph.D.**  
University of Pittsburgh  
Laura Hamilton, Ph.D.  
RAND Corporation  
$399,831, 2008–2012

**Teaching Practices, Classroom Peer Ecologies, and Youth Outcomes**  
**Scott Gest, Ph.D.**  
**Thomas Farmer, Ph.D.**  
**D. Wayne Osgood, Ph.D.**  
Pennsylvania State University  
Philip Rodkin, Ph.D.  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
$399,367, 2008–2011

**Toward an Understanding of Classroom Context: A Validation Study**  
**Drew Gitomer, Ph.D.**  
**Courtney Bell, Ph.D.**  
Educational Testing Service  
$531,095, 2008–2011

**The Direct, Indirect and Moderating Effects of Organizational Climate in Child Welfare Agencies**  
**Charles Glisson, Ph.D.**  
University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
$150,000, 2007–2009

**Enhancing High-Quality Observation Instruments**  
**Thomas Good, Ph.D.**  
Mary McCaslin, Ph.D.  
Darrell Sabers, Ph.D.  
Caroline Wiley, Ph.D.  
University of Arizona  
$25,000, 2008–2009

**Making a Difference: Examining Classrooms Practices in Middle School English Language Arts**  
**Pam Grossman, Ph.D.**  
**Susanna Loeb, Ph.D.**  
Stanford University  
$188,446, 2008–2010

**Setting-Level Norms for Prosocial Problem-solving among Middle-school Students**  
**David Henry, Ph.D.**  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
$25,000, 2008

### Improving the Measurement of Classroom Mathematics Instruction

**Heather Hill, Ph.D.**  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
**Robin Jacob, Ph.D.**  
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research  
**Geoffrey Phelps, Ph.D.**  
University of Michigan  
School of Education  
$400,000, 2009–2012

**Measuring Quality Assessment in Science Classrooms through Artifacts and Self-Report**  
**Jose Felipe Martinez, Ph.D.**  
UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies  
**Hilda Borko, Ph.D.**  
Stanford University  
$394,775, 2009–2011

### Empirical and Theoretical Issues in Classroom Observation: Creating Practical Tools for School-Based Researchers and Practitioners

**Robert Pianta, Ph.D.**  
**Jason Downer, Ph.D.**  
**Bridget Hamre, Ph.D.**  
**Andrew Mashburn, Ph.D.**  
University of Virginia  
$200,000, 2007–2009

### Other

**Videotaping as a Training Tool in After-School Programs**  
**Lucy Friedman, Ph.D.**  
The After-School Corporation  
$25,000, 2008–2009

**Building the Capacity of High School After-School Programs**  
**Sam Piha, M.S.W.**  
Bay Area Partnership  
$25,000, 2007–2008

**CLASS-Based Professional Development in Social and Emotional Learning**  
**Tom Roderick**  
Morningside Center for Teaching Social Responsibility  
$25,000, 2007–2008

**Special Initiative: Research Planning in Youth Civic Engagement**  
**Lonnie Sherrod, Ph.D.**  
Fordham University  
2008 Reviewers

Our reviewers come from diverse disciplines and include researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. We thank them for helping us recognize and fund high-quality proposals.
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The Foundation’s Board of Trustees provides us with invaluable expertise and guidance as we work to advance our mission. The Board contains four committees—Audit and Budget, Executive, Finance and Investment, and Program—that oversee all aspects of the Foundation, including grantmaking, investments, officer and trustee appointment and review, annual priorities, and budgets. This diverse, accomplished group, which includes researchers, academics, practitioners, and finance professionals, meets four times each year, although the Committees can and do meet more often.

Among the highlights of the Board’s work in 2008 was an examination of the Foundation’s efforts on the use of research evidence. Board members posited thought-provoking questions that helped the Senior Program Team hone the RFP and our thinking about this topic. The Board also spent time reviewing and discussing the Foundation’s priorities and our program strategies. They were particularly interested in efforts to increase the impact of our work and the percentage of high-quality applications we receive for our research grants. In addition, the Finance and Investment Committee met more than 20 times with various portfolio managers and senior staff to ensure that our investment strategy remained sound.

All committees are appointed annually, along with the secretary, treasurer, chair, and vice chair. At the end of 2008, Henry Gooss was appointed Board Chair, following the successful chairmanship of Gary Walker. Mr. Gooss has guided our investment strategy for several years and is poised to lead the Foundation through the current financial climate.

J. Lawrence Aber, Ph.D., is professor of applied psychology and public policy at New York University’s Steinhardt School and Board Chair of the school’s new Institute for Human Development and Social Change. In 2006, he was appointed by the Mayor of New York City to the Commission for Economic Opportunity. Dr. Aber received his Ph.D. from Yale University.

Paula Allen-Meares, Ph.D., became chancellor of the University of Illinois at Chicago in January 2009, where she is also the John Corbally Presidential Professor. She is author or co-author of more than 100 publications, serves on several editorial boards, and is a current Trustee and Fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine. Dr. Allen-Meares received her Ph.D. from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Michael Casserly, Ph.D., has been the executive director of the Council of the Great City Schools since 1992, and worked as their director of legislation and research for 15 years prior. He is the author of “Beating the Odds,” the first U.S. report on urban school performance on state tests, among numerous other reports and studies on urban education. Dr. Casserly received his Ph.D. from the University of Maryland.
Henry E. Gooss *(Vice Chair, Treasurer)* is senior adviser to 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 received his M.B.A. from New York University.

**Robert C. Granger, Ed.D. (President)** has been president of the William T. Grant Foundation since 2003. He joined the Foundation in 2000 as senior vice president for program. His previous positions include senior vice president of MDRC and executive vice president at Bank Street College of Education. He received his Ed.D. from the University of Massachusetts.

Lisa Hess was the chief investment officer for the Loews Corporation from 2002 through 2008. She is also a regular contributor to *Forbes* magazine. She 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 received her M.B.A. from the University of Chicago.

Christine James-Brown became president and CEO of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) in April 2007. She previously served as president of United Way International since 2004, and before that she spent 10 years as president and CEO of United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Ph.D., is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania’s Annenberg School for Communication, and director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center. An expert on political campaigns, Dr. Jamieson has authored or co-authored 15 books to date. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bridget A. Macaskill was named president and COO of Arnhold and S. Bleichroeder Advisers, LLC, in early 2009. For several years prior, she served as principal of BAM Consulting LLC, an independent financial services consulting firm, which she founded. Ms. Macaskill was formerly the President, COO, CEO, and Chairman of Oppenheimer Funds, Inc. Currently, she is a member of the board of directors of Prudential plc, and is a trustee for the TIAA-CREF funds and the CREF accounts.

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 received her Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin.

Russell Pennoyer *(Secretary)* is president of Benedetto, Gartland & Company, Inc. He was formerly an executive of American Exploration Company and also served as an associate with Davis Polk & Wardwell. He received his J.D. from 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 received his Ph.D. from UW-Madison.

Gary Walker *(Chair)* is president emeritus at Private/Public Ventures. He joined the organization in 1986 and served as president from 1995 to 2006. Previously, Mr. Walker was senior vice president of MDRC and worked with the Vera Institute of Justice. His work on demonstration projects that hired the hard-to-employ has helped shape current welfare and social service policy.
## Foundation Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Brewster</td>
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**Children's PressLine**

Children's PressLine (CPL) is a nonprofit youth media organization with a 33-year legacy of reporting on issues of national importance. CPL trains underrepresented youth ages 8 to 18 to advocate for children around the world through the power of journalism. CPL recruits, trains, and leads young journalists to execute all facets of journalistic work, including story development, research, reporting, interviewing, and writing articles for their media partners. The print, broadcast, radio, and online pieces the reporters create are disseminated through CPL's mainstream news partners and established media outlets, allowing their work to reach millions of adults. Story content focuses on current events as interpreted from a youth perspective and provides a valuable public service.

In the past, Children's PressLine has focused on oral journalism, having youth dictate their stories to staff members who transcribe the written articles. However, teen participants told CPL staff that they wanted to be more involved in the writing component of the journalism process. CPL is using their YSIG grant to hire a writing coach who will develop and implement a teen writing curriculum. The writing coach will work with students to improve their writing skills, and the students will begin to write traditional news articles.

**The POINT**

Located in the Hunts Point neighborhood of the south Bronx, THE POINT Community Development Corporation provides comprehensive after-school programming for local youth and is committed to the economic and cultural revitalization of Hunts Point. THE POINT’s programming includes visual arts, theater, music, dance, and their own radio station. The POINT has also partnered with the International Center of Photography (ICP) and Cirque du Monde (a division of Cirque du Soleil) to offer youth unique workshops in photography and circus performance. THE POINT operates every day after-school and also has a variety of summer programs.

THE POINT currently offers the Middle Grades Program after-school to middle-school youth. It consists of the ICP photography program and a mix of homework help, arts, and recreation. The latter portion of the program does not draw and retain as many participants as other POINT offerings, and staff believed this is because the activities are too similar those in THE POINT’s Early Grades Program. THE POINT will use their YSIG grant to implement *Real Stories: Real Teens*, an age-appropriate curriculum that promotes reading and reflection and provides opportunities for youth to design their own activities.
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