TALKING THE WALK:

A REPORT FROM THE FOUNDATION FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT OCTOBER 2004
WHAT WE MEAN BY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS: STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS SERVES A FOUNDATION’S INSTITUTIONAL GOALS. THE GOALS OF A STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS PLAN PARALLEL THOSE OF A FOUNDATION. THE PLAN DEFINES AUDIENCES AND DEVELOPS MESSAGES BASED ON WHOM A FOUNDATION HOPES TO REACH IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE ITS OBJECTIVES. THE PLAN PROPOSES AN INTEGRATED STRATEGY THAT USES A VARIETY OF TACTICS TO INFLUENCE THE TARGETED CONSTITUENCIES. THESE TACTICS INCLUDE MEDIA RELATIONS, NETWORKING, ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO GRANTEES, AND ORGANIZING CAMPAIGNS AND CONFERENCES.
Chair’s Message

Embracing Communications as a Core Strategy

The 2003-2004 Foundation for Child Development Annual Report, Talking the Walk, is the second in our series highlighting a key dimension of our mission: to understand children, particularly the disadvantaged, and to promote their well-being. The Board of Directors advocates communications as a core strategy for advancing this mission. Through our communications activities, we believe we will strengthen the political will necessary to bring about social change for children and families.

How are we doing this? The Board of Directors’ wealth of professional experience and leadership in communications undergirds FCD’s evolving communications strategy as it gains traction and momentum. Under President Ruby Takanishi’s leadership, we have a legacy of focused grantmaking in communications. These include the Journalism Fellowships in Child and Family Policy at the University of Maryland where working journalists gain greater substantive expertise in child policy issues; establishing the Work and Family Desk at Marketplace, a nationally syndicated broadcast program on public radio; providing opportunities through the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Mass Media Science and Engineering Fellowship for graduate students in human development to have intensive experiences in the media; and working with our grantees to disseminate their work.

FCD’s support of the journalism fellowships, in particular, is resulting in a cadre of journalists and researchers who are well-informed about FCD’s core issues. The AAAS Fellowships train advanced graduate students in translating the complex ideas in their fields into accessible, newsworthy stories for the general public. Working with media professionals gives fellows the opportunity to participate directly in all aspects of news-making, from editorial decision-making, to writing, to dissemination. The program strengthens the relationship between research and media, and between researchers and journalists, to enhance public awareness of social issues informed by scientific research.

FCD’s Journalism Fellowships in Child and Family Policy focuses on established media professionals and deepens their understanding and coverage of child and family policy issues. With over 100 fellows to date (see listing in this report) in nearly every region of the United States, and from nearly every type of media outlet, the program is contributing to the public’s awareness of policies that influence children’s well-being in both the long- and short-term. These fellows also are resources for each other and for scholars, policy makers and advocates who might benefit from having access to a growing network of child and family policy journalists.

FCD’s major media event this year was the release of the FCD Index of Child Well-Being (CWI), which received national media attention. (For more information about the CWI, please refer to FCD’s new website, www.fcd-us.org.) Our long-term goal is to secure the CWI as the main indicator of the well-being of American children and youth, just as we look to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for a sense of the state of the nation’s economy. Consistent with our Strategic Communications strategy, the CWI will be released annually to call attention to child and youth well-being and contribute to public debate about policy solutions.

The Board’s strong support of FCD’s communications work during the past year demonstrates our dedication to talk our walk. I am confident that the Foundation for Child Development will continue its contributions to social change for children as we embark on this new phase of stronger commitment to Strategic Communications.

P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale
Chair
The Foundation for Child Development (FCD) is at a turning point. Years of discussions among Board and Council members – which began well before I arrived in 1996 – led to the conclusion that FCD must now talk the walk to be consistent with our tagline: “Connecting Research with Policy for Social Change Since 1900.” If we are to truly be agents of social transformation, the time has come to change how we communicate about our work and our goals. No longer will we call on our grantees alone to be the translators and communicators of their important work. Now, FCD will also put itself on the line, moving away from the traditional philanthropic approach to communications toward a different approach, called Strategic Communications.

Strategic Communications goes beyond current efforts by many foundations to be more transparent organizations to the public. It goes beyond publicizing the good work of grantees. Strategic communications seeks to promote social ideas, to mobilize decision-makers and key stakeholders around policy options and solutions, and to create social movements for desired changes. Going forward, all of our communications and media grants, as well as our foundation-generated communications, will be closely aligned with FCD’s signature programs for maximum impact on policy change for children and their families.

What does this mean practically, to implement a strategic communications approach? At FCD, it means we will target our resources toward reaching key decision-makers about our ideas for creating a new first level of public education in the United States. To achieve this, the FCD Board created the new position of Director of Strategic Communications. Staff launched FCD’s third-generation web site (www.FCD-US.org) signaling our intention to influence the hearts and minds of all web-users who seek to influence the life prospects of children. We are reviewing the Foundation’s grants in media and communications (Listed in this Report on pages 20 to 22), which constitute about 17 percent of FCD’s grants awarded from 1997-2004, to ensure they are focused on our priorities.

As we develop our first strategic communications plan, we seek to learn from the experiences of other Children, Youth and Family (CYF) foundations. For this Report, the Foundation commissioned journalist Patricia Edmonds to write an analytic, independent essay, urging her to be bold, if not provocative, about the experiences of other CYF foundations thus far, both their successes and their failures. Edmonds focused her inquiry on attempts both to explain the rationale behind the strategic approach to communications as well as the methods currently in practice to implement and evaluate a successful strategic communications strategy. She comes to the sobering appraisal that, for most CYF foundations, connecting their aspirations for strategic grantmaking with that for strategic communications is in its infancy: Foundations, FCD included, aiming to make this connection are flying airplanes as they are building them.

Strategic communications aimed at children’s well-being is a new philanthropic frontier. While FCD recognizes that changing the role of communications in philanthropic organizations poses risks and creates the possibility of becoming controversial, we welcome the opportunity to be more effective. FCD is a small foundation that seeks to speak with a louder voice. Too much is at stake for too many children and their families for us not to talk our walk. Our choice is clear.

Ruby Takanishi
President and CEO
“FOUNDATIONS OPERATE ON CHANGE THEORIES – THEY THINK IF THEY EDUCATE NEW CLASSES OF PEOPLE, OR DO RESEARCH AND PUBLISH IT, OR WORK WITH COMMUNITY GROUPS, OR ADVOCATE WITH POLICYMAKERS DIRECTLY, THAT WILL CHANGE WHAT THEY WANT TO CHANGE IN THE WORLD

...EVERYBODY FLIES BY THE SEAT OF THEIR PANTS.”

FRANK KAREL
To improve the lives of America’s children, youth and families, thousands of U.S. foundations invest passion, brainpower and several billion dollars a year. Yet, according to Stephanie McGencey, executive director of Grantmakers for Children, Youth and Families, even big foundations often feel they are “this tiny voice in this huge wilderness and no one can hear us.” Philanthropic leaders are wondering why that is. Perhaps the wilderness is so huge because many foundations continue to communicate much as they always have - very quietly, behind the scenes, as the money behind the action.

However, some have begun to adapt a more direct, intentional communications approach aimed at galvanizing public support for better child and family policy, research, and programs. They no longer want to simply fund the efforts that might eventually get noticed by a journalist or shape the course of legislation. They are no longer satisfied with doing only what the vernacular calls “walking the walk” – the vital, fundamental work of supporting good programs and producing good research data. They also want to “talk the walk” – to aggressively transmit and translate the knowledge they’ve developed, to influence the public agenda. A small but growing number of children, youth and families foundations want to effect social change themselves. They’re at the vanguard of a movement that’s not quite sure where it’s marching – a movement toward strategic communications.

STATE OF THE DEBATE: THE OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS OF STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS

Though Frank Karel spent nearly three decades building communications programs at philanthropic organizations such as Commonwealth, Rockefeller and Robert Wood Johnson Foundations, he readily admits that “we know almost nothing about social change, what really causes it to occur.” At best, says Karel, “Foundations operate on change theories – they think if they educate new classes of people, or do research and publish it, or work with community groups, or advocate with policymakers directly, that will change what they want to change in the world… Everybody flies by the seat of their pants.”

Strategic Communications could change that.

Light years away from the episodic, fragmented way foundations have traditionally shared information – the sporadic press releases, the dense research reports, the wary story pitches about grantees – strategic communications employs a more formal, structural, and holistic methodology; all communications and public relations work would be intertwined with the work of the organization.

Most foundations don’t systematically cultivate ties with journalists, or help grantees do so. Nor have most devoted much time, thought or budget to any other modes of communications, such as online resources or customized campaigns targeting opinion leaders. The strategic communications approach entails honing, targeting and funding the dissemination of information every bit as deliberately as most foundations target and fund their most prized programs. It is an approach to information-sharing that’s common in the corporate and for-profit worlds but just starting to take hold among the nation’s 60,000-plus foundations.

Frank Karel sees foundations leaving an era in which their prevailing attitude, “born of the Judeo-Christian ethic, was that the best philanthropy was anonymous and it was considered unseemly to communicate. ‘Then some foundation people said, ‘We can’t operate like that, Congress doesn’t like secretive pots of money’ – and that’s a message that’s gotten through to most foundations, that they need to communicate for accountability and transparency.” But what’s been less clearly understood, Karel says, is how to use communications “to advance the mission of the foundation.
Basically, foundations have two assets – one is their money, and the other is information they or their grantees have generated over time. The tool you use to make that information effective is called communications.”

Not everyone is sold on Karel’s view, or even on the idea that foundations should be in the business of communications at all. Council on Foundations (COF) president Dorothy Ridings recalls that before she could launch a communications training program in the late 1990s, “first I had to convince most folks that this was important to do – they didn’t think it was. Or there were an awful lot who said they were afraid to.” Indeed, making the switch to strategic communications is not happening consistently in the foundation world. In a 2003 survey by the Urban Institute’s Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy, only 14 percent of independent foundations and 33 percent of corporate ones deemed it very important to their foundation’s effectiveness to publicize its work.

Nevertheless, an earnest debate is underway regarding the possible gains and losses of employing a strategic communications plan. Some argue that a more active, fully integrated communications approach may clash with many philanthropists’ historic aversion to trumpeting their good works or with the philosophy that philanthropies should remain “above the fray.” Beyond those questions loom many more challenges, from the philosophical to the practical.

At small foundations, there may be neither dollars in the budget nor competency within the staff to handle communications tasks. Under current federal tax law, communications expenses fall within the qualifying distributions that private foundations must pay out each year; but some in Congress have proposed capping non-grant expenses or changing the distribution formula, so the status of communications costs could change. And some foundations still question how far they can go in addressing policy or political issues, lest they cross the line into lobbying.

Proponents contend that moving to strategic communications is essential if foundations genuinely aspire to shape public policy and influence public opinion. The thousands of U.S. foundations that focus on children, youth and families – “CYF,” for short – constitute one of the largest and fastest-growing sectors in philanthropy. These CYF foundations represent enormous untapped capacity to communicate strategically about the policy issues that concern them.

Compared to when she assumed the COF presidency in the mid-1990s, Ridings says she now hears somewhat fewer arguments against communications efforts, and sees marginally more foundations mounting them. Some are CYF foundations that have concluded they must spotlight social ills as well as offer services to treat them. “They’re sending the kids to camp – but they’re saying, ‘Hmm, we keep sending the same kids to the same camps,’ so they’re looking more at systemic or policy solutions,” Ridings says.

In a report they wrote on foundation communications, authors Susan Nall Bales and Franklin D. Gilliam Jr. – keynote speakers for GCYF’s conference – posed what they consider the pivotal question in this debate: “Why should foundations do communications?…Because they can’t not do it.” That’s an assertion that CYF foundations have only begun to test-drive and scrutinize, to gauge its salience to their work and its practical implications. More than anything, the debate about the advantages and disadvantages of various communications approaches reveals that a philanthropic adoption of strategic communications is in its infancy. Even Frank Karel, a longtime advocate of foundation communications, is careful to qualify his statements. “The only sweeping assertion I can make about communications,” he says, “is this: A lot of times, it’s crucial.”

Former journalist Ridings has this advice for foundations considering their communications options: “You have to be a player in the media, that’s just

IN A 2003 SURVEY BY THE URBAN INSTITUTE’S CENTER ON NONPROFITS AND PHILANTHROPY, ONLY 14 PERCENT OF INDEPENDENT FOUNDATIONS AND 33 PERCENT OF CORPORATE ONES DEEMED IT VERY IMPORTANT TO THEIR FOUNDATION’S EFFECTIVENESS TO PUBLICIZE ITS WORK.
“BASICALLY, FOUNDATIONS HAVE TWO ASSETS – ONE IS THEIR MONEY, AND THE OTHER IS INFORMATION THEY OR THEIR GRANTEES HAVE GENERATED OVER TIME. THE TOOL YOU USE TO MAKE THAT INFORMATION EFFECTIVE IS CALLED COMMUNICATIONS.”

FRANK KAREL
absolutely critical. If you’re interested in social change, you ain’t gonna get there unless you’re a media player. That means figuring out what story you have to tell, and being confident in telling it. It means educating journalists, however you can help do that. It means a two-pronged approach – reaching mass media to get people talking, and then reaching the elites to make the case with more information and depth. You’ll have to figure out how many resources to devote to each of those…

“And then, don’t expect it to pay off immediately,” Ridings concludes. Even at its best, she warns, strategic communications “is not a slam-dunk. But I’ll tell you what is a slam-dunk: If you don’t do any of this, you’re gone.”

STATE OF THE TERRAIN: WHAT TO CONSIDER WHEN USING COMMUNICATIONS TO EFFECT SOCIAL CHANGE

Despite the ongoing debates and the questions they raise, the role of communications is clearly a priority issue for philanthropy at large. Though there are no hard statistics, analysts say they see more foundations hiring “Directors of Strategic Communications” and budgeting for communications efforts. The subject is being explored in pilot projects, white papers and COF panels; and it’s the theme of the Fall 2004 conference of the group Grantmakers for Children, Youth and Families (GCYF).

In any foundation’s deliberations about what it means to communicate strategically, resources must be carefully considered and distributed among the many branches of communications programs – mailings, web development, advertising or marketing, media relations, event planning. Once a foundation’s leaders decide to move toward a strategic communications approach, how do they know where to start? What tools will be successful? And to what experts or models should they turn for guidance?

TARGETING THE AUDIENCE

On COF President Dorothy Ridings’ list of communications must-dos: “reaching the elites.” On Frank Karel’s list of social-change levers: “approaching policymakers directly.” Of all the many decision points that put the strategic in strategic communications, this is among the trickiest: which audience to approach with which message, to advance which goal. It’s a calculation to which some top CYF foundation communicators have devoted much thought and research. Among them: strategic communications directors Lawrence Gianinno at the W.T. Grant Foundation (WTGF), and Dana Vickers Shelley at the Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF).

When he arrived at WTGF in 1999, Gianinno says, “Reaching the public was a major focus.” But over time, he says, “We narrowed the frame in terms of our objectives,” a chief one being to influence policy for the betterment of children. The best way to do that wasn’t reaching the public via mass media, Gianinno explains – WTGF would find that neither affordable nor effective. Instead, WTGF has narrowed and narrowed further its targeted audience: “Researchers, policymakers mostly on the federal level, and practitioners. More specifically, we’re talking about ‘influentials,’ people who are in positions of power and/or influence who can make a difference in kids’ lives … Ultimately, we’re talking about politicians in Washington, D.C., and their staffs; policymakers at Brookings and other think-tanks; and practitioners such as people who run community-based organizations.” But even to this carefully selected population, WTGF doesn’t communicate about all of its programs. It focuses virtually all communications efforts on a single “action topic” (currently, quality after-school programs).

Shelley aspires to the same laser-like focus, as she puts the finishing touches on what will be AECF’s first strategic communications plan. She knows that in
WHERE ARE ALL THE KIDS? THE STATE OF CHILD AND FAMILY COVERAGE IN THE NEWS

While there’s ample analysis of how U.S. media cover politics, war and other news topics, child and family coverage receives barely any scrutiny. Dale Kunkel, a University of Arizona communications professor, has conducted the nation’s only ongoing scientific examination of news coverage of these issues. In 1994 and 1999 studies, Kunkel analyzed major newspapers’ and television networks’ coverage to see which children’s issues were addressed, how frequently and how prominently. In a 2002 study, he examined how extensively news media covered five key children’s issue areas including child health insurance, abuse and neglect, and teen childbearing.

In the first study, children’s coverage was dominated by crime and violence – the subject of 40 percent of newspaper stories and 48 percent of television reports – with education the second-ranked topic (25 percent of newspaper and 15 percent of TV stories). The remaining one-third of stories were virtually split among family, cultural and health topics; only 4 percent touched on economic concerns such as poverty, homelessness, welfare and child care. Only one in four of the stories focused on policy issues.

Five years later, the second study found some positive trends. Though TV had not increased coverage of children, newspapers had; crime and violence coverage had diminished while health and culture coverage had grown. But on the down side, Kunkel found economic concerns still got virtually no attention – and the share of stories focused on policy issues had slipped to one in five.

The 2002 study took what Kunkel calls “a much more evaluative perspective” on how media cover key children’s policy issues – not just, are reporters producing stories, but “are they providing data that’s informative?” On each issue, the study authors developed a body of background information – basic contextual data that they felt should be in any solid news report on the topic. Then over several months, they checked all published and broadcast pieces to see how many of them included that background information. Kunkel described the “surprising and disappointing” outcome: “The extent to which news coverage contained that most-important background was so modest” – so immeasurably small – that the study methodology had to be revamped, to give credit if a story provided any context at all.

Amy Mitchell is associate director of the Project on Excellence in Journalism, an initiative funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. Mitchell suggests several reasons for the paucity of policy coverage on children, youth, and family issues. “These are complex stories, hard to report on, and as newsrooms cut back on staff and resources, any story that takes more time to cover is harder to get assigned... News organizations used to operate much more on a ‘beat system’ with reporters continuously following an issue – but now they often don’t tune in until something big happens, so you don’t get the nuanced stories, the understanding or knowledge beat reporters had....”

Kunkel’s conclusion: “The reporters who are writing these stories typically don’t have the background – or aren’t given the space – to get into any depth, to provide the public with relevant context to make sense of the article’s information in the broader context of overall issues.”

Patricia Edmonds

philanthropic circles, “We want people to care, we want to talk to everyone because it’s a good thing – but it’s not helping us get anywhere.” Everybody knowing about something doesn’t lead to policy reform; it’s the Senate majority and minority leader, the speaker of the House and minority whip, the committee chairs... My audience is very small. We’re reaching out to those 10 people who can actually change what’s going on. In some ways, it’s harder to do less than it is to do more.”

CYF foundations may glean strategic-communications insights not just from what Gianinno and Shelley say, but from who they are. WTGF brought in Gianinno from ABC Television, where he was the vice president responsible for network programming research. And AECF hired Shelley after she held senior communications positions in the Clinton administration. Since foundations must compete with corporate and political communicators to grab the public’s attention, it can’t hurt to acquire top talent from those arenas.

MEDIA RELATIONS

Research has long confirmed that Americans learn most of what they know about public affairs from news media. Accordingly, most communications experts contend that, to be truly strategic communicators, foundations must at least take into account – and where practicable, try to influence – how their issues are covered by mainstream media. That means still doing what some consider the old-fashioned work of media relations, but in a 21st-century environment.

When foundations consider transforming their communications efforts from skeletal to strategic, they are acknowledging communication’s expanding role in society at large. The Information Age has seen an explosion of communications media – cable TV, satellite radio, Web sites – all vying for attention and audience ‘round the clock. Yet even as many more outlets produce many more pages and broadcast hours of content, media analysts say that content has become shallower, “softer” and more entertainment-oriented, and has swung away from nuanced news and policy debates.

Communications theorists also contend that the way the news media present or “frame” an issue determines whether the public perceives it as societal concern in need of a public policy solution, or a private concern that is somebody else’s problem. Today, media convergence has softened the lines between those who originate information (e.g., foundation-supported researchers) and those who transmit it (journalists). So as news and information media become even more “entertainment-ized and consumer-ized” (to use author Bales’ term), foundations will face even greater obstacles to getting their issues taken seriously. The shift already has had significant effects – and not positive ones – on U.S. media coverage of CYF issues.
As commercial media subject consumers to endless cycles of information “spin,” foundations stand as one of the few remaining sources of nuanced, informative, credible information. This changed media climate gives foundations the opportunity to position themselves uniquely, in keeping with the more traditional philosophy, as an above-the-fray resource for the public on issues of substance and mutual concern.

THE WORLD WIDE WEB

When setting priorities, as CYF foundations hone their distinct communications strategies, most put online initiatives at the top of the list. The Web’s speed, reach and relative cost-effectiveness make it a potential-packed frontier for philanthropies. Starting in 2000, a two-year experiment called the Foundation Media Relations Project worked intensively with five grantmaking organizations to improve their media outreach. Project leaders concluded that one essential way to do that is with “useful Web-accessible information… To be an information resource for journalists, philanthropic organizations should have a Web presence, with a dedicated Web site and an e-mail strategy.”

By its very nature, the Web could address one concern some foundations have about stepping up communications: that it will make them seem too “corporate,” too PR-pushy, and will thus undermine their status as honest brokers of neutral information. In online communication, every group can find its own comfortable combination of what Web theorists call “push and pull” – pushing information aggressively out to users (as with e-mail) versus more passively posting a Web site in hopes of pulling users in. Within the basic rules of user-friendliness, the Web lets foundations offer their data on their own terms, as deeply and extensively as they wish, for journalists and other information-seekers to access at will. Once foundations establish their own data depots online, they can link almost infinitely to groups that share their goals; and they can marshal their Web assets to support all their other communications efforts. If foundations are, as one editor put it, “only an Internet site away” when their priority issues hit the news, they stand a much better chance of reporters finding and using their information, and reflecting their views.

Case in point: A frequently-tapped tip sheet for U.S. journalists is Al’s Morning Meeting, a daily column on the Web site of the Poynter Institute, a Florida journalism training academy. Al Tompkins fills his column with story ideas and angles, and links to help journalists cover issues. In a column earlier this year, Tompkins mentioned a new national survey showing all but five states behind schedule in meeting the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. He directed journalists to the surveying organization: The Education Commission of the States (ECS), which promotes communication about education among state policymakers – and was founded by foundations (Carnegie and Ford, in 1965). Tompkins also directed journalists to news coverage of the ECS survey from Stateline.org, an online publication that reports on state policy issues – and is backed by a foundation (the Pew Charitable Trusts, since 1999).

Online and in an e-mailed newsletter, some 11,000 journalists a day read Tompkins, who says he’s always looking for fresh, credible information to point them to. Though many foundations are superb at generating that kind of research data, they are realizing that they could become much better at disseminating it, especially online.

STATE OF PLAY: WHAT THE DOERS ARE DOING AND HOW THEY ARE DOING IT

What strategic communications efforts have been mounted vary widely among the differing types of foundations, according to a study from the Urban Institute’s Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy. Foundations with smaller staffs or fewer financial resources are less likely to implement intensive communications programs than foundations with more resources and staff, the study found. It also found that
“the more grant money foundations distribute, the more likely they are to undertake media outreach”: Foundations with annual grants under $10 million were roughly half as likely as foundations with annual grants over $10 million to take even basic communications steps. Groups that were somewhat more inclined to mount communications efforts included community foundations, who need to raise local visibility and funding for their work; and corporate foundations, whom the report says are “ahead of the game” because their corporate parents already have communications experience.

Even with the most innovative, well-staffed, generously-funded communications programs, foundations can find mainstream news and information media “difficult to influence,” admits Lois Salisbury, head of the Packard Foundation’s Children, Families, and Communities Program. “But that doesn’t mean it’s not possible to move the story that you want moved.”

Some social-change-minded foundations, including several in the CYF sector, have been tinkering with new forms of outreach in their strategic communications plans. The following five case histories summarize what they’ve attempted, and what they can show for results.

**CASE EXAMPLES**

- An approach used by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) may satisfy philanthropists who lament having “no control” over how or whether news media cover their issues. In 2000, the Knight Ridder/Tribune Information Services (KRT), a newswire run by two of the nation’s biggest media companies, was approached about distributing articles on end-of-life issues, written by academics with RWJF funding. KRT editor Jane McDonnell took on the project; she consulted with the academics and RWJF but made it clear KRT would need final editorial control over the content, which she had professional journalists “ghost-rewrite” from the initial drafts. After months of collaboration, on September 10, 2001, the 15-part series “Finding Our Way: Living with Dying in America” went out to KRT subscribers, complete with photos, graphics, a logo – even ideas for local angles. Although the 9-11 terrorist attacks dominated news coverage in the following weeks, all or part of the series appeared in more than 130 newspapers delivered to more than 7.1 million readers.

RWJF was thrilled, says senior communications officer Victoria Weisfeld. The series addressed the foundation’s issues, and was “widely acceptable to editors” who trust KRT to distribute quality journalism but must be careful to preserve journalistic integrity. Because RWJF knew when the series would run “as opposed to picking up the paper one day and finding our topic in it,” it could help grantees and other local groups organize around the coverage. And reprints of the series allowed RWJF to spread the information even more broadly.

- At The Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF), media outreach isn’t just about foundation programming – it is core programming. Starting in 1991, KFF transformed itself from a traditional grantmaking foundation to an operating foundation with the intertwined missions of health policy analysis and research, and communications and media programs. The media thrust is such a priority that about half the foundation’s staff works on some part of it, says Matt James, KFF’s senior vice president for media and public education.

For the year-long media fellowships supported by KFF in which mid-career journalists get well-funded “working sabbaticals” to report in-depth health stories that their news organizations might not do otherwise, KFF had 130 applicants for five spaces. Joe Grimm, recruiting and development editor at the Detroit Free Press, says he’s comfortable partnering with KFF because the foundation gives journalists solid training and information but makes no demands about what (or whether) they write from it.
WHEN JOURNALISTS DO GET CYF ISSUE TRAINING, THERE ARE TANGIBLE IMPROVEMENTS IN COVERAGE, SAYS CAROL GUENSBURG, WHO DIRECTS THE JOURNALISM FELLOWSHIPS PROGRAM. JOURNALISTS WHO CAN WRITE ABOUT ISSUES WITH GREATER DEPTH AND CLARITY ARE BETTER ABLE TO MAKE THE CASE TO THEIR EDITORS TO COVER THEM.
Penny Duckham, who runs the fellowship and intern programs, admits that there are “some tensions” with others at KFF who’d like journalists to focus more on the foundation’s priority topics. Duckham believes the no-strings approach is essential to the program’s credibility – but with no requirement that journalists cite the underwriter, what’s the return-on-investment for KFF? Duckham says that by “deepening the understanding and grasp” of journalists, KFF raises the overall quality of coverage in its field.

• Journalism fellowship programs funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) and the Foundation for Child Development (FCD), and based at the Philip Merrill College of Journalism at the University of Maryland, aim to improve CYF issue coverage by training the journalists who provide it. (See listing of FCD Fellowships in this report.) The Casey Journalism Center on Children and Families (CJC), funded since 1993 by AECF, runs two- and five-day conferences where reporters learn in depth from CYF issue experts; it also sends reporters a weekly e-mail digest of “children’s beat” news and data. The Journalism Fellowships in Child and Family Policy program, funded since 2000 by FCD, trains journalists at issue-oriented seminars, and gives fellowships for in-depth reporting projects of up to six months.

Through surveys, CJC learned a great deal about the journalists who cover CYF issues today. Most care deeply about the subject, and choose to cover it even knowing their employers don’t consider it a priority, and even when they’re responsible for other coverage areas as well. Most say their bosses would never pay for training, so they rely on externally-funded professional development programs, such as those FCD and AECF support. But those programs’ funding, like most grants, is subject to review; and the costliness of in-person training means the two programs, combined, will train only about 75 journalists this year.

When journalists do get CYF issue training, there are tangible improvements in coverage, says Carol Guensburg, who directs the Journalism Fellowships program. She tells how one recent reporting fellow used a local official’s speech about early childhood education to write a broader story on the topic – and made Page One. Thanks to the fellowship, the reporter told Guensburg, “she felt confident enough to write knowledgeably about a complex subject. Journalists who can write about issues with greater depth and clarity are better able to make the case to their editors to cover them.”

• The Grantmakers Income Security Task Force (GIST) is an affinity group of philanthropies working on income and poverty issues. Many GIST members’ grantees are advocates and child-serving organizations who’ve been “on the front lines” for years, helping communities cope after the 1996 federal welfare system overhaul. In 2002, as Congress considered reauthorization of welfare’s successor, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program, GIST members wanted their grantees’ experiences to inform the reauthorization – to influence social policy.

For help crafting both a message and a means to deliver it, GIST partnered with Connect for Kids (CFK), a nonprofit that employs communications strategies to address social policy issues. CFK convened GIST grantees to hear both their concerns about TANF and what help they would need to communicate those concerns to decision-makers.

Six GIST members chipped in to a “funding collaborative,” so no one foundation had to make a huge contribution, says Cecilia Garcia, CFK executive director. And “that pot of money allowed us to purchase communications expertise that a small nonprofit could never afford on its own” including political strategist Celinda Lake and Hart Research Associates, both Washington heavyweights.
The communications team attached one clear message – what should and should not be in TANF – to materials that some 200 grantees used to approach lawmakers nationwide, with special emphasis on key committee members. Garcia believes the effort “scored a pretty solid victory” by stalling efforts to ratchet up work requirements for welfare recipients. CFK’s follow-up surveys showed that lawmakers did in fact hear from “a lot of the (grantees) we were working with,” Garcia says. In addition to the project’s near-term objectives, Garcia believes GIST made a long-term investment in “building the communications capacity of grantees, in order for them to influence policy change” in the future.

- Foundations’ media outreach can not only enrich news coverage with sound information, but steer coverage away from misinformation. For example: “In part because the media focus so much on the negative, we have a public that thinks everything about children is terrible and getting worse,” says Kristin Anderson Moore, president of the non-partisan research group Child Trends (whose foundation backers have included the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Foundation for Child Development and others).

Surveys that Child Trends conducted last year found public misapprehension of the true status of children, Moore says. For example, though the teen crime rate was at its lowest level in more than 25 years, nine of 10 survey respondents still believed the percentage of teens committing violent crime had risen or stayed flat in the prior decade. These knowledge gaps have ominous implications, Moore fears. If Americans remain unaware of the good news about children, “they may be less willing to continue investing in the programs or supporting the policies that have helped to bring about these positive changes.”

To combat that, Child Trends concentrates on disseminating information on children, youth, and families – a mission it’s pursued for 25 years. And as news coverage has trended toward sound-bites, Moore has transformed the communications tactics used. Child Trends now focuses more on offering research data in a form that Moore describes as “accurate and contextualized but extremely succinct and, when we can, catchy. Our research briefs are very rigorous and non-partisan but short, 6-8 pages.” Because a New York Times reporter had that user-friendly research brief in hand when assigned a story on children left unsupervised, Child Trends’ research was featured in the story.

**NEXT STEPS: GETTING PHILANTHROPY TO TALK ITS WALK**

Like any movement for institutional renewal, the drive to re-invent how foundations communicate will be embraced and extended by some. Others may perceive it as de rigueur, and adopt it grudgingly. Still others may ignore it completely.

If they choose to ignore it, they do so at their own peril, warns Francie Ostrower of the Urban Institute. In their communications efforts to date, she says, “Foundations appear to be functioning … at a level of insularity that warrants serious thought by those who run institutions intended to serve a public purpose – and are increasingly being called upon to show that they do.”

If foundations want to be acknowledged as contributors to the commonweal – and most do – then they need to throw light on who they are and what they do. Strategic communications can help. If foundations want to be respected players in America’s public policy discussion – and many do – then they need to spotlight the deep, smart, spin-free data they can contribute to that discussion. Strategic communications can help.
“IF YOU DO THIS RIGHT, YOUR BRAND BECOMES MORE VALUABLE.” AFTER A DECADE OF EXTENSIVE AND RELENTLESS MEDIA OUTREACH, HE SAYS, [KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION] HAS “A STRONGER BRAND – SO NOW WHEN WE PRODUCE A REPORT, IT GETS READ.”

MATTHEW JAMES
But will foundations commit to genuinely improving communications, online or anywhere else, if they remain ambivalent about the whole proposition? In the Urban Institute’s survey on effective foundation practices, 43 percent of all respondents admit they’re doing a fair or poor job of communications. However, “unless they believe that doing better is integral to their effectiveness, it is uncertain that they will expend much effort to try and do better,” the survey report concludes.

Although strategic communications absolutely heightens a foundation’s effectiveness, say its proponents, KFF’s Matthew James warns that its language may “sound more business-oriented than most foundations like to think about …” But he offers it anyway, with utter conviction: “If you do this right, your brand becomes more valuable.” After a decade of extensive and relentless media outreach, he says, KFF has “a stronger brand – so now when we produce a report, it gets read.”

The antipathy and resistance to communicating that many foundations feel is understandable: They’re not sold on it, they’re not good at it, they don’t know where to begin. Should they choose to beef up communications, they face daunting tasks – everything COF’s Ridings listed, from crafting messages and educating the news media to cultivating decision-makers (and funding it all, to boot). But even so, it still seems self-evident that, to champion the social concerns they care about, foundations must communicate, coherently and strategically. To do otherwise is to surrender the field and encourage more of what they deplore – “gotcha” stories about their operations, and shallow coverage of their issues.

For those who would embrace communications as a tool for social change, Frank Karel prescribes a simple course-setting exercise:

“TO ACHIEVE WHAT YOU WANT TO ACHIEVE, DOES SOME GROUP HAVE TO THINK DIFFERENTLY ABOUT SOMETHING? ACT DIFFERENTLY ABOUT SOMETHING? IF YES, WHAT INFORMATION, EFFECTIVELY DELIVERED TO THEM, COULD SUPPORT THEM CHANGING THE WAY THEY THINK AND ACT?”

“FROM THAT, YOU BUILD A COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY.”

Patricia Edmonds is a journalist, writer and consultant based in Northern Virginia. In 2003 and 2004 she was editor at large and consultant for the Casey Journalism Center on Children and Families, a grant-funded program that trains journalists on children, youth and family issues. Before that, Edmonds was an assistant managing editor for news at NPR, overseeing the online news operation. She also has worked for dot-coms, magazines and newspapers including the Detroit Free Press and USA TODAY, where in the early 1990s she pioneered a children’s beat on the National news staff.
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Mass Media Science and Engineering Fellowship

Rima Arnaout, 2004
Voice of America
Student, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University

Lisa Aziz-Fadeh, 2000
Discovery On-Line
No Current Information

Tahalia Barrett, 2003
Popular Science
Student, Graduate School of Business, University of Michigan

Etienne Benson, 2001
Popular Science
Graduate Student, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Anita Bowles, 2002
Raleigh News and Observer
Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Linguistics, University of Maryland

Robert Frederick, 2003
KUNC-FM,
National Public Radio Affiliate
Freelance Science Reporter

Bill Godsil, 2002
Richmond Times Dispatch
No Current Information

Christine Kelly, 2004
Richmond Times Dispatch
Matriculated 2004 in Cell & Molecular Biology, Weill Graduate School of Medical Sciences

Imelda Davalos Pribe, 2000
Voice of America
Special Assistant to Associate Administrator for Primary Care, Bureau of Primary Health Care, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Julie Rosenthal, 2004
National Public Radio
Student, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania

Stephani Sutherland, 2001
Los Angeles Times
Freelance Science Writer

Cathy Taylor, 2002
Good Morning America
No Current Information

Shannah Tharp-Taylor, 2003
Chicago Tribune
Associate Social Behavioral Scientist, RAND Corporation

Saskia Traill, 1999
WOSU-AM,
National Public Radio Affiliate
Senior Program Specialist, Division of Children, Youth and Families, National Economic Development & Law Center

Linda M. Waldron, 2001
Voice of America
Assistant Professor, Sociology Department, Christopher Newport University

Heather K. Warren, 2000
On-health.com
American Psychological Association
Postdoctoral Fellow, Prevention Research Center, Pennsylvania State University
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Brooke Adams, 2003
Family Reporter,
The Salt Lake Tribune
Salt Lake City, Utah

Stacy Adams, 2000
Reporter and Columnist,
Richmond Times Dispatch
Richmond, Virginia

Lisa Applegate, 2001
Reporter, The Roanoke Times
Roanoke, Virginia

Maja Beckstrom, 2003
Families Reporter,
St. Paul Pioneer Press
St. Paul, Minnesota

Nell Bernstein, 2002
Freelance Writer
Berkeley, California

Michael Bonfigli, 2001
Freelance Photographer
Washington, D.C.

Monica Brady-Myerov, 2002
Reporter, WBUR-FM,
National Public Radio Affiliate
Boston, Massachusetts

Kaitie Burford, 2003
Youth and Families Reporter,
The Albuquerque Journal
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Vanessa Bush, 2003
Senior Editor, Essence Magazine
New York, New York

Linda Campbell, 2003
Editorial Writer and Columnist,
Star-Telegram
Fort Worth, Texas

Jeremy Caplan, 2002
Senior Associate Editor,
Yahoo! Internet Life
New York, New York

Pat Caverly, 2001
Editor, Native Monthly Reader
Pauma Valley, California

Anne Marie Chaker, 2004
Reporter, The Wall Street Journal
New York, New York

Mike Chalmers, 2004
Social Services Reporter,
The News Journal
New Castle, Delaware

Sue Ellen Christian, 2000
Health Reporter, Chicago Tribune
Chicago, Illinois

Noel Cisneros, 2003
Education Reporter, KRON-TV
Oakland, California

Helen Cordes, 2004
Freelance Journalist
Georgetown, Texas

Kiley Cruse, 2001
Photographer, Omaha World-Herald
Omaha, Nebraska

Deborah Davis, 2004
Health and Social Issues Reporter,
The Santa Fe New Mexican
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Wendy Davis, 2004
Senior Editor,
Primedia's Trusts & Estates
New York, New York

Elizabeth DeVita-Raeburn, 2003
Freelance Science and Health Writer
New York, New York

Louise Diamond, 2002
Documentary Filmmaker,
Rebekah Films
Brooklyn, New York

Laura Diamond, 2003
Children's Issues Reporter,
The Florida Times-Union
Jacksonville, Florida

Cherie Diez, 2003
Photographer, St. Petersburg Times
St. Petersburg, Florida

Joe Dits, 2002
Reporter, South Bend Tribune
South Bend, Indiana

Kathryn Eastburn, 2001
Contributing Editor,
Colorado Springs Independent
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Jane Elizabeth, 2003
Education Editor and Reporter,
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Pat Etheridge, 2000
Correspondent, CNN
Atlanta, Georgia

Eric Eyre, 2002
Education Reporter,
Charleston Gazette
Charleston, West Virginia

Linda Fandel, 2000
Deputy Editorial Page Editor,
The Des Moines Register
Des Moines, Iowa

Scott Finn, 2004
Reporter, Charleston Gazette
Charleston, West Virginia

Daniel Forbes, 2001
Freelance Reporter
Astoria, New York

Brooke Foster, 2003
Reporter, Washingtonian Magazine
Washington, D.C.

Maggie Fox, 2001
Health Reporter, Reuters Ltd.
Washington, D.C.

Matthew Franck, 2003
Child and Youth Reporter,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch
Jefferson City, Missouri

Eric Frazier, 2003
Family Beat Reporter,
The Charlotte Observer
St. Charlotte, North Carolina

Annette Fuentes, 2002
Freelance Reporter
Kerhonkson, New York

Natalie Ghidotti (Gardner), 2002
Editor,
Arkansas Business Publishing Group
Little Rock, Arkansas

Sarah Glover, 2002
Photographer,
The Philadelphia Inquirer
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Bill Graves, 2002
Education Reporter, The Oregonian
Portland, Oregon
Kristen DeDeyn Kirk, 2002
Managing Editor, *Port Folio Weekly*
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Charlene Koski, 2003
Health and Social Issues Reporter, *Herald Republic*
Yakima, Washington

Donna Ladd, 2001
Freelance Reporter
Jackson, Mississippi

Laura Lang, 2003
Freelance Reporter
Silver Spring, Maryland

Leah Latimer, 2001
Freelance Reporter and Producer, *BET.com*
Mitchellville, Maryland

Tod Lending, 2001
Documentary Filmmaker
Chicago, Illinois

Sharon Lerner, 2002
New York, New York

Michele Marchetti, 2003
Freelance Reporter
New York, New York

David Marcus, 2001
Reporter, *U.S. News & World Report*
Washington, D.C.

Jennifer Marino, 2000
Education Reporter, *Savannah Morning News*
Savannah, Georgia

Jonathan Martin, 2001
Social Services Reporter, *Spokesman-Review*
Spokane, Washington

Virginia Martin, 2001
Health and Assistant State Editor, *The Birmingham News*
Birmingham, Alabama

Brandy McDonnell, 2004
Reporter, *The Oklahoman*
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Tracie McMillan, 2004
Managing Editor, *City Limits*
New York, New York
Monica Mendoza, 2004
Education Reporter and Editor-in Training,
The Arizona Republic
Phoenix, Arizona

Dawn Miller, 2000
Editorial Writer, The Charleston Gazette
Charleston, West Virginia

Jim Morrison, 2001
Freelance Reporter
Norfolk, Virginia

Analisa, Nazareno, 2001
Reporter, Express-News
San Antonio, Texas

Cara Nissman, 2003
Teen Reporter, Boston Herald
Boston, Massachusetts

Mary Van de Kamp Nohl, 2004
Senior Editor, Milwaukee Magazine
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Jean Reid Norman, 2002
Assistant Metro Editor, Las Vegas Sun
Las Vegas, Nevada

Colleen O’Dea, 2002
Reporter, Daily Record
Parsippany, New Jersey

Megan O’Matz, 2004
Social Services Reporter, South Florida Sun-Sentinel
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Heather O’Neill, 2002
Associate Editor, Living in Stamford
Stamford, Connecticut

Tanya Ott-Fulmore, 2001
News Director, WBHM-FM
Birmingham, Alabama

Mary Annette Pember, 2001
Freelance Photojournalist
Cincinnati, Ohio

Kim Pleticha, 2002
Freelance Print and Broadcast Reporter
Austin, Texas

Encarnacion Pyle, 2004
Social Services Reporter, The Columbus Dispatch
Columbus, Ohio

Paul Raeburn, 2004
Freelance Journalist
New York, New York

Katy Reckdahl, 2003
Freelance Journalist
New Orleans, Louisiana

Mary K. Reinhart, 2000
Reporter, East Valley and Scottsdale Tribune
Mesa, Arizona

Louis Rom, 2002
Political Editor, The Times of Acadiana
Lafayette, Louisiana

Lee Rood, 2003
Reporter, The Des Moines Register
Des Moines, Iowa

Carlos Sadovi, 2001
Court Reporter, Chicago Sun-Times
Chicago, Illinois

Ovetta Sampson, 2001
Reporter, The Gazette
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Christopher Schwarzen, 2002
Reporter, The Seattle Times
Snohomish County, WA

Aria Seligmann, 2002
Associate Editor, Eugene Weekly
Eugene, Oregon

Rochelle Sharpe, 2002
Freelance Reporter
Brookline, Massachusetts

Barbara White Stack
Reporter, The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Samantha Stainburn, 2004
Freelance Reporter
New York, New York

Gary Susswein, 2003
State Reporter, Austin American-Statesman
Austin, Texas

Ruth Teichroeb, 2000
Senior Social Issues Reporter, Post-Intelligencer
Seattle, Washington

Marian Uhlman, 2001
Health Reporter, The Philadelphia Inquirer
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Viviana Villalon, 2004
Reporter and Features Editor, Hoy
New York, New York

Rebecca Voelker, 2002
Freelancer and Contributing Editor, Journal of the American Medical Association
Chicago, Illinois

Pueng Vongs, 2004
Reporter and Editor, Pacific News Service
San Francisco, California

Erin Walsh, 2003
Education Reporter, North County Times
Escondido, California

Rob Waters, 2001
Freelance Reporter and Editor
Berkeley, California

Richard Whitmire, 2004
Editorial Writer, USA Today
McLean, Virginia

Mitchell Zuckoff, 2001
Investigative Reporter, The Boston Globe
Boston, Massachusetts
### 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Forum</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$107,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work with national, regional, and state nonprofit children's organizations to produce and disseminate media packets focusing on accessibility and availability of early education and health coverage for uninsured children and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts Midwest</strong> - Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To produce the book <em>Bridges to Understanding Children's Museums</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediascope</strong> - Studio City, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a collaborative effort to develop voluntary guidelines for educational children's programming on broadcast television.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Public Radio, Inc.</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$227,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For in-depth, sustained, research-based news coverage of issues concerning low-income families and their children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Advertising Council, Inc.</strong> - New York, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a state-wide public information campaign about the New York State Universal Pre-Kindergarten Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for a Behavioral/Social Science Fellow in the AAAS Mass Media Science and Engineering Fellows Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.</strong> - New York, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For public service advertisements and a New York Times advertisement on the New York State Universal Pre-Kindergarten Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council on Foundations, Inc.</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop and implement a public information program that raises the visibility and understanding of foundations' roles in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$132,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For support of three Child Development Fellows per year in the AAAS Mass Media Science and Engineering Fellows Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Forum</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work with national, regional, and state nonprofit children's organizations to produce and disseminate media packets focusing on accessibility and availability of early education and health coverage for uninsured children and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Psychological Association</strong> - Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Reason to Hope: Early Violence Prevention through Multi-Media Campaign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Austin Children’s Museum</strong> - Austin, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a video project to support an exhibition on child development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizens’ Committee for Children of New York, Inc. - New York, NY $5,000
For posters to advertise New York State Universal Pre-Kindergarten Initiative statewide.

Columbia University - New York, NY $10,000
To the Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media for a seminar for journalists on Universal Pre-Kindergarten.

Foundation for Child Development - New York, NY $9,685
To support FCD Media Fellows in Child and Family Policy.

University of Maryland Foundation, Inc. - College Park, MD $700,000
To support the Journalism Fellowships in Child and Family Policy program at the Philip Merrill College of Journalism.

WNYC Radio - New York, NY $78,300
For programming about well-being of children in New York City and Universal Pre-Kindergarten.

2000

The American Assembly - New York, NY $55,000
To support the communications and dissemination component of a project to build consensus on family policy.

American Prospect, Inc. - Boston, MA $111,865
For partial support of coverage of family economic security and work support issues, and the Young Writers Fellowship Program.

Schott Center for Public and Early Education - Cambridge, MA $50,000
For the planning and initial implementation of the Early Education for All campaign in Massachusetts.

University of Illinois - Chicago, IL $10,000

Society for Research in Child Development - Ann Arbor, MI $20,000
For partial support of its communications and dissemination initiatives in its Washington, DC office, and to provide media training for researchers.

2001

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) - Washington, DC $13,500
For support of three Child Development Fellows per year in the AAAS Mass Media Science and Engineering Fellows Program.

American Prospect, Inc. - Boston, MA $110,420
For partial support of the young writers program for two fellows to cover and write on issues relevant to children and families.

Education Writers Association - Washington, DC $3,000
For support of the participation of its National Fellows in Education Reporting in joint sessions with the University of Maryland Philip Merrill College of Journalism Fellowship Program in Child and Family Policy.
Minnesota Public Radio - St. Paul, MN $385,265
To establish the Work and Family Desk on Marketplace.

Ms. Foundation for Women, Inc. - New York, NY $50,000
For a media campaign to promote the report “Raise the Floor” on the needs and circumstances of low-wage workers.

Schott Center for Public and Early Education - Cambridge, MA $150,000
For support of the Early Education for All campaign in Massachusetts.

University of Illinois - Chicago, IL $16,400
For the dissemination of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs website “Careers in Child and Family Policy.”

University of Maryland Foundation, Inc. - College Park, MD $1,280,915
To support the Journalism Fellowships in Child and Family Policy program.

2002

American Forum - Washington, DC $100,000
To expand and increase state and local media coverage of Universal Pre-Kindergarten and full-day Kindergarten in targeted states.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) - Washington, DC $190,345
For support of three Child Development Fellows per year in the AAAS Mass Media Science and Engineering Fellows Program.

2003

Foundation for Child Development - New York, NY $137,825
To promote two Foundation grants: the FCD Index of Child Well-Being (CWI) and Children’s Risk of Fatality in Child Care Centers.

FrameWorks Institute - Washington, DC $19,900
For the development of two related workshops on communications research on child development for journalists and for scientists.

Harvard University - Cambridge, MA $20,000
For a series of articles in the Harvard Education Letter on teaching young immigrant students.

2004

Institute for Educational Leadership - Washington, DC $85,000
For a book supporting P-3 alignment to educate young children in the United States.
The Foundation for Child Development does not accept unsolicited proposals.

OUR FUNDING PRIORITIES

The Foundation for Child Development, through its Mapping the P-3 Continuum (MAP) Initiative, supports the restructuring of Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, and Grades 1-3 into a well-aligned first level of public education for children ages three to eight in the United States.

The Foundation is especially interested in promoting our New American Children focus. This effort aims to stimulate basic and applied research on immigrant children (birth through age 10), particularly those living in low-income families.

WHAT WE FUND

FCD supports research, policy development, advocacy and communications strategies related to our MAP Initiative.

The Foundation for Child Development awards an average of 14 grants each year. Please see our complete listing of grants for details about specific grant-funded projects.

WHAT WE DO NOT FUND

• The direct provision of Pre-Kindergarten education, child care, or health care
• Capital campaigns and endowments
• The purchase, construction or renovation of buildings
• Grants for projects outside the United States
## CONDENSED STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

**Fiscal years ending March 31, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$552,652</td>
<td>$440,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments at fair value</td>
<td>102,139,648</td>
<td>82,412,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable from investments</td>
<td>221,896</td>
<td>337,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other accounts receivable and assets</td>
<td>90,843</td>
<td>48,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets net of depreciation</td>
<td>477,621</td>
<td>554,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$102,482,660</td>
<td>$83,793,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Net Assets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td>$3,916,721</td>
<td>$4,772,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts and accrued expenses payable</td>
<td>205,628</td>
<td>74,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Federal excise tax liability</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>4,467,349</td>
<td>4,846,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net assets:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>96,915,771</td>
<td>76,897,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently restricted</td>
<td>2,099,540</td>
<td>2,049,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net assets</strong></td>
<td>99,015,311</td>
<td>78,946,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Liabilities and Net Assets** | $103,482,660 | $83,793,494 |

## CONDENSED STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES

**Fiscal years ending March 31, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Net Assets</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment return:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and dividends</td>
<td>$1,566,656</td>
<td>$2,259,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized gain on investments</td>
<td>784,178</td>
<td>1,260,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depreciation) on investments</td>
<td>22,370,910</td>
<td>(12,307,577)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: investment-related expenses</strong></td>
<td>176,876</td>
<td>251,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment return (deficiency)</td>
<td>24,233,865</td>
<td>(9,038,901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other income</strong></td>
<td>288,797</td>
<td>31,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue (deficiency)</strong></td>
<td>24,522,662</td>
<td>(9,007,689)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants to institutions</td>
<td>2,744,174</td>
<td>5,746,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct charitable activities</td>
<td>623,052</td>
<td>922,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>909,836</td>
<td>477,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants administration</td>
<td>121,125</td>
<td>253,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal excise tax</td>
<td>366,740</td>
<td>32,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>4,764,927</td>
<td>7,432,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Change in net assets** | 20,068,738 | (16,440,600) |

| Net assets at beginning of year | 78,946,573 | 95,387,173 |

| **Net Assets at End of Year** | $99,015,311 | $78,946,573 |
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CHANGING FACES OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN — FCD YOUNG SCHOLARS

2003 Scholars

Robert Crosnoe, University of Texas at Austin
Elena Grigorenko, Yale University
Wen-Jui Han, Columbia University
Krista Perreira, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

2004 Scholars

Neeraj Kaushal, Columbia University
Iliana Reyes, University of Arizona

1Part-time staff
Our Work

The Foundation for Child Development is currently focused on four main program initiatives. These programs — Mapping the P-3 Continuum (MAP), New American Children, the FCD Index of Child Well-Being and the Young Scholars Program — are all part of FCD's efforts to enhance the educational opportunities available to all children in the United States.

Foundation Initiatives

Mapping the P-3 Continuum (MAP)

Does our current first level of early education meet the needs of all children? What exactly does a "first level" of education include? What do we know about the alignments between the preschool years and the K-12 years in our school systems? FCD wants you to know more...

New American Children

What happens to children during the first years of education when the typical classroom is more diverse than ever before? What are the unique educational needs of immigrant children, and their families and how well prepared are we to respond? FCD wants you to know more...

FCD Index of Child Well-Being

Can we measure the well-being of American children and youth? Why would we want to measure child well-being? For what would such a measure be used? FCD wants you to know more...

Young Scholars Program

How do we get ideas to be more than just ideas? FCD wants to ensure that well-designed research on young immigrant children informs and contributes to effective public policies. Learn more...

Grants

Click here for a complete listing of FCD grant work