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MISSION STATEMENT

The Foundation for Child Development (FCD) is a national private philanthropy dedicated to the principle that all families should have the social and material resources to raise their children to be healthy, educated, and productive members of their communities. The Foundation seeks to understand children, particularly the disadvantaged, and to promote their well-being. We believe that families, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and government at all levels share complementary responsibilities in the critical task of raising new generations.

Seeking to achieve its goals, the Foundation supports:

basic and policy-relevant research about the factors that promote and support the optimal development of children and adolescents

... policy analysis, advocacy, services, and public education to enhance the discussion and adoption of social policies that support families in their important child-raising responsibilities; and

... leadership development activities linked to the programmatic focus of the foundation.

The Foundation believes that by integrating these approaches, FCD will strengthen its effectiveness in achieving its mission.
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Celebrating its Centennial is a remarkable milestone for any organization. After all, organizations typically have shorter lives than people. Many lose their way, their inspiration, or their economic viability. Few last as long as a century.

The Foundation for Child Development (FCD) began as a modest volunteer effort by a handful of energetic New Yorkers. It has evolved with the times, holding on to its basic commitment to children but embracing new strategies as children's needs, American society, and the Foundation's resources have changed. In this way, it has endured for one hundred years.

The pages that follow tell the story of that remarkable century. And as the timeline at the bottom of each page suggests, the Foundation's work did not develop in isolation. It has been—and continues to be—closely linked to the history of nationwide efforts to improve the well-being of children. This is a story with many players: not only the children themselves, but also parents, philanthropists, policymakers, health professionals, children's advocates, and researchers from diverse disciplines. Some of them are named in the pages of this history. Others who led the Foundation over the century are identified on the back page of this publication.

Many people who made important contributions to FCD's work could not be mentioned here. We, therefore, wish to acknowledge the generosity and efforts of many donors, board members, grantees, advisers, and friends who have helped to sustain, invigorate, and inspire FCD's work. In large measure, this is their story.

Karen Gerard
Chair, FCD Centennial Committee

Ruth Ann Burns
Chair, Centennial Brochure Advisory Committee
Before school buses, before polio vaccine, before Head Start, before special education, before Sesame Street, before sonograms...there was the Foundation for Child Development.

100 Years of Commitment to Children

The Foundation for Child Development (FCD) is the oldest philanthropy in the nation focused on improving the life prospects of children. Over the course of its 100-year history, FCD has helped to shape the field of child development with advances in research, policy, programs, and advocacy.

Compared with the nation’s largest philanthropic institutions, its endowment is modest, yet FCD has had an impact that belies its size. It has nurtured and supported groundbreaking work in diverse areas of child development—physical, cognitive, social, and emotional. It has been a leader in prevention, in parent education, and in advocacy on behalf of low-income children and their families.
The Foundation for Child Development has helped to narrow the gap between what we know about how children grow and learn, and what we do to help them thrive. From its earliest days, FCD pioneered in the collection and analysis of data on children's well-being—the kind of information that has helped to inform policy. And it has supported research that brought to the fore family, community, and societal influences on the trajectories of children's lives.

FCD began with a different name. For much of the century, it was known as the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children. And it focused primarily on the needs of children with disabilities. As decades passed, FCD evolved into a grant-making institution. It changed with the times, adjusting to new realities, reshaping its mission, and widening or narrowing its lens as the times demanded. Some things have not changed. Throughout the century, FCD has been committed to children—to enhancing the quality of their day-to-day lives, strengthening the capacity of families and communities to care for them, and bolstering the nation's commitment to their well-being.

“When I came on the Board of the Foundation, I was shocked to learn that its resources were very modest because FCD had a national presence on children's issues, a national visibility that one would have thought to be associated with much more significant financial resources.”

Julius B. Richmond
Physician & Board member
Wheels turning. Merchants moving wares. Youngsters leaping from stoops onto crowded sidewalks, coatless mothers close behind with forgotten lunch pails.

At the Century's Turn...

These sights and sounds must have astonished the children on the horse-drawn omnibus—at least at first. Home-bound due to disabling conditions, they had spent their early years in cramped rooms, waiting for the hour when parents would return from work and siblings from school or play. This was an era before wheelchair access, before special education, before equal educational opportunity for all children. Indeed, another seventy-five years would pass before Congress would enact a law assuring all of our nation's children—including those with disabilities—the right to an appropriate, publicly supported education.
But to Mabel Irving Jones, a tough-minded young New Yorker, excluding disabled children from school made no sense—morally or educationally. In 1899, she and a number of like-minded friends persuaded the Children’s Aid Society, the city’s largest child welfare organization, to establish a class for crippled children at its new building on Sixteenth Street and Avenue B. For their part, the young women would form an organization—they called it an Auxiliary Board—to oversee the class and ensure that its students were transported from their homes to the schoolroom.

The first class had three children. Within months, word of the special class spread and a dozen more students enrolled. In February 1900, the fledgling organization was incorporated under the aegis of the Children’s Aid Society. That event gave rise to an organization that evolved, over a century, into today’s Foundation for Child Development (FCD).

The First Decade:
Affirming Public Responsibility for the Well-Being of All Children

It is easy, looking back, to paint Mabel Jones’ project in sentimental hues. After all, her classroom and the children who filled it were the stuff of a Dickens novel. And in many ways, her project was unremarkable. In the waning years of the nineteenth century, public attention to the plight of the urban poor often focused on children. In the 1880s, child welfare advocates were crusading to end the confinement of children in asylums and almshouses and to curb child labor. Among educators and psychologists, new ways of measuring and classifying intelligence had stirred interest in young “defectives” and “degenerates.” By the time Mabel Jones and her friends came of age, the cause of crippled children had been taken up by many affluent New Yorkers, particularly women.
But the projects of compassionate citizens rarely endure over a century. As the Foundation for Child Development marks its Centennial, it is worth asking: What set this effort apart?

Mabel Jones and her colleagues were not content to bestow charity on a small group of children. Nor were they satisfied with attracting a handful of well-heeled New Yorkers to their cause. Instead, they appealed to public officials and institutions to address the needs of the city's disabled children. In this way, they affirmed public responsibility for the education of all children. They could have done it differently.

They could have isolated the children, creating a new institution where children with severe disabilities could live and learn. Many others took this route. Instead, they saw integrating home-bound children into the community as a public responsibility.

They could have relied on tutors and home schooling to help children learn. They could have established a program of “friendly visitors,” a well-established form of charity at the turn of the century. But Jones and her colleagues were determined to help children experience the world and enjoy the company of their peers, so that they could grow socially and emotionally as well as physically and intellectually.

They could have limited the project to vocational training. By 1904, Mabel Jones reported that the curriculum of the class for crippled children was designed to be “as nearly as possible to the standing it would have in public school.” Whenever possible, children were transferred into public schools.

They could have focused narrowly on disabling conditions. They could have been content with donating braces and “rolling chairs.” Instead, the project’s commitment to the whole child was explicit and emphatic, anticipating the mission that would drive FCD’s grant-making decades later.

the first decade...
"[Our children need to know] how to find things out for themselves. Is there any better 'tool' to give them for this purpose than a thorough training in reading, writing, and arithmetic?"

MABEL IRVING JONES
AACC Founder

They could have been content to work only with the children. But from the start, the project worked with parents as well, establishing formal mothers' meetings in 1903. An early report on the Association by the Russell Sage Foundation noted that children were treated "as a member of a family and part of the community."

As their project grew, they could have expanded their private classes for crippled children. Instead, Jones knocked repeatedly on the doors of public officials, including New York City Schools Superintendent William Maxwell, to insist on her children's right to attend class with other, able-bodied children in the city's public schools. In short, Mabel Jones was determined to make her project obsolete. And she succeeded. In 1906, the New York City Board of Education incorporated into PS. 104 the first public school class for children with disabilities—a milestone in the history of public education. In this way, Jones laid the groundwork for FCD's commitment to policy development and advocacy, as well as to service.
THE SECOND DECADE:
Moving into Public Health Practice & Research

Mabel Jones’ cause—making the education of crippled children a right, not a charity—had won the day. But Jones’ work did not stop, nor did the agency fold. She and her colleagues saw clearly that children with disabilities had a broad spectrum of health and developmental needs that were not being met. Within a year, a cataclysmic event brought home this reality. The 1907 polio epidemic—the largest ever reported—swept through New York City. From the start, nurses had been employed to care for the children in the special classes, to accompany them to and from school, and to work with their families. In the aftermath of the polio epidemic, the Association’s identity evolved from an educational agency to an organization of visiting nurses.

In 1908, the Auxiliary Board declared independence from the Children’s Aid Society and established the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children (AACC). The newly independent organization faced a challenge that was to characterize its efforts throughout the new century: responding to rapidly changing conditions and needs.

The century’s second decade witnessed the explosive growth of public health nursing, with an emphasis on improving sanitary conditions in homes and institutions. As the scale of these efforts increased, efficiency became a major concern. There was broad consensus that efforts to help children with disabilities needed to be more systematic. But scientific management requires solid data, and little was known about children’s needs or the services they were receiving.

In 1913, the AACC moved headlong into the social survey movement. Focusing on a one-square block area in Manhattan’s largely Jewish and Italian Cherry Hill section, Association nurses conducted a door-to-door survey of 1,361 families. The results were dramatic: of the crippled children identified in the survey, more than three-quarters were not under medical care. Preschoolers, in particular, had escaped attention.

The Cherry Hill survey expanded the AACC’s mission to include research aimed at informing policy and practice—a function that remains central to FCD’s mission. Late in 1913, the AACC Board created a Survey Department and undertook large-scale studies of city neighborhoods. These surveys won recognition for the Association, and at the same time produced a steady supply of cases for its public nursing service.
In 1916, a second devastating polio epidemic hit the city, adding nearly 1,500 new children to the Association’s case load; by decade’s end, the nursing service had doubled in size. AACC was providing health supervision, free transportation, school nurse service, and “fresh air” camping to children in all of Manhattan and, beginning in 1917, in the Bronx as well.
"I think the whole history of the Association has been change: from an educational task that had nurses attached to it, it became nursing, it became treatment, it became prevention, and over into basic prevention, so that there is a continuity and also a discontinuity there."

ALICE FITZGERALD
AACC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
1935-1950

BELOW THE WORLD WARS:

Strengthening the Association and its Nursing Service

In the aftermath of World War I, competition for funds intensified. Annual contributions covered about half the annual nursing budget, which had reached $17,000 by the late teens. Small foundation grants offered some relief, but the situation remained critical. Once again, the women of the Association came up with an innovative solution. Learning from the whirlwind fundraising campaigns that World War I had popularized, they held a four-day old-fashioned street fair on elegant Park Avenue. Hand-drawn posters hung around the city publicized the event and its sponsor, but offered no hint of the extravaganza that awaited fairgoers. The New York Times called the fairgrounds a “miniature city.” The day’s leading headliners, including Fanny Brice and Eddie Cantor, graced its stage. A little-known contribution of the Association: the fair turned hot dogs into an institution of New York street life. Sold by Mrs. Nelson Doubleday, they gained sudden respectability and were consumed by thousands of first-time buyers. “All the women who have always wanted to eat them and never felt that it was the thing, are doing it at the fair,” the Times reported.

The fair’s success exceeded the organizers’ wildest dreams, tripling the Association’s income and turning it overnight from an obscure, shoestring charity to a well-regarded social welfare agency. The event also drew to the Association a new generation of volunteers, including Annie K. Belding, the wife of textile merchant Milo M. Belding, who joined the Board in 1921. Fairs in 1923 and 1925 built on this success.

During this period, Association nurses were making tens of thousands of visits to young patients each year. But new challenges faced the organization. Advocates of “scientific medicine” were raising questions...
about the professional training and competency of nurses, particularly public health nurses.

For 25 years, the nursing service had been headed by Genevieve Wilson. By the mid-thirties, the Board felt that change was needed. Alice FitzGerald was recruited to head the Association's nursing service. She dedicated herself to restoring public health nursing to its earlier stature, introducing a strong staff education program and helping "unregistered" nurses earn credentials. FitzGerald was dedicated to making a shift from merely alleviating children's symptoms to offering corrective treatments. She renewed emphasis on the whole child. And in a field that too often assumed that crippling conditions were inevitable, she stressed prevention.

1929 American Academy of Pediatrics founded
1933 Society for Research in Child Development founded
1935 Alice FitzGerald becomes AACC Director of Nursing
The Forties: Creating a Grantmaking Institution

The year was 1944. Once again, war had intensified the need for trained orthopedic nurses; with one of the largest teams of nurses in the country, the Association was well equipped to help meet the country’s emergency. But the children could not be neglected, especially in light of new outbreaks of polio. By 1943, polio already accounted for nearly a third of the cases handled by the Association. In 1944, another serious outbreak of the disease in New York City lifted the percentage to more than half of its four thousand cases. Faced with conflicting demands, the Board responded by training a corps of orthopedic volunteer nurse assistants for the Civilian Defense Nursing Corps.

In the midst of this frenetic activity came word that longtime Board member, Annie K. Belding, had died. According to the terms of a trust established by her husband, Milo Belding, her death brought to AACC two bequests totalling 11 million dollars—not a large endowment, compared with those of the largest foundations, but enough to put AACC on the philanthropic map.

But where on that map did AACC belong? Should the organization continue to deal primarily with physical disabilities? What about mental and emotional disabilities? Should the Association remain a service organization? Or should it venture into new areas of activity?

A committee was convened to chart a course for the Association. It was a distinguished group, and committee members reached out for advice to influential people in the public and private sectors and in the philanthropic community. Some individuals consulted in the process urged the AACC to abandon the nursing service altogether. Many urged a broader vision, arguing that the Association could become a research
organization of national stature that would provide leadership on issues related to children's well-being.

The process of re-inventing the Association was arduous. Two things were clear from the start. First, the Association would become a grant-making institution. And second, now that the Association had a sizable endowment to invest and administer, its female leadership would have to give way to men. This assumption was in keeping with the mores of the times, and while women continued to occupy Board seats, years would pass before they again took their places among the Foundation's key decision-makers.

By the time a new course was mapped out, a new charter was approved by the state, and a new Board president and executive director were in place, a new decade had arrived.

“We all struggled with what to do with the sizeable amount of money that came our way. Everybody wanted to make it a multiplier, to make it catalytic.”

Lewis B. Cuyler
Board Member
THE FIFTIES:

Shifting the Focus from Polio to Birth Defects

In the early part of the century, child health workers devoted most of their energies to coping with the impact of the acute infectious diseases that struck so many young people. In time, the advent of preventive policies and practices—known as the sanitary revolution—reduced the risk of physical disability. And the introduction of polio immunization in the mid-fifties brought further change, shifting the spotlight to a different set of child health and developmental challenges.

As the threat of polio passed, researchers began to focus on a leading cause of children's disabilities—birth defects. By learning more about prenatal development, they hoped to prevent many congenital abnormalities. In hindsight, the emphasis on birth defects seems natural, even inevitable, for a foundation dedicated to preventing crippling conditions. But at the time, the study of prenatal development was a political and professional minefield and was de-emphasized by many U.S. research and training institutions.

The Association sponsored conferences, convening experts from countries where prenatal research was underway. Ultimately, it was instrumental in spurring the U.S. National Institutes of Health to organize a study section in the field of prenatal research. Over time, the Association's work and influence led to better prenatal care and perinatal practice. Prenatal research was not an isolated instance of risk-taking at the Foundation. The willingness to consider new approaches has been, in the view of some observers, a hallmark of its work.

While reaching out to scientists from around the world, the
Association was determined to gather expertise from various disciplines. This was an era before scientists routinely crossed oceans to share their research, before they logged onto the Internet to communicate about their progress and send queries to investigators in other fields. The Association regularly convened meetings that brought together pediatricians, orthopedists, chemists, biologists, and psychologists. Its grants broke new ground by supporting research not only on the causes of disability, but on its effects—the social stigma that can hamper the development of children with disabilities.

Looking back at the history of the Foundation, pioneering psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner observes that the interdisciplinary approach was built into the organization: "The structure is one in which the notion of what discipline you [represent] doesn't enter your consciousness... and you [have insights that you] never would have thought of...." As individuals from many fields were consulted, new voices were heard, challenging the Foundation to look at a wider range of risk factors that threaten children's healthy development.

**THE SIXTIES:**

**Addressing a Wider Range of Issues**

The election of John F. Kennedy in 1960 proved to be momentous for the Foundation. Soon after taking office in 1961, Kennedy formed a Panel on Mental Retardation to study a condition that had touched his family. To chair the Panel, he tapped AACC's executive director Leonard Mayo. On the basis of the Panel's report in 1963, Congress amended the Social Security Act to assist states and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation.

Mayo's appointment certainly brought visibility and prestige to the Association. It also challenged the Foundation's staff, Board, and grantees to consider the relationship between research and policy. The focus on policy intensified through the decade, as the War on Poverty...
“...One of the strong philosophical threads in the fabric that [we] were weaving was the need for a closer relationship among the several disciplines essential to an understanding of human life and its development. And so this team concept was one that we were constantly trying to develop. As one goes over the life of an organization or one’s own professional life, one asks: how much did I or the organization really do to bring about change....I know full well that this team concept in research [has now] been accepted and that the Association had something to do with it.”

LEONARD MAYO
AACC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
1950-1958

took hold and concern about early development heightened.

Mayo’s role on the President’s panel answered a question that had remained open since the organization’s early days: Should the Association broaden its focus to include mental and emotional handicaps? In its early decades, the AACC Board had decided to limit its focus to physical disabilities. From the time of Mayo’s appointment to the Panel, the Foundation’s role in supporting research into mental and emotional disabilities was never again questioned.

In the mid-sixties, against a backdrop of social and political upheaval, the Foundation’s lens widened, taking in a host of new issues:

First, the Association turned its attention to the subject that was transforming the field of psychology during this era—cognitive development. Many studies were underway, aimed at understanding why some children experience cognitive delays and disabilities, including mental retardation. Might the causes be traced to infancy? Do familial or social factors play a role? To gain a deep understanding of cognitive development, researchers would need to follow a large group of children over time—ideally, from birth (or even before) through adulthood. That is why the Association decided to support research that became known as the Aberdeen study—a long-term study of children in a Scottish city that kept very good records of its children’s early years. The result was a series of discoveries that helped to shed light on medical, social, and familial factors associated with mental retardation.

Second, the Association supported research that led to an important breakthrough in preventing mental retardation. With the National Association for Retarded Children, the Association funded studies by Dr. Robert Guthrie, who developed a test that is still used today to iden-
tify children at risk for phenylketonuria (PKU). Immediately after birth, the PKU test can identify newborns who are unable to metabolize protein—a condition that can lead to severe mental retardation in the first year of life. This test is now mandatory across the nation.

Third, the Association supported research on the effects of malnutrition on children’s development. It was widely believed that malnutrition caused irreversible neurological damage, but very little was known about the relative contributions of physiological and social factors to children’s outcomes. This research offered evidence that social deprivation can contribute significantly to the effects of malnutrition.

A fourth research effort undertaken during this period took a very different tack. In the late fifties, a researcher offered a practical suggestion: If you want to understand all the risks to healthy development, why not look at accidents—a leading cause of death and disability in childhood. The initial impulse was to study all kinds of accidents; over time, preventing automobile accidents assumed the greatest urgency. A conference was convened at West Point, bringing together industrial engineers, epidemiologists, and a wide range of consultants, including experts on airplane crashes. Discussion pointed to a technology available to reduce injuries from car accidents—seat belts. AACC’s work on accident prevention helped to inform advocacy work that led to laws requiring seat belts and child restraint systems in cars.
Beyond the Sixties:
Linking Research and Policy

The fifties and sixties had forever changed the course of the AACC. Its new visibility on the national scene and its activity in diverse fields resulted in a network of professionals that strengthened the Association immeasurably. The Foundation's growing reputation attracted to it some of the most influential thinkers in the biological and social sciences: physicians like Julius Richmond, Michael Rutter, and Milton Senn; and psychologists like Urie Bronfenbrenner, Jerome Kagan, Henry Riecken, and Sheldon White.

At the same time, the Foundation's ventures into research had helped to expand knowledge about a wide range of issues affecting children's development.

But had the Foundation strayed too far from its commitment to service? This was the question posed by Leonard Mayo as he left the Association in 1965. His final report to the Board urged a return to greater involvement in practice as well as research, and a vigorous effort to bring to the field many of the things that had been learned over the last two decades. Mayo had taken some measures to make research findings accessible; for example, he commissioned Benjamin Spock to write a handbook for parents of children with disabilities. But his final advice to the Board was that more needed to be done.

The question of the Foundation's
mission was very much up in the air when Robert J. Slater, Jr., a physician and Dean of the University of Vermont Medical School, began his tenure as head of the organization. Slater stressed applied research that could contribute to policy formulation, especially on the national level. Under his leadership, the Association reoriented its research efforts to focus on the organization and delivery of health services to children. The goal was not only to find out how often children were visiting doctors’ offices, clinics, or hospitals, but also to document the results. This was an innovative approach at a time when the evaluation of public services was relatively uncharted territory.

Slater headed the Foundation from 1967 to 1973. A key strategy during this era was collecting data on the status of children—an activity that hearkened back to the days of the Cherry Hill and Yorkville surveys. The Association undertook a State of the Child report for New York City. While offering specific recommendations about policies and programs for New York City children, the project identified childhood social indicators—aspects of children’s lives that could be measured and would, taken together, allow an overall assessment of their well-being. It also devised new methods for extracting this information from local, state, and national records.

During Slater’s tenure, the Foundation also supported cross-cultural studies that inspired psychologists to integrate into their work some of the tools used by anthropologists. Using these tools, they could study the impact of culture on children and delve more deeply into the factors that promote or impede healthy development.

These were transitional years in the Foundation’s history, when some of the scholars who would later make key contributions appeared on
the scene and significant projects were initiated. Whereas early grants had focused squarely on handicapping conditions, during the late sixties and early seventies the Foundation began to open its lens to a wider range of child development issues. But it was over the next decade that these investments would bear fruit.

**The Seventies:**

**Exploring the “Ecology” of Human Development**

For more than a decade, the Board had been considering a name change. The Association for the Aid of Crippled Children had evolved into a Foundation with a broader scope. In 1972, the name was changed to the Foundation for Child Development. The change marked a widening of the lens from some children to all children. It reflected increasing emphasis on the trajectories of children’s lives and the conditions that affect them. A new mission statement was drafted, articulating the Foundation’s commitment to social research, advocacy, and action on behalf of children at risk. To translate this mission into a program, the Board elected as president its principal author, their fellow trustee, Orville G. Brim, Jr.

A sociologist with an eye for the big picture, Brim headed FCD from 1974 to 1984. During this period, the Foundation funded path-breaking work by influential psychologists. At the same time, FCD supported a number of direct service projects in New York City, including the Lower East Side Family Union Planning Project, and began an 18-year association with the Center for Family Life in Sunset Park, Brooklyn. While providing much needed services to local children and their families, these projects were intended as models of how to work in a neighborhood. They sought to identify the features that make neighborhood projects succeed and to suggest strategies for replicating them.
Growing a New Generation of Scholars and Advocates

“When you give a grant,” Leonard Mayo said, “In the final analysis, you invest in people....Good ideas come with good people.” Speaking a quarter-century later, Sheldon White put it this way: “When I looked over the list of FCD grantees, I was impressed by the quality of people that the Foundation was identifying and the seminal quality of their work.”

Many of the scholars and researchers associated with FCD’s efforts on behalf of children came of age in the century’s middle decades. During the seventies, concern about the next generation of child development experts intensified.

In partnership with the William T. Grant Foundation, FCD launched a Congressional Science Fellowship program. Through this project, 60 individuals had opportunities to work with members of Congress, gaining first-hand knowledge of the national political and legislative processes involved in the transformation of ideas into policy and law. This initiative was followed, in the eighties, by a Young Scholars program.

Among the grant recipients were numerous people who, in the late eighties and nineties, emerged as leaders in the child development field or related disciplines.

“The return on FCD’s investment in the Congressional Science Fellows and in the Young Scholars program has been quite remarkable. Recipients were young people and mid-career people. Now we have a cohort of people ranging from age 45 to retirement age. And it’s not a big group—100 people. But many of them are in key roles in government, in philanthropy, in research, at the National Academy of Sciences, and in other key positions.”

RUBY TAKANISHI
FCD PRESIDENT
1996-PRESENT
"If we are to study these large-scale societal influences on children—as I believe we must—new talents are required... We must recruit new and different kinds of behavioral and social scientists—economists, historians, lawyers, political scientists, and sociologists—to link up with developmental psychologists, social workers, child psychiatrists, pediatricians, in analyzing the impact of societal forces on the individual child."

Orville G. Brim, Jr.
FCD President, 1973-1984

But perhaps the greatest overall achievement of this period was FCD's role in restoring balance to developmental psychology at a time when the field had become preoccupied with children's cognitive growth. In the seventies and early eighties, FCD grants advanced an area of study which developmental scientists had neglected—emotional development. In studying children's development, few had asked: How do children view themselves and the process of growing up? Is a child's self-concept amenable to scientific study? To address these issues, the Foundation supported Jerome Kagan's efforts at Harvard University to explore and document young children's emerging sense of self. FCD's grants also sought to nurture young scholars interested in social and emotional development.

Brim believed that to understand an individual's developmental trajectory, you need to study the settings in which he or she lives. He referred to this as the "sociology of child development." His ideas strongly resonated with those of Cornell psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner. Bronfenbrenner transformed the field by describing the "ecology" of human development—the study of the nested contexts (nation, community, school, home) in which children grow up. FCD recognized the importance of this work and made substantial investments in Bronfenbrenner's Ecology of Human Development program at Cornell University. With FCD support, Bronfenbrenner wrote The Ecology of Human Development. This book, published in 1979, had a major impact not only on the field of child development but across the social sciences.

Brim's penchant for the big...
picture caused him to question how childhood fits into the broader span of human development. He believed that viewing the early years in the context of later periods would give the field a deeper understanding of child development, and he suggested that in a rapidly changing society, such work might strengthen relationships among the generations. With Jerome Kagan, he edited a book called *Constance and Change in Human Development* which challenged the view that early childhood experiences are all-powerful.

**Late 70s and Early 80s**

**Documenting the Status of Children**

From the days when Mabel Jones knocked on the doors of School Board officials, the Foundation for Child Development has been committed to influencing policy related to the well-being of children and families. Over the course of American history, public debate surrounding these issues has been tendentious. Issues of privacy, responsibility, and the public interest have often swirled into political storms. The Foundation’s history unfolded against the backdrop of this turbulence.

In its early years, the Association advocated for greater public investment in children, particularly those with disabilities. But for as long as service delivery was the primary mission, the challenge was to respond to policy changes rather than initiate them. The Association needed to adjust and reorient its activities as government took over some of the functions it had carried out, as other organizations entered the scene, and as epidemics and wars altered the social and political landscape.

In the second half of the century, policy challenges changed considerably. The launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957 raised the nation’s concern about children’s cognitive development. The federal government began to take a stronger role in education, traditionally a state and local responsibility. In the mid-sixties, President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty created new programs for children, including Head Start.

As these events unfolded, opportunities to affect policy on behalf of children grew. In the seventies, the Foundation responded in two ways: by investing in the collection and analysis of data that could influence policy, including data reflecting children’s perspectives, and by studying and strengthening the efforts of advocacy organizations.
Beginning in the late seventies FCD built on its State of the Child project, which had focused on New York City. Brim believed that since children do not participate directly in the political process, data can sometimes speak for them. The Foundation provided startup and core funding to Child Trends, Inc., an organization dedicated to collecting and analyzing national data about the health, education, behavior, and overall well-being of American children. Child Trends later moved to Washington, D.C.

The Foundation also responded to policy opportunities by focusing more sharply on advocacy. Beginning in the seventies, it made a series of grants explicitly aimed at strengthening child advocacy, with an emphasis on legal advocacy. Grantees included the American Civil Liberties Union, the Mental Health Law Project, the Children’s Defense Fund, and the National Black Child Development Institute.

In the eighties, the policy climate changed dramatically. Government support for children and families shrank—in some areas, almost to the vanishing point. The child poverty rate shot up. In many communities, the safety net became perilously thin...or non-existent. New challenges loomed.

80s and Early 90s
Spotlighting Two-Generation Strategies

The shift in political winds and the departure of Orville Brim after ten years at the helm of FCD, occasioned soul-searching on the part of the Foundation and its Board. As it searched for a new chief executive, the Board devoted considerable time to writing a mission statement reaffirming FCD’s commitment to funding the integration of research, policy, and direct action initiatives. But the statement added that given limited resources, the curtailment of relevant government programs, and the increasing number of children at risk, FCD’s program should be “more closely focused towards the objective of influencing, over the near term, policies and programs having a direct impact on children and families at risk.”

In 1986, the Board named a new president, Barbara B. Blum. Blum believed that the Foundation needed to address widespread public skepticism about the wisdom of societal interventions for low-income families and children.

One of FCD’s main concerns during this period was welfare policy and, in particular, the Family Support Act of 1988, which focused
on moving adults off welfare and into jobs. This legislation continued a long-standing government practice of delivering services to low-income families using two separate tracks: one that focused on adults’ work or welfare status with little attention to children’s needs; and a second that provided child and family services but gave short shrift to employment, training, or income security. FCD saw, in this legislation, crucial opportunities to improve conditions for some of the nation’s children by infusing welfare reform with a two-generational perspective. In 1989, the Foundation convened a research forum on children and the Family Support Act at the National Academy of Sciences. And it supported a range of projects aimed at developing and disseminating two-generation strategies.

During Blum’s tenure, the Foundation worked in partnership with other organizations on several key projects. FCD played an important role with the Hewlett and Ford Foundations in creating the Grantmakers Income Security Task Force, which examined a wide range of issues related to income, benefits, and the relationship between them. Working with the United Way of New York City and the New York Community Trust, FCD supported the Agenda for Children Tomorrow (ACT) task force, which sought to move planning capacity for child welfare services from central offices into neighborhoods.

In the late eighties, FCD’s agenda stressed timely, direct action. Implicit in this program was a commitment to serving the children and families of New York City. Blum believed that by supporting programs like the Center for Family Life in Brooklyn’s Sunset Park community, FCD could improve the prospects of some New York City children while showcasing effective, neighborhood-based strategies for improving the life chances of low-income children.
The late nineties brought to FCD a new President, Ruby Takanishi, charged with charting the Foundation’s course into its second century. “The evolution of FCD since 1899, reflects parallel changes in American philanthropy over the past hundred years,” says Takanishi. “Moving from its early origins in personal charity and institutionalized provision of direct service, modern philanthropy has sought to become more strategic, leveraging larger and more sustained resources to address social problems that philanthropy alone cannot solve.”

The challenge for FCD—now and into the future—is to use its resources creatively and effectively toward fundamental, systemic social change that is responsive to the changed needs of American families. Ultimately, FCD seeks for all families a fair, just, universal system of supports through a combination of income security and high-quality education and health programs.

In recent years, FCD has focused on an area that most Foundations have overlooked, and that is ripe for research, policy analysis, and creative programming: working-poor families. Some of these families have incomes below the poverty line; others earn slightly more and are not officially poor, but they are living in impoverished conditions and struggling to provide for their children’s basic needs.

FCD has taken on one of the toughest challenges facing any nation: addressing the causes and consequences of economic inequality for children and their families. Even the nation’s largest philanthropic institutions cannot solve this problem alone. How can a relatively small foundation like FCD make a difference?

FCD can increase knowledge about the causes of poverty, its effects on children, and strategies that can alleviate it. It can support thoughtful, courageous individuals who are able to develop powerful programs and policies. It can support advocacy from the top and from the bottom. Finally, FCD can join kindred organizations in challenging social injustice and pointing to promising solutions. These are the strategies that FCD has supported from its earliest days, and these are the strategies that will see it into a new century.

“I believe that a small foundation like FCD has an important role to play. It has a certain freedom, and thus the ability to innovate and take risks.”

BARBARA PAUL ROBINSON
FCD CHAIR
1991-PRESENT

100 years...

MILESTONES IN THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT FIELD

| 1996 | Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act enacted |
| 1997 | President Clinton holds two White House Conferences on early learning and child care |
Wheels turning. School buses winding through city streets or tree-lined roads. Trucks rumbling past parks. Young children making their way to the playground, clutching the hands of their teachers.

At the Century’s Turn...

One hundred years have passed since Mabel Jones and her friends began their class for crippled children. Little about today’s Foundation for Child Development recalls its early days. FCD has evolved from a public charity to a private foundation; from an organization concerned with physical disabilities to one committed to addressing the social conditions that jeopardize children’s healthy development. It has grown from a local New York City organization into a national institution. It has moved from providing direct service to integrating research, policy analysis, and advocacy in order to improve children’s lives.

Change has been steady and dramatic, but the convictions that set the Foundation in motion at the turn of the last century continue to inform its grantmaking today. FCD remains committed to understanding and enhancing children’s development in the context of their families and communities. Its work remains rooted in the belief that public institutions have a responsibility to ensure that families have access to the knowledge and resources they need to raise their children well. Only by remaining faithful to these principles can the Foundation for Child Development meet the test of public trust and fulfill its historic mission.
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