

Marilyn Smith

- B.S. (1958) Oklahoma State University, M.S. (1960) Oregon State University, Ed.D (1970) George Peabody College

Major Employment:

- National Association for the Education of Young Children – 1973-1999, Executive Director
- Council for Professional Recognition – 1999-, Program Associate

Major Areas of Work:

- Child Development and Early Childhood Education

SRCD Affiliation:

- Social Policy Committee (1977-81), Governing Council and Chair of Finance Committee (1982-88)



SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

Marilyn Smith

Interviewed by Alberta Siegel
At Stanford University
March 10, 1994

Siegel: Today is Thursday, March 10th, 1994. I'm Alberta Siegel. I'm talking with Dr. Marilyn Smith in my office at Stanford University, at ten o'clock in the morning. Dr. Smith has just come out from Washington, and tomorrow she will be plunged into the meeting of the California Association for the Education of Young Children, and she came a day early so we could do this recording for the Society for Research in Child Development.

Marilyn, we want to talk eventually about your participation in the Society for Research in Child Development, and one function for sure of these tapes will be to write a history of the Society for Research in Child Development, but we also want a range more widely because these tapes will be filed with the National Library of Medicine, and in the future people might use them for other purposes, which we can't anticipate, and so we're kind of covering as many bases as we can. I thought we might just start with your education. I have your CV in front of me, and I see that you went to the Marlow High School, which is located where?

Smith: Marlow, Oklahoma.

Siegel: Marlow, Oklahoma. And then you attended Oklahoma State for your bachelors degree, which was in child development.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: And that was in the middle 1950's.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: Tell me about what it was like then at Oklahoma State. I know it's a big, big place now, and it was probably smaller then.

Smith: Probably no more than eight to ten thousand.

Siegel: Oh, really!

Smith: And I went to a child development department in a college of home economics --

Siegel: Right.

Smith: -- because that's where you could get the child study emphasis. My parents insisted I also get an elementary teaching certificate so I could be assured of a job--I finished by doing this, so I did sort of a double major by taking classes in a college of education to get a teaching certificate, but they would not coordinate it. I had to do the coordination.

Siegel: Even though it was a small university by today's standards.

Smith: Yes. But it's that traditional thing we still have a problem with in some places that education and child development are not integrated well, preparation programs, especially undergraduate.

The highlight, actually, of all of that, was being selected to go to the Merrill-Palmer Institute as a senior, because in that period of time Merrill-Palmer was a thriving place for interdisciplinarian pursuit of the study of human development. And they selected between sixty to eighty or ninety students a semester, to come for a semester, at a either late junior or senior level of their studies. Oklahoma State selected one person a semester to go, and that was actually the stellar experience of the undergraduate thing for me that began to put all the pieces together, interest in pursuing studies further, because of the total integration of -- or I will never forget arriving there and being placed in a group of about fifteen, and being told by an anthropologist who happened to run this group (because everyone was put in groups) you have to define what you need to know about human development, and then I will help you construct what we will do in this semester. It really took us back, and we struggled for two or three days before we as the students could get our questions organized of what we thought we needed to know to plan --

Siegel: Did they have housing for you?

Smith: Oh, yes. You lived on -- it was the one block, these old homes. It's really literally across the street from Wayne, which, of course, it now is a part of, it's one of those mini institutions that we have lost. You lived in these houses, and the classrooms were living rooms of these old homes.

Siegel: So when you say you struggled to figure out the answer, the struggle was incurring in this living situation?

Smith: Oh, yes. Sitting around the floor in the living, in an old, old house, in the living room and sitting on chairs or on the floor. That was your core group. You did other things, but that was the heart of what you did. We had to define what our questions were, what we needed to know more about. And part of this resulted in all kinds of speakers coming in to help us begin to explore those questions. Part of it was experiences out in the community, going out and seeing programs. It wasn't all done as a group of even of twelve or fifteen, whatever our group size was, it was a lot of individual, we could probe down some of our own interests. A lot of independent reading. The leader of our group, the anthropologist would say, "Here are readings that could help you," but sometimes we would agree to just talk about a issue. We all might have read different things about it out of this huge list she would prepare, but it was this wonderful opportunity to really grasp on to the concept of what learning (I think) really should be about, and how one really has to ask the question to figure out what you need to know in order to pursue that.

Siegel: You know, I was teaching in a college home economics during those years, and I remember that being sent to the Merrill-Palmer was a great honor for a student, and that students characteristically had that very positive response that you had.

Smith: And it's what I'm sure has made the difference in my whole career --

Siegel: Really.

Smith: -- of going on, because up until then I had not even contemplated going on for a masters, but the instructors there just would start talking about it and what the options were, and then use their connections. D. Keith Osborn was my advisor, and just would probe, "Would you be interested?" "Would you pursue this?" And then would make suggestions, and made the contact for me at Oregon State with Katherine H. Read. She became Katherine Read-Baker, but at that point it was Katherine Read. Through his influence I got an assistantship at Oregon State and as soon as I got back to Oklahoma State and finished my student teaching, which I needed to do to get the certification over in education, and I was out to Oregon.

Siegel: So did your parents conclude that maybe you would be able to get a job?

Smith: They were always supportive of my interest in the child development aspect, and particularly the concept of working with preschool children, but it's just that at that time they couldn't see where I could get a job in that area, and just were insisting on, 'be sure you have a certificate in case you ever would have to fall back on it.'

Siegel: Did you ever have to fall back on it?

Smith: No.

Siegel: And I suppose that eventually you let the certificate lapse?

Smith: Oh, yes.

Siegel: So what was Oregon State like at that time?

Smith: You know I can't even say what the size of that student body was, but I -- similar because it was a land grant again, and the child development department was in the college of home ec, again.

My assistantship was teaching in the lab school, and having a group of -- I don't recall whether they were three or four year olds that I was responsible for, and working with student teachers and lots of observers and -- but that was all -- I'd been quite used to that from the lab school at Oklahoma State.

Siegel: You had a lab school at Oklahoma State?

Smith: Oh, yes.

Siegel: Similar arrangements?

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: And, of course, they had a lab school at Merrill-Palmer --

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: -- although I don't know whether you worked in it.

Smith: Observed in it. Didn't work in it. Observed in it. So all that was very, very usual. And great people, professors to work with, and very small classes. Del Shallock was my major Professor -- experience with a small cadre of master students, and even that interaction being just very stimulating.

Siegel: Have you ever read that novel about Oregon State? I'm trying to think of that name of it. It was written by a New Yorker who went out there to teach English, and I think he's kind of become a hate figure in that town, because he saw it as very small town and very small timey.

Smith: Oh, but I'm sure it would, but for my background it was – well, Marlow, Oklahoma is a town of four thousand people, and then I'd been in Stillwater, Oklahoma, so it just fit the pattern. I had not – Detroit was the unknown situation to me –

Siegel: Yes. Big city.

Smith: -- living there (Detroit) for the six months. And then the Oregon thing that was so wonderful for me was the west coast and the beauty of the ocean and all of that, which if you grew up in Oklahoma, that was a new experience.

Siegel: We'll go to the bookstore after lunch and see if we can find that book. I think the author was Mellimen, but I'm not sure. But Brewster Smith was at Oregon State. I don't know if you ever ran across him, and his – or maybe it was his father, I think, spent his career there. And I met Brewster Smith's mother once, and I mentioned this novel, that was my total knowledge of Corvallis, and her face darkened and she – I said, "Really, all I know about it is that novel," and then she said, "Well then you don't know anything." And I think she obviously had loved that town and loved the university and been a contributor to it.

Smith: Beautiful little college town.

Siegel: So how long were you there?

Smith: I believe I started – I did the masters in sort of an academic year and two summers. In other words I finished Oklahoma State in the spring and immediately went out and started that summer in Oregon working, then all that year, and then finished the following summer, and as a result of being there, then attended my first NANE Conference, the National Association for Nursery Education. That was before we changed the name to NAEYC, and that conference was in L.A. that year, that was '59, and so Katherine Read was very active. I think she was on the board of the organization. And, of course, it was just assumed, graduate students would get in their cars – or car, there was one group of us, and drive from Corvallis to L.A.

Siegel: You bet!

Smith: And I was fortunate in that the person I was sharing a room with in Corvallis, in an apartment house, family lived in Redondo Beach, so she put us up in her home so we didn't have hotel costs. And again, the connections, because of Katherine Read, then I already had my first job at Iowa State University -- you start in the fall, even before I went down to that conference, and there met Glen Hawkes, who was the head of the department of child development of Iowa State University. But he'd already hired me, sight unseen, based on Katherine Read's recommendation.

I had wanted to go to work for Jimmy Hymes at the University of Maryland, and had applied there as well - - that was of high interest to me because of his writing and so forth. But they were insisting on interviewing in person the people they were hiring, and that just wasn't feasible, so I got the job at Iowa State. – I met him (Glen Hawkes) in person when I went down to L.A. to the conference –

Siegel: Glen Hawkes?

Smith: Glen Hawkes. And by September 1959 I was on sight in Ames, Iowa -- started to teach there. And again, teaching in the lab school, being responsible for, then I know I had three year olds, and a lot of student teachers. Teach in the morning, work with the parents, work with all the student teachers, with all the observers, and then teach classes in the afternoon.

Siegel: Those are busy jobs.

Smith: And that first year, I can still remember vividly -- how we all quite got through it, because there were three of us, all brand new masters doing that, and you can imagine -- all living together in the same little apartment. And the preparation was incredible, but the physical energy and emotional energy required to work with children and their families, and then all of the teaching --

Siegel: And the pay was lousy probably?

Smith: I could not -- I should go back and look. I couldn't even imagine what it was, but my family felt that that was prestigious to be teaching in a university, so --

Siegel: You know, now when you were at Oregon State, was there any research going on in the nursery school? Were there investigators who were using it as a research laboratory?

Smith: Not a great deal. I would say in the lab schools at Oklahoma State there was minimal. At Merrill-Palmer there was more going on, and it had certainly gone on there in the past, we know that.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: So I got a little more exposure there to that concept. But then, in Oregon State, some, but it wasn't fundamental. Actually -- and at Iowa State it wasn't -- it was there, but it was not a major thing. In the programs that I was in that we mentioned on the way were very much about preparing teachers as the main focus.

Siegel: Preschool teachers.

Smith: Yes. And there was a valuing of the research and the child study, and the using and the applying of it. And certainly at Iowa State there was more, in terms of research because they had a very strong doctoral program, and being aware of the research going on there, the interest. And it was through that position that I got to SRCD for the first time, because the professors up there at Iowa State were leaders in NANE, presidents and so forth. I mean, Glen Hawkes was the president of NANE during that period, and someone else on the staff was secretary. There wasn't an office then. There wasn't a staff, and they pretty much ran it (NANE) out of the department with some help from Chicago. But these people were also very active in SRCD. They weren't active in the sense of being on the council board and all, but SRCD was a very important organization to them, and they always went to the meetings.

When it was in Minneapolis in '60 -- I think it was '64, that was close enough that I could go, and they took a fairly large contingency of staff, and even graduate students who all went up to Minneapolis for the SRCD conference. And the thing that's memorable to me about that is that it was in, probably March, because I remember there was -- February and March there was snow on the ground, and they had just announced Head Start. And there was a huge debate from colleges all over the country about whether or not they would be involved in the summer training. I say '64, and I'm not sure. Maybe it was '65, because Head Start began in 65.

Siegel: I think it probably was '65, because I think SRCD met in odd years.

Smith: All right. Then that was it. And it just seems to me so incredible now that we could learn about the Head Start concept in February or March, and by summer we were training people and they were opening classrooms. I'm sure that is exact, because I know '65 is when Head Start began.

But what I remember was it was like at that meeting when Glen Hawkes and other faculty were conferring with all their other colleagues around the country, "What are you going to do?" Because they felt like it (Head Start) was coming on so fast, could it be done well? Could you get people trained quickly enough to not do harm? And so it was a big debate. Do you say, "They're not doing it right, there isn't enough money, and so we'll just stay out of it? Or do we get involved and do the best we can?" Well, Glen Hawkes's nature, of many things, and the reply here was, "They're going to do it, so we're going to get

involved and do the very best we can with it.” But that’s what makes that first meeting – that almost overwhelms my memory of that meeting because of that debate.

Siegel: I was at that meeting, but I don’t think I met you.

Smith: No?

Siegel: But I do remember the meeting, and I remember staying at the Radisson Hotel, and I remember all the excitement of that year. Before we get to Head Start, I want to ask you about home management babies. Were there home management babies at Iowa State?

Smith: I had forgotten about that, Alberta. They were definitely at Oregon State. We didn’t have it at Oklahoma. They definitely had it at Oregon State, and I wasn’t involved in it, it was only in Oregon.

Siegel: We had it at Penn State.

Smith: Yes. And I remember at Merrill-Palmer hearing people talk about it, but – and the students who had had the experience, I mean it was like a life changing experience to them, the way they would talk about living in the home management home with the babies, but no, I didn’t experience it.

Siegel: I think of Damaris Pease, wasn’t she a Professor at Iowa State? Yes.

Smith: Damaris Pease?

Siegel: Damaris Pease. She did a study of home management babies.

Smith: Maybe Iowa State did, and I just don’t recall it, or it was not in operation by the time I got there. That’s fascinating! That’s something I had forgotten. I wonder why it was – that certainly phased out.

Siegel: And you didn’t live in a home management house as an undergraduate at Oklahoma?

Smith: No.

Siegel: Oklahoma State?

Smith: No. I don’t think they had it.

Siegel: At Penn State they had very attractive one-story ranch houses on the campus near the home economics buildings. They looked like the houses that prosperous, middle-class people would live in. I don’t think I ever stepped inside the doors. I don’t have any memory of the interior, but the exterior was very attractive; brick houses, and each of those houses came with a baby. And I think the babies were obtained through the social services system. Does that ring a bell with you?

Smith: What – because when you brought it up I thought, “Where did they get the babies?” And I was thinking that I’d heard of situations where it was faculty who taught – would live there with their own baby, but I don’t know. I don’t know.

Siegel: I think the social workers disapproved of this practice, and I think they criticized the home economics colleges. I don’t know that, but I seem to remember that our Dean was quite concerned in that there was – the argument was that there was continuity in that the resident advisor kept an eye on that baby through the whole year, but the babies care would actually rotate from week to week from one girl to another, and each girl lived for a term in the home management house, and one of her weeks was cooking and one week was something else, shopping let’s say, and one week was taking care of the baby. And this was when Bowlby’s influence was very prominent in social work, I guess it still is, and they were very dubious about that practice. But you don’t remember it at Iowa State, but you remember it at Oregon State.

Smith: Yes, I do.

Siegel: I don't think it's done anymore.

Smith: Oh, I'm sure it's not. I really think I would know about it if it were. I think we would.

Siegel: And the study showed that those children compared favorably in height and weight and nutritional status and developmental milestones and all that, to whatever comparison group was used. Clearly they did better than, let's say, children in orphanages, but the – I think the social work profession, their view was, these children should be adopted at birth. And it may have been – I don't know, but it may have been that the one's that ended up in home management houses, that their papers really weren't clear and they couldn't have been adopted, and so it was a question of foster care versus the home management houses. But anyway, okay, you're not going to be my great informant on home management babies.

Smith: No. No.

Siegel: You know the other thing is they may have gone slightly underground by then. They may still have been having them, but they may not have displayed it prominently in the community. But as you say, it may have been faculty children, or whatever. Anyway, on to Iowa State and Head Start.

Smith: Well, milestones I think of during my tenure at Iowa State, one came prior to Head Start, and that was the 1960 White House Conference on Children. And I was selected as a delegate, which again, it's always incredible to follow the connections from people to people and see how everything really happens. NANE was given a certain number of delegates, I think maybe six, and they decided that it should be by age category, so they had the current president and other people, leaders in the field, but they had a slot for a student, and the other slot for a young professional, and I was identified as a young professional. And again, I'm sure it was because Glen Hawkes and Katherine Read and these people were on the NANE Board or in the group that was making the selection.

But at any rate, I got this incredible opportunity my first year teaching at a very young age, to go to the White House Conference. It was an overwhelming experience in some regard. I was in awe. But my thoughts about it is it has from that time forward triggered within me to the point that I have spoken against having White House Conferences.

They do not prompt change, because we know that we can go back to the recommendations of those conferences that were in that period held every decade, and we have not yet implemented those recommendations. And so that in the last – from time to time there will be a new impetus of someone starting a momentum, we've got to – you know, we've lost our White House Conference, we need to have White Conferences, we need Summit Conferences again, and I guess I – in that I fear that it gives an excuse for spending money and putting attention and energy into formulating recommendations that we do nothing about.

Now maybe I should be more positive and say, "Well, maybe it's the way they're organized, and maybe they should be designed with different purpose, of difference organization --

For the 1970 White House Conference I was in Washington and that was my first year at NAEYC in 1970, and I wasn't a delegate, but I was very close to people who were, and was talking to them while they were in there for the meetings and learning a lot about it, and it was just so political, and so many fights among different interest groups to get their recommendations in, to get it voted on, and all of this emotion and you know, I think, "For what? What does it accomplish?"

Siegel: And that was the 1970 White House Conference.

Smith: Yes. And it probably was going on in '60, but as a very young person, sort of, I wasn't privied to that. At that point I was just sort of enjoying the speakers and the massiveness of it and getting to meet these people and so forth.

Siegel: Where was it held actually?

Smith: Washington.

Siegel: I understand, but I mean --?

Smith: I don't even remember where I stayed. We were in lots of different hotels. It was in auditoriums down in various government buildings, that's why I think its not a clear -- It wasn't in hotels, I mean we'd have food functions in hotels, and I remember going to the hotels for those, but the meetings themselves were in Federal Government auditoriums.

Siegel: And did you meet the President?

Smith: I don't recall that. The strong memories, actually, are of the people in my field that I met, the people that – because I met them in person.

Siegel: You'd heard about them –

Smith: Heard about them –

Siegel: -- and read their writings.

Smith: So that was a milestone, and then I would say the next memory of that time when I was at Iowa State, and then the next was the launching of Head Start. That was '65, and Iowa State did say that we would do training. And we had two cadres of trainees and I was put in charge of it, and actually got Nancy, who was Nancy Elson then that you've met, Nancy Hunt had been at Iowa State, her husband was at Harvard when she was the [redacted] then, but we got her to come back and do it with me and we sort of co-directed these two intensive weeks of training.

And I'll never know the rationale about how they decided, about who went where for training, but here we were in Ames, Iowa, and our trainees came from Alabama and Mississippi and Nebraska. I think we might have had some from Iowa, but mostly out of state. We had one week per group, and it was intensive. We were totally committed to our training being comprehensive, and so we had medical doctors and social workers and nurses, as well as our child development specialists. We wanted it to be as much application to practice as possible, so we built everything around the children, we made school – we had to lay all the labs in operation so that we could have intensive observation, and as much as possible, a lot of small group discussions. Some lectures, but always trying to follow-up with break-outs and discussing and trying to help apply and observe and so forth, and just going these long, long days and I think evenings, and just as intensive as we could.

Siegel: And these trainees were going to be Head Start teachers?

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: Or they were going to be Directors of Head Start programs?

Smith: Directors and teachers.

Siegel: And their qualifications were?

Smith: I don't even know. You know the timeline. I mean it was, there you were at SRCD, whether it was February or March, and they were deciding – colleges were deciding were you going to do the training.

They had decided, government had, that they were going to open them that summer, and how – who decided who -- because they set up the community action agencies to operate the programs and already it was designed to be very locally based.

Who selected the teachers and who were going to be the Directors? My memory of our group was extreme variance in backgrounds, preparation in many different areas, and people coming – some people, yes, had worked with children, but other's hadn't.

Siegel: Generally, pretty young or--?

Smith: No. No. My recollection is of people in their thirties and forties. I also remember that we were stressing for us -- it was so important to comprehensive nature, which was the -- in our usual training at Iowa State, they were so heavy on the actual early childhood education – working hard to be sure we were integrating the health services and the social services that the families would need. And we knew the other Child Development and Early Childhood Education backwards and forwards, but we had to really stretch ourselves to be sure that we were helping integrate this. And then we turned around and did it immediately the next week for another cadre of groups. So we did it two weeks in a row.

Siegel: This was in the summer?

Smith: It was in the summer. It was early summer, and then they went back and did those first summer Head Start programs.

Siegel: Now the children who were in the lab schools at Iowa State, were they primarily children of college professors, or --?

Smith: And students.

Siegel: And students?

Smith: Yes. Because it was a lab school, the criteria for the selection from the waiting list was racial mix as much as possible, and of course, in Ames, Iowa that in one sense would not be easy if you took it from the community, but by taking it especially from the student and faculty population it became easier.

Siegel: I see.

Smith: Also, we always tried to make sure that we had children with some form of special need, and all the things you would think of frequently we'd have at least one child that didn't speak English. Everything, all the variances you could think of, because of it being an observation setting and a training setting.

Siegel: But it wouldn't be a similar population to the Head Start children that they would go back to teach?

Smith: Not necessarily. Not necessarily. What an interesting comment about my memory of what came out of that, having described what we tried to do, in many places I think tried to do very quickly. There were colleges and universities that really took advantage and abused the system because the colleges and universities were paid by the number of people that were trained.

So what happened in that first summer that there were places that accepted the students and literally put them in auditoriums to watch films practically – there were variations in between. So there was a real uprising within NANE about that, and by the next summer, NANE had been instrumental, or this organization had in getting a committee, actually as a paid – two or three paid people who went over all of the proposals so that colleges could no longer get by with that for the training. And then soon after that they started all the RTO's and training, and then they began to establish criteria and so forth.

Siegel: What does RTO mean?

Smith: Regional Training Officer. The training eventually got in place and evolved, but it was rough going that first year.

Siegel: But the idea of Head Start at that time was not only early childhood education, but also social welfare services for the children and medical – at least screening, and maybe also medical care and treatment.

Smith: Oh, absolutely. Getting those children to dentists, getting those immunizations, getting the health screening going, was a big critical part. Parent involvement and training, we used it almost as a job training for parents. Head Start came and you could argue what the primary goal was, it came out of the poverty program, and to some it was more of a – previewed it as – the educational experiences at a very, very important period in children's lives. And being sure that the children were healthy and well-fed, and could take advantage of the educational learning opportunities.

Siegel: And the typical Head Start program at that time was, one year, two year, six months?

Smith: It became almost immediately – at first it was just that summer program, but it became a one-year program. And it still –

Siegel: I'm talking about the program for the child.

Smith: For the child.

Siegel: Yes. Became one year.

Smith: Yes. One year.

Siegel: I see. But at first –

Smith: For four year olds.

Siegel: At first it was a summer program.

Smith: Just that first summer, and I guess, hopefully, most of those children then went on that next year. I'm not sure about that. But we did get it off to a start that summer.

Siegel: But then it became a year-long program for four year olds.

Smith: And, of course, we're still fighting that. And hopefully this year and next we'll be making progress on that with that new Head Start advisory panel report that just came out about two months ago or so.

Siegel: Yes. Now we've fast-forwarded to 1994.

Smith: Yes. It demonstrates how you start these programs and almost thirty years later, the things that still need to be fixed. Of course, the Society – then it wasn't as urgent to have children in a program all day long, but see we're still faced with now, children in a Head Start program primarily being in for a half day. It's ludicrous because if the parent really is out in the job force, where is the child the other part of the day. Actually, it keeps many of the children who are eligible out of the program. So needing to be full day, needing to stay in it for more than one year. Children need to be younger, start earlier.

Siegel: Yes. Now is that because they're running two groups of children every day, morning and afternoon?

Smith: Originally -- it also is because of the time working in the community as well, and working with parents and some of the other services.

Siegel: -- say in the morning, and then in the afternoon she'd be working with parents and so forth.

Smith: And then in other cases they would only hire people for part day.

Siegel: I see.

Smith: In other cases they really do have morning and afternoon. It's a local decision.

Siegel: So how many of these training programs did you do while you were --?

Smith: I guess we repeated it the next year. As always, the first one is the traumatic one that you remember most vividly, so that would have been 1986. And then by 1987 I was leaving there (Iowa State).

Siegel: Not '87.

Smith: I mean, '67.

Siegel: '67.

Smith: Right. 1965 and 1966 we would have done those training programs. And I don't know whether – I just don't recall whether I was – or whether they were still doing the training. I'm not sure they were even continuing to do the training that way. I think that was just getting it started, and then I left Iowa State in '67.

Siegel: And went to?

Smith: Peabody College to get my doctorate. Many of these wonderful institutions I was associated with are no longer independent. They're both – I'm thinking obviously of Merrill-Palmer Institute and Peabody College, and in those cases both still do exist, but by being absorbed by a larger university. Many of – of course, we lost many just all together, so.

Siegel: Peabody was absorbed by Vanderbilt, and Merrill-Palmer by Wayne State. And the ones we lost all together --?

Smith: Well, now I'm drawing a blank. For ones that were really important to the child development field, I can't say, it's like Tufts and -- sometimes being connected with a larger institute.

Siegel: Pacific Oaks still on its own or did it affiliate with UCLA?

Smith: No, I think its still on its own.

Siegel: Yes. I think.

Smith: And so is Bank Street.

Siegel: Yes. Bank Street.

Smith: And Erikson is attached to Layola University Chicago. It still carries its very strong own identity.

Siegel: At the time you went to George Peabody it was an independent freestanding institution. How large was it at that time?

Smith: I don't know. I don't know.

Siegel: You weren't an administrator who had to know those facts.

Smith: No. No. I got there because of DARCEE. Again, Head Start. 1967, okay – the money was flowing into training – to do training and research. Actually, it was research primarily on the curriculums for children, and that was the DARCEE model they were developing there.

Siegel: DARCEE is spelled?

Smith: DARCEE. And I can't tell you – I have to look it up. Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education.

Siegel: Yes. Okay.

Smith: When I made a very sudden decision in May of '67 to look for a place to do my doctorate, in the fall of 1967 I had seen flyers from George Peabody, DARCEE's program, about having scholarship for doctoral students, and it was past the deadline, but I just gave a call and Susan Gray wasn't in, but I learned that Dr. Richard Hinze was in charge of the doctoral fellowship programs and called. And yes, the deadline was past but they had one that hadn't been filled. And again, --

Siegel: How old were you at this point?

Smith: Thirty one. I'd been at Iowa State seven years.

Siegel: Oh, you had been.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: So you were ready for a change.

Smith: Yes. But I hadn't really decided very systematically. I really enjoyed what I was doing and my responsibilities kept changing, it had been very satisfying, and hadn't really thought about going on. And all of a sudden the following year didn't look that bright because for a variety of reasons we lost twelve to thirteen faculty; retirement, moving, just a variety of reasons. And I was going to be – I just kept being given more and more and more responsibility. I was going to be put in charge of all the labs -- being larger, and so many of the support people I'd worked with were going to be gone, and I just thought well maybe this is the time to do something else and I just quietly explored it. I picked up the phone, and ironically there was a scholarship that was still available, and even more ironic, he said, "And we have money in our budget, we can fly you down here to look at us, and us look at you and see if it would be a good match." So I quietly over Memorial Day weekend, without people knowing it, just – because they were open on Memorial Day, I just flew down, interviewed all day and flew right back.

Siegel: Nashville in the late sixties. Most musical town in America, I think. I don't know if it struck you that way?

Smith: No. I was extremely focused on study. Extremely focused on study. It was all very satisfying studying. The statistics were extremely scary to me, that had not been an area I had excelled in or even – I hadn't even tried, didn't even attempt it; I didn't have a good math background. And the only reason I'm reflecting on this is Joe Stevens (deceased SRCD member) got me through it as sort of a tutor, because he was – his work with Susan Gray and Rupert Klaus were years from their Murfreesboro Study [Early Training Project, Murfreesboro (TN) Preschool Program for Culturally Deprived Children - (study results provided inspiration for founding Head Start)] on forward. And he (Joe Stevens) was getting his doctorate at the time, but he had done a lot of work in the programs with the children.

The other thing that saved me was that Klaus taught me statistics, and here I was in this huge class, my memory is maybe fifty graduate students. It was huge. But his examples were all from the Murfreesboro Study, so they were my stuff. Klaus's teaching examples couldn't have been more meaningful to me, which made an incredible difference.

And I remember just getting myself on the front row, and whatever I didn't understand, asking questions. I learned to ignore some other people in the class who thought I should not stop and ask questions, but – and then I used – Joe would tutor me on the side, and made it fun, so that was the traumatic part.

Siegel: That's true for so many students. Statistics is the fearsome topic, and so often it is somebody that tutors.

Smith: The other very interesting thing for me, and challenging, was to be assigned to work in the lab school because their (DARCEE) model, at that point, made heavy use of behavior modification, which with all of my child development training was just antithetical to anything I had ever believed or felt was correct, or the best of what we knew about how children developed. But I understood the setting I was in, and I really went there trying – that was the only quandary about even taking the scholarship, I knew this was not a program that was – the philosophy, kindred sole kind of thing. But I also thought, you need – you're saying from a far. 'You need to be immersed in this, you need to listen to people, you need to see how they come to conclusions, that you had come to different conclusions.' And I was really able to keep that attitude and it was a good growing experience, but I have very interesting, vivid memories of some of the times when I would be in the lab situation wearing the apron with the M&M's in my pocket –

Siegel: Literally?

Smith: Yes. And following the instructions of doing it the way I was supposed to do, and working with a child on some task, and as the child would perform and do the task, giving M&M's. And I could just see the disruption and the attention of the child move from the task to the M&M. You broke the concentration. And was able go back out then – of course the instructors in the classes were all observing and querying and saying, "How do you respond to this? You saw –

Siegel: -- interview with Dr. Marilyn Smith on March 10th, 1994 at Stanford University. Marilyn, we were just talking about the use of M&M's in behavior modification at the nursery school at Peabody, and your own reservations about that, and how you could see that the children's concentration and attention was disrupted when you pulled these little M&M's out of your pocket, and you were asking the people behind the one way vision screen or whatever, "Hey, what about this?"

Smith: My memory is, I think we both learned from each other. I really think that – I'm sure I wasn't the only one, that many people probably were helping people that were designing their studies and their curriculum and approach, rethink the approach, and understand that as in many things, it's very complex and there are times when reward could really be very helpful. But it's an intricate, it's not simple, and like many things when you start doing it in mass and you're training teachers and your working with – which they were doing, they were using their model in Head Start programs with many people who were hired in those program who did not have backgrounds in academics, that it gets oversimplified, and then perhaps misused.

And that certainly wasn't the only part of the program, and they had many aspects that were very important and I could support small group work, very individualized and very careful planning, and all of those have made important contributions. So it was a good learning experience and important for me to, I think, in fact, more valuable to work in a setting where -- for that part of my study where it was different from – very different from the schools that I'd operated in before, the colleagues that I'd worked with before.

Siegel: Was there any connection at that time between Peabody and Vanderbilt in your courses, for example?

Smith: No. No. It was very independent. I really do think my hesitation was, there probably – somehow I think that with Susan Gray's work, that she might have – I don't know whether she ever had joint appointment over at Vanderbilt.

Siegel: Well, certainly Nick Hobbs moved over to Vanderbilt eventually.

Smith: Yes. I mean there was -- those people certainly were known in both places, and I'm sure a big part of why they were able to integrate so satisfactorily -- Peabody. My understanding now is, the person whose on the faculty there, that it's working beautifully now that they integrated.

Siegel: How long were you there?

Smith: Three years.

Siegel: Three years --

Smith: Three years to get the doctorate.

Siegel: Oh, that's good time. And did you do a thesis or not in that program?

Smith: Yes. Yes. I designed a study -- actually went back to Des Moines, Iowa using kindergarten teachers, and I had -- the way they led a discussion with children, before and then after the training. So it took a semester to actually do it and collect the data and all that. That's where I learned to use a tape recorder, to tape all of those discussions those teachers were doing with their children. And then --- so the whole last year I was really focusing totally on the dissertation, doing the study back in Iowa, and then the last semester I went back to Nashville, that would have been in the fall -- in the spring of '70 I guess, getting it written up and finishing that work.

Siegel: And had you had any thought of going back to Iowa State at that point?

Smith: No, but I just assumed I would go back to a university, in an academic setting, and was interviewing in a variety of places that spring at colleges, primarily in departments of child development. And the opportunity came to go to NAEYC.

Siegel: And that was NANE under its new guys?

Smith: Yes. NANE, National Association of Nursery Education had become the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). That was a change that occurred about '65. They had hired an executive director in about '66, somewhere around there, and it was small staff, they were just building a staff in Washington. And I was on the board, I think, for the second time. I had been on the board of NANE in the mid 60's, and then went -- rotated off, and then I had come back on as an officer while I was at Peabody finishing up. And so I was known by the staff and the board, and they created a new position of an assistant to the executive director. They'd just finally been able to get enough money for an Assistant position to work with him, and I was offered that opportunity because I was a known quantity. And decided that it was a great chance to go to Washington and find out about policy and how -- that was my memory was, what a wonderful opportunity to figure out how the people make policies that are for children, and to be in Washington, that sounded exciting. I think I'll do that for a year or two before I get back and start on the tenure track, because I knew when I started on that that it would be hard to break away and I probably wouldn't do it. So I went there in 1970 for a year, or maybe two.

Siegel: And here it is, 1994.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: And who was the director at that time?

Smith: Dr. Milton Akers. Nell Goldsmith had been the first one, and Nell Goldsmith had come out of retirement to really help them out. And she had just held it together just for a year or two until they could -- this is when they decided to finally get an executive director. So she had done it until they found Dr. Akers, and he came on board.

Siegel: At the time you joined them in 1970, what was the membership of NAEYC?

Smith: Ten thousand.

Siegel: Ten thousand?

Smith: Ten – something like that. The organization had been an organization of one to two thousand from its inception in '26 to the mid 60's, and a growth spurt took off in about '64 -'65, and it's just gone straight up ever since, and we're now about ninety thousand.

Siegel: Ninety?

Smith: Ninety thousand.

Siegel: And were you publishing Young Children at that time when you joined? Had that already been launched?

Smith: Yes. Yes. That went through a variety of forms starting with A Bulletin of Nursery Education and becoming The Journal of Nursery Education. And then with the name change a whole lot of things happened in about 1964. The name was changed to NAEYC, the journal was changed to Young Children. They finally got, after toying around with a lot of ways of trying to have affiliation, they finally got a really solid affiliate structure developed where they could bring in groups as a whole group and give them a discount and so forth. And all of that is part of the reason -- and they hired a staff, they did all of that at once. A lot of this under Glen Hawkes's leadership as President; he challenged the Board to take this organization and do something with it or forget it, you know, we just [redacted] much done. And his words were like, "We've got to go for broke," and so they did all of that at once, and then here Head Start hit right after.

So some people would look at the NANE/NAEYC membership figures and they just think that the membership took off when Head Start came, and that certainly was part of it, the increased attention on children, professionalism and so forth in children's program. But the organization had gotten itself structurally institutional-wise to be more solid, and so it was already taking off and could take advantage of what was happening I think in the field, and so it started on its escalation.

Siegel: And you were located in the building that I visited, which was near Dupont Circle as I recall?

Smith: Yes. 1834 Connecticut Avenue, which was just across the street from the Washington Hilton, just up from Dupont Circle. And that was a building that Milton Akers had found, gotten the organization moved into, and so all that was set in brownstone.

Siegel: And were there state organizations in every state or regional, or --?

Smith: We have a very strange, in one sense, unsystematic affiliate group system, because when they designed the affiliate system it was, we will take any group that exists that is concerned about the education of young children and wants to come in as a group and we'll give you greatly reduced dues for your members by coming in as a group, if all your people would join NAEYC and be an affiliate. So it meant that you had city groups, county groups, groups of kindergarten teachers, groups of church-housed nursery school teachers, groups of daycare people, I mean you had this just – whatever they happened to be out there. Some cases it was a state group, one case it was even a regional group, it's just whatever existed, therefore it's not real systematic that in every place you've got a state group that's tied to local groups, and we've had to work on that because it's missing – for example, there are places where they have very strong city groups and not as strong state group, which makes policy influencing at the state level almost impossible.

Siegel: Yes. I seem to remember hearing from Lois Stolz that in the early years NANE was dominated by university professors and probably heads of labs schools and that kind of stuff, and now I'm not sure that's still the case.

Smith: No. Actually -- well, obviously with ninety thousand people it's not the case for the membership base, but the leadership is not as well. It's extremely varied. It can be administrator's programs, people in the policy positions, even foundation positions. So leadership -- when I look at the composition of the national board, these people are in leadership roles in a variety of places, in addition to academia. In fact, there's almost a sad situation that I've noticed in some recent elections of -- there appears to be almost a backlash -- if you are in an academic setting it's maybe harder to get elected, and that's unfortunate because people need to be looked at for their competence and their qualifications, regardless of work setting.

Siegel: They had something similar with the American Psychological Association in recent years. You almost wonder if people aren't voting against the academic people, the petitioners. How long was it before you were elevated to your present position of being a Director?

Smith: January '73. Dr. Akers resigned in the spring of 1972 and I was made acting director. They conducted a search, and then in November of '72 I was asked to -- I became an applicant along with others, and all the interviewing and so forth took place at the '72 conference. And then was set --

Siegel: -- your organization -- and it's also been during your era that you've worked on accreditation?

Smith: Yes. The establishment of an accreditation system for early childhood programs, we started that work in the early '80's -- open forums and getting all the input and comment you possibly could on what these criteria for a high quality program should be, and then going through extensive field testing, and then launching it nationwide.

We actually, I think, for NAEYC's work, we started the '80's giving a lot more attention to doing something about standards. From my view we have been building our organization up to have the capacity in numbers and in prestige, and in institutional capacity, that we could then instead of just publishing about high quality and what we mean by good programs for young children, and talking about it in speeches, that we could begin to move into the standards setting world.

And we first did it with guidelines for teacher education, which is in keeping with what this organization started out to be. And we had no authority to force them on anyone, but we put them out there as guidelines, developed and endorsed by the association, so that was our first take at it, and I think sort of gave us the courage to then go ahead and set the standards for early childhood program, and actually give something to those programs, an accreditation for a three-year period of early childhood groups that could demonstrate they could do that.

Siegel: Who were the first groups that sought accreditation? Were they the university based programs or the church based programs or Head Start?

Smith: Thank goodness they were a variety. You know, Head Start has been slower to come into our accreditation program because they have their own performance standards that is a part of their system, but in some more recent years, some of the Head Start programs start getting interested. And even one of the very interesting things, because it's totally voluntary. It's only -- that's why building up an organization that had some status and clout or prestige was so important, so that people would want the name NAEYC accreditation, because that's the only reason to do it, is for some kind of credibility. And interestingly enough we've been extremely pleased that there are public school kindergartens who wouldn't need that at all, because their accredited through their school system, who more and more are seeking to get our accreditation.

But from the beginning it probably because of our pilot testing work, and part of that was done right here, actually in San Jose, Santa Clara county was one of the pilots. -- made sure the pilot work, that we were getting a sampling of all types of programs, and so we -- and we worked so hard that the criteria were applicable to -- it didn't matter the sponsorship of the program, whether it was for profit or non-profit. Didn't matter the age, it could be infants it could be toddlers, it could be before and after school age child

care, whatever the sponsorship, that it could be defined – the criteria could be defined that children in groups had needs, and these were their needs.

That that was one of the big decisions, and the big pressure points we had that those standards should be different for different states because their licensing standards are extremely different state by state, and that's upheld by arguments about level of income and the economy in the different states, and what they can afford to pay and what parents can afford to pay, and that's where we had this wonderful opportunity to say, but NAEYC is doing this for children, and for the protection of children through programs, and the needs of those children do not vary according to what state they live in, or what county they live in. They're in a group program and they're this age, they have these basic needs, and to have this quality of program, so that's – it's given us that opportunity, which has been wonderful to try to have an influence.

So it's – from the beginning, it was all types of programs had gone after, and interestingly enough the two states that from the very first have had the highest enrollment and highest enrollment in the program and highest number of credited programs are California and Texas, and those are two very – both of those were pilot states, but they're very different with the in-state licensing standards.

And so you ask how could that be in Texas, because Texas's licensing standards are not high. And our take is that, in their case, programs that were running good programs for children, being licensed didn't represent high quality to those teachers and directors. They were pleased that they could seek, and perhaps get an accreditation that came closer to making a statement that they were different from someone down the street who was licensed just as they were licensed, because they were so far above what that licensing standard was. So it's fascinating what the result has been in terms of numbers that have gone through, that in states where you do have low standards, it also is used by programs.

Now in those states it's also – well now, of course, we've been in it long enough, where we're facing those difficulties, maybe more and more programs that don't make it, and aren't able to achieve it, because they really are operating with a society in their state whose not willing to pay, or not able to pay what it would cost to operate a high quality program, to get the ratios where they would need to be, the qualifications of teachers.

Siegel: I'm on the board of director at Great Western Financial Corporation, and we're located in Northridge, which is now a well-known place because of the earthquake, and we have, I would say on the order of five thousand employees in North Ridge. And a wonderful man in our organization named Bill Marshack started having quality circles, in which he talked with the employees about their work and what their needs were, and childcare emerged right away as their primary need. And so he spearheaded having a childcare center on our campus in Northridge. – you've ever seen.

Smith: Tashma Hall.

Siegel: It had these thick walls, and you feel like it could be twenty stories tall its so substantial. But anyway, they asked me where, you know, how to proceed to get the high quality program, and I suggested that they affiliate with Cal State Northridge, which does have an early childhood program. And they talked to Cal State Northridge and the answer was that Great Western would swamp Cal State Northridge, that we're so much bigger and have so many more employees that they didn't see that they could take us on.

So then they went to a non-profit organization that services child care centers (I can't say the name, I don't have it in my head), and once the thing was built and staffed, and up and running, they brought the board of directors to visit it and the woman who took us around told us very proudly, "We are eligible for accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children," we meet all of their criteria. So I said, "What do you mean eligible for accreditation?" And she said, "Well, we have to be open for a year before we can actually apply, but we have set it up in such a way that when the year passes -- and that's in our printed manner," and so forth and so on. And she was saying this with great pride, and of course I was just sort of standing there knowing more than I said, but pleased to hear that, and she was using it as an emblem of quality.

Smith: The corporations, of course, our timing couldn't have been better in terms of that regard because this has been a period these last eight years where corporations have gotten involved – in childcare – and if corporations are going to put money or their name to a service for an employee they want to be sure it's good. And most of them know, they don't try to become experts in everything, they look to a professional organization, and so accreditation – a voluntary accreditation system by a professional association makes considerable good sense to them, they understand it, so they have just lapped it up.

Some corporations, IBM, AT&T, Dupont, have financially supported it. AT&T has said to every employee, "If you have a child in a childcare center, we will pay for that center, their fee to go through the self-study – they pay an application fee which gives them all the materials in the packets to go through the self-study, which is quite extensive, and get ready for – to determine if they really could meet the criteria and to determine when they want to go for it, and then they pay a validation fee, which is separate to pay for trained validators to come in and validate they are doing what they say they're doing and it goes on to a commission for a decision. So the fee varies by the size of the center and the number of teachers and that because the packets vary, you can a center with twenty children, you can have a center with four hundred, so it's according to the size because of having a package you have to send, even validation fee is by size because the larger the program the more validators you have to send or the more days they have to be there because they have to sample/observe a certain percent of the classrooms, so it varies.

Siegel: Now how did you learn how to do accreditation? What was it in your education at Oregon State and Peabody that set you up so you knew how to do this, because this is extremely complex?

Smith: Well, part of what we did is we hired a wonderful person named Dr. Sue Bredekamp to come in and design it. When we started getting into the whole standards movement, when we decided to do teacher education guidelines, and even that was funded by Rose Alschuler who, I'm not sure all exactly how, but I think may have some connection with SRCDC.

Siegel: Rose Alschuler?

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: I wouldn't be surprised, but I don't know that. She was a great friend of Lois's.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: Lois and Herbert were married at Rose Alschuler's home.

Smith: Oh, no. I didn't know this.

Siegel: I think a winter home in Arizona. I think her regular home was in Chicago.

Smith: Alschuler's was Chicago.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: And she funded, or her family funded in her memory, wanted to give funds to NAEYC for some project, it was soon after her death, and this was needing to be done and we were ready to launch it, so that funded our starting off to develop the guidelines for teacher education in early childhood in the early eighties.

Siegel: Oh, I didn't know that. You know her family consulted with Lois as to what kind of a gift they should give in her memory.

Smith: Interesting.

Siegel: And I bet Lois talked to Jimmy Hymes.

Smith: See they probably put her on to us.

Siegel: I wouldn't be surprised.

Smith: I didn't know how they got to us, except it also came through a woman named Charlotte Collier who lives in Chicago and is great friends with the Alschulers' who is a real – has been a real active person in NAEYC, and so she set up a meeting between the two of us. I stopped at O'Hare Airport on some trip and she brought the person who – the daughter who had done all the negotiating and [redacted] some of this out, and that's how it started. But they obviously had found us some way, and you've just explained what were those connections probably were.

Siegel: I think so. I think so.

Smith: So when we were able to start those guidelines, then I looked for a consultant who could do that work, and found Sue Bredekamp, through Jenni Klein, who was then at the Office of Child Development, and Sue had done an internship there and she was working on her doctorate at the University of Maryland. And so – that work, and it was wonderful and we got to know her and her work, and so then brought her on when we decided to do an accreditation – design an accreditation system, brought her on full-time.

And she had almost completed her dissertation, at that point, but she made the design of the accreditation system into her dissertation, and that's – thank goodness she did, because the design of our accreditation system is extremely well documented, as well as the pilot study, because that became then what after we did all the work, I mean she did all the work, that's what she wrote about and it's on file completely, all of that work. So she was extremely instrumental.

When you – I've never been asked that question, "What would prepare you to be involved in developing an accreditation system?" I know that the thing that flashed in my mind first, was the most direct influence on the system of it was having participated in NCATE, the National Council for the Accreditation for Teacher Education. And in the late 70's, NAEYC became a member of – or participated in NCATE and started out of their interest in coming to us, or the executive director at that time wanting an early childhood emphasis, and someone with that expertise, I started – and so forth, and a lot of what you did at the board meetings was to deal with these cases of colleges of education who were up for accreditation, and you would go through these folios and there had been people who had gone out on site and done the visits and all that, and then you'd be making those decisions about whether or not they would get reaccredited. So in terms of all the systems that surround accreditation and how they work, that really got my head full of what works and what doesn't work, and how you could improve that system.

Siegel: I see.

Smith: Because I really don't think anything in any of my formal training related to systems for doing this. The criteria, I mean that's defining what high quality is. Yes. But that's where you rely on research. But that's where you get into the debate that I think probably – what do you do when you don't have research to support decisions that need to be made? And in our case if the research is there you do your best to rely on it, and to use what's there, but then you've got to move on to best theory and best practice, and in the end it's professional judgment.

Siegel: Now the validators are professional people?

Smith: The validators have to have their college degrees in the field and have experience. Actually, we constantly train validators, because part of the way we keep the costs down in this system is to have validators trained all over the country so that you're not having to have a few select highly trained people that you fly all over the country to do the validation visits. You have them within the state and hopefully within the community, and of course, you have to watch, they've got to be able to say that they can objectively do the observation and don't have a vested interest in that center. And the center director that's

being validated has to say that they feel comfortable with the objectivity of that person, that's what you have to be cautious about when you're pulling from that community of people may know each other. But within that, that really has enabled to keep the cost of it, that means we're constantly training people, and because it keeps growing, we're constantly training validators.

And what we've learned over time is our best validators now are coming from centers directors who have gone through the system and been accredited. – a wonderful growth opportunity. I've not done any systematic documentation of this, but we really have observed that it's – since we've started this system that people who have chosen to – who have professional training and have chosen to direct centers and work with childcare centers, early childhood programs directly, are getting more recognition. We're finding more of them surfacing into leadership positions in the affiliate groups. We're finding that we can set many examples where they go back to get their masters, go on for more advanced work. Sometimes when they go in on leave, they go on and do other things, more state administration or on to college faculties, but it's been a boom. And I think it helps the experience of doing the accreditation has helped them define themselves more professionally. – an expanded vision of what they're capable of.

Siegel: So you have really leveraged your job to have an impact all over America on the quality of childcare and quality of early childhood programs through this, as well as other mechanisms. You also have the mechanism of the journal, and your annual conferences, etc. etc., but you used accreditation.

Smith: It's one thing that I wish Lois could have known about. We were just starting on it when – it's accomplishing – as it is to our mission, because I've noticed --

Siegel: Well Lois was a great organizer, and what you're talking about is an organizational effort, and it was undoubtedly far beyond her imagining, but I think you're exactly right that she would be pleased. She was the first president of National Association of Nursery Education, and it's fantastic what that organization has developed into in the last twenty or thirty years. It's fantastic.

Smith: And I feel that somewhere I think that there probably were disappointments on her part in terms of what she had hoped for for the organization in the field. The field – but because we have so many untrained people working with children, and it's a constant problem. It's a problem in our society of qualifications to work with children not being understood and respected and valued.

Siegel: That's right.

Smith: But I – through this, and we still – that problem is pervasive, but the accreditation system is really giving us a mechanism to work on that one, and it's helping.

Siegel: What would be your guess of all of the early childhood programs in American, what proportion are now accredited? Do you have any way of --?

Smith: No. We've accredited – I'm not even up on these numbers. I guess around four thousand. Of course, I don't know over time how many are accredited, I think at this point we have over four thousand accredited because unlike – we said every three years you have to be reaccredited –

Siegel: Good.

Smith: -- unlike hospitals and colleges, which will go from eight to ten years.

Siegel: Medical schools go from eight to ten years, but hospitals –

Smith: Are they more frequent?

Siegel: Are more frequent. Yes.

Smith: Okay.

Siegel: And what was the other one you said?

Smith: Colleges, eight to ten years.

Siegel: Yes. I think that's right.

Smith: Ten years is the standard.

Siegel: But I think hospitals, they hardly get through one accreditation and they're starting to work on the next one.

Smith: Well, they're like us.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: But we just felt when we had to make that decision in the design phase, that it better be three years. So you've got constant having to go re-through it or groups that don't, or groups that try to and can't make it. And we have enrolled at any one point in time, I guess three to four thousand. How many centers, I don't – It's miniscule because there's eighty thousand, a hundred thousand some centers.

Siegel: Are there?

Smith: Something like that, I mean it's still miniscule. But you start somewhere and you build and it's given – accreditation system has helped in so many other ways. One of the very interesting spin offs is licensing standards state by state as they review more and more it becomes – our criteria become a standard for them to look at and measure themselves against when they're making their licensing decisions.

Starting any corporation or anyone whose really in the business group of designing centers usually now says, "Well, this is your bible, you take these accreditation criteria and build a program around it. If you're going to start from scratch, this is what you use as your guideline." As I mentioned, kindergarten programs using it and curriculum supervisors in schools using it as a measure, so it's spin offs beyond – it's helped other people to define what programs should look like, beyond those that just go in and get accredited.

Siegel: When we return after lunch I'm going to turn our attention to SRCD, but what have we failed to cover about NAEYC that we ought to talk about?

Smith: You know while we're – because we have spent this so much on NAEYC, I guess this would be the time to reflect on things that I – how SRCD in a way sort of spun off of NANE, and that is a perception within our organization and may not be a perception – because I have never read history of SRCD, and I don't know the perception that is told of how it started. And I think it's important to say, sort of from what I read, of some in our archives from the NANE perspective happened there.

NAEYC, the NANE started in 1926 and it was called the Committee for Nursery Education. And the conceptualization came from Patti Smith Hill, and she confided with a number of people in the field for years that Lois Meeks-Stolz was one of the main people she confided with. And the concern, as I understand it was, nursery schools were beginning to proliferate, it was a growing phenomenon, and the concern was where are standards? It's the same thing today. Who is defining what is a quality program? Who is doing the training? What research is informing this practice? And something needs to be done.

And the question was, should it be done through an existing organization because there was a – and I'm not going to have all the names right, but a Kindergarten Teachers Union, a teachers kindergarten union. It was kindergarten and union somehow in the name, and then that became ACEI, Association for Childhood Education International. And there were other organizations, and I guess these people were all active in all of them, but they didn't feel that the nursery school phenomenon was being addressed. And their question

was, start a separate organization, or try to get these other organizations to pay more attention to this and do something about it.

So they formed this committee and they met in 1926 – I guess they met in '25, in '26 they had their first conference. And George Stoddard, was – who I think was the first president of SRCD, and I may be wrong on that, if not he was an early president of SRCD, but in on the organization – was in on that original group and became the second president of NANE, Lois Meeks being the first. Patti Smith Hill sort of conceptualized, got this committee together, and then it's my understanding she said to Lois, "You be president. You take that leadership role." And I think that's reflected in Lois's history that she's done.

Siegel: They listed the past officers in this directory, and the first list of officers they have is labeled 1933 temporary, George D. Stoddard Chairman.

Smith: Okay.

Siegel: And then '34-'35, Woodworth, Robert S. Woodworth is Chairman, and George D. Stoddard was Chairman Elect. And then '36-'37 George D. Stoddard was Chairman. So he and Woodworth were the two key people, and your absolutely right he was the first –

Smith: And what was the year that he was the temporary, the first chair?

Siegel: '33.

Smith: That's when he was president of NANE.

Siegel: Is that right?

Smith: I think. I can look that up. Maybe '31 to '33. I believe it was '31 to '33. [George Dinsmore Stoddard, President, NANE, 1931-1933.] So he was in. I know that Gesell was in on those early meetings. In fact, I should look through that list of early presidents and see how many –

Siegel: Gesell was listed as a – I guess you'd just say a board member, along with John Anderson, Frank Freeman, Robert S. Lind, the sociologist, E. Sapear, that would be the anthropologist, and Harold Stewart who was a physical growth man, and Buford Johnson was the Secretary/Treasurer, that's a name I don't know.

It's interesting, they're all males. And that's what Alice Smuts is writing about. She's writing about how the early history in the child study field was women, and then in the 20's male academics came in and took leadership. And here by '33 the whole panel of officers is male, so it's interesting. You know Hamilton Cravens has a book on the Iowa Child Welfare Station that's just come out –

Smith: Oh, I need to look at that.

Siegel: With a lot about Stoddard.

Smith: Yes, I need to look at that because my sense, he had just become, you know, very quickly because of the debt, he was put into the head of the Child Welfare Station in Iowa, and that's how he was known to people. And one quote I've seen of his, is how the NANE, those conferences, of that committee on nursery education and then became NANE and those conferences they had, and that was the late 20's and early 30's, how wonderful they were because you could find out what they were doing at the other child study centers, because that was when Lawrence Frank and all that money was going to all those centers and establishing them.

And so part of my sense of what happened is, it was NAEYC, just like SRCD was started as a multidisciplinary organization, focusing in NANE's case on children in group programs and what those programs should be. And the satisfaction of having the opportunity to meet with each other and the

stimulation there, and then my guess is, and that's where it can be checked against all the other people who have really looked into this, is that Stoddard and others saw the value and the need, therefore, to start an SRCD, to start their own society that would focus specifically on the research issues of child study.

And so it seems to me that NANE was formed by a cadre of people who fully appreciated and were involved in research and child study. But the mission of NANE was to try to develop standards and promote standards about what the early childhood programs should be, and what teacher training should be for people working in those programs. And that SRCD then became the society to focus on the standards, if you will, and the promotion of high quality research, and what the research questions should be and how to promote that. And so, I just think there's a lot more to be known about it, but everything I can sense from anything I've read from NANE's records is that this is not a case where an organization started and there was any dissention and a splitting off, because so often that is the case.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: But that this was more of a situation of finding the value, of forming a group that's nationwide with professionals trying to work and coordinate an influence, and that the value became known and therefore the need for another group, kindred soles, if you will, but –

Siegel: That's very interesting. That's very interesting. I know Lois admired Stoddard very much, and thought of him and the Iowa Station as wonderful places, in fact. I remember when she had heard that the Iowa Station had been closed, that she couldn't believe her ears. And she told me she was sure I was mistaken, and she went to the telephone and called up Harold Stevenson and said, "Harold, I've just heard that the Iowa Station was closed, is that true?" She was well into her eighties by then by it was inconceivable to her. The Iowa Station and Stoddard were – and Stoddard's predecessor, his name is flickering in and out of my head right this minute, the man as you say who died several –

Smith: Burt Baldwin.

Siegel: Burt Baldwin who worked so much on physical growth. She admired him enormously. He's more of a shadowy figure to me than Stoddard. Stoddard was a very public figure, much of a speaker and so forth.

Smith: We have a history on NAEYC that was done as a dissertation by a doctorate student about early 1980, and she interview Lois, but Stoddard was dead by the time she did the work, and so his information is very sketchy. Ruth Updegraff, who was at Iowa throughout her career and was the president of NANE, and she was interviewed for this history. And then when I sent her the transcripts of all of it and asked for comments, she wrote back to me that she questioned whether Stoddard was really at that original organizing meeting in 1925 of the National Committee for Nursery Education, which this –

Siegel: This is side three, March 10th, 1994, Alberta Siegel, Stanford University, interviewing Dr. Marilyn Smith. When we finished the last side before lunch we were talking about the early history of the SRCD as it was linked to the early history of the National Association for Nursery Education, and the fact that some of the same people were prominent in organizing both groups, although the NANE is several year earlier. And we're just looking at the directory of the Society for Research in Child Development, which lists the governing councils for each biennium and we're looking at some of the early names.

Smith: And what it confirms is what I had thought, that George Stoddard was the first chairman of the SRCD council. The other names that stand out that I know were instrumental in the early organizing of NANE, are Arnold Gesell and Lawrence Frank, I think, I've seen mention in our history, and Beth Wellman, I believe. Those are the ones that I spot here in the early council.

The other thing that I have observed that was an interesting phenomenon was – we do have copies of the first – all of the conference programs that we've ever had from 1926 forward for NANE, and the first few

years, those meetings were heavily – the types of sessions were heavily on research and on child study. Almost no indication of implications for practice and straight application of practice, they practiced concepts, but those started showing up on the conference program in the early 30's. And, of course, that is also the time that then SRCD began, and I have no idea whether that was a purposeful decision that NANE should start including more application and practitioner oriented sessions and that the role of SRCD would – I have no idea, but that's just an observation of a point in time when those two things seemed to have occurred simultaneously.

Siegel: Kind of a division of labor between –

Smith: Perhaps.

Siegel: -- the two organizations.

Smith: Now NANE and NAEYC have continued to have research sessions, but they're always – they're far more the application of research to inform the early childhood practice.

Siegel: Let's move forward to when you got active with SRCD's governing council. When was that exactly?

Smith: 1982.

Siegel: It was '82.

Smith: Yes. And I had been a member of SRCD since I went to that meeting in Minneapolis, but I hadn't been to a lot of the conferences. I can remember when I attended a New Orleans conference, this was before I went on the council.

Siegel: '77 was New Orleans.

Smith: Okay. They formed the Social Policy Committee then, and I was appointed to that, I think because of my responsibilities at NAEYC probably. My first connection in leadership for SRCD was a tenure on that Social Policy Committee. Weren't you on that?

Siegel: I don't remember whether I was at that time, I certainly was later. I don't remember whether I was on when Jim Gallagher was chair or not.

Smith: He chaired, and Ed Zigler was on, Diane Slaughter.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: Because she and I were – I was with her a lot at those meeting, I can remember.

Siegel: I think Mary Ainsworth was President in that biennium.

Smith: Yes, she was.

Siegel: And she and Jim Gallagher –

Mairlyn: Yes, she was.

Siegel: -- were good friends and good colleagues, and I think that – I may be wrong about this. I may be wrong about exactly when she was President, but I know that Mary thought a lot of Jim Gallagher, and she thought that the Chairman of the social policy committee when she was in a leadership role had to be somebody who could act pretty autonomously, because she didn't feel as if this were her area of strength particularly.

Smith: I remember her connection somehow to that committee vividly.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: And her interest in it.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: But at the time that I was serving on it, Jim is the one I remember as chair.

Siegel: And I think the person who brought your name forward was Berry Brazelton.

Smith: I would suspect that's correct.

Siegel: Because the social policy committee was launched at the recommendation of a study group, which I chaired, and it had four or five members: Harold Stevenson, Berry Brazelton, Harriet Rheingold and myself. And we recommended to the SRCD that they have such a standing committee. And Berry was always saying, you know, "We have to get Marilyn Smith involved in this." He's a big fan of yours.

Smith: Well, I think the – probably because of the policy implications and – although we always could do more, we were certainly in the early '70's trying to work in that domain. And when I first went to NAEYC as the Assistant Director – let's see, I walked in the door in Memorial Day of 1970, and that was when Marian Wright-Edelman was right in the midst of writing the Comprehensive Child Development Bill that eventually was passed through both houses of the Congress and the Senate, and then was vetoed by Nixon.

And so, my first assignment was to go to her, it was almost weekly meetings, and it was then called The Washington Research Project, it wasn't called Children's Defense Fund yet. And under the auspices of the Washington Research Project, or something like that, she was writing this legislation and was pulling together every group imaginable to work on this legislation, and to go back to our organizations to build the momentum to support it.

Those were fascinating meetings because they were full of fights over issues. I can remember one meeting where finally some of the women's groups walked out because it had gotten to the point of the reality of the legislation could not immediately call for full child care free for every child in this country; priorities had to be set, that was a reality, and you had to start somewhere. And so it was being defined as starting with low socioeconomic groups, and they could not agree on that and they walked. That's a vivid memory.

But as a result of all those meetings, then I was writing – I initiated with NAEYC, these legislative alerts out to as many members as we could communicate with, trying to get them to keep people informed about what was in the legislation, and how to inform people and inform voters, and contact their Congressmen, I mean about supporting it. Our November '71 conference in Minneapolis, we had Walter Mondale speak, and of course, he and Brademas were the key leaders of that legislation, and we were picketed because we had Mondale there. There were a lot of conflicts from people who were fighting against the legislation.

And I imagine that people like, I know Harold Stevenson was active in being in and out of organization a lot in those years, and Berry knowing about that, so I'm assuming that that built up a concept within their minds of – this is the way to bring that organization into what SRCD does in the realm of policy. But that's a round-a-bout way of commenting on that before I went on the council I had had this other committee assignment, which I think it enabled me to get to know some of the leadership people.

I then went on the council in '82 for a six- year term. My memory is that that first meeting was in Detroit. I'm positive, I think. And I can't tell you – well you said the meetings are on the off year, so it would have been – the council always met the prior year where the convention was going to be.

Siegel: That's right.

Smith: So –

Siegel: And the '83 meeting in Detroit was the historical meeting, because it was our 50th anniversary
–

Smith: Okay.

Siegel: -- so that's exactly where it would have been.

Smith: So my first meeting would have been going to Detroit the year before the conference meeting. The finance committee was formed at that first meeting, and I do not have a real detailed memory of how it occurred, but I have sort of a Gestalt, because it was my first meeting. –was that, here was a council who had – was leaning on staff – it took me a while to get it figured out, but staff really were – there's more staff than I first thought, because at first just thought it was Dot Eichorn and Vi, who I never met.

Siegel: Vi Buck?

Smith: Vi Buck, who I'd never met, but I feel like I know well just because you always heard about Vi, or you talked to Vi on the phone doing the support work back in Dot's office in Berkeley.

Then I gradually came to understand that well, but then there was someone paid in Chicago, that was Barbara, and that the editors in various places had stipends and had some support, and so it was really sort of scattered all around, and then there was the Washington piece some times, and out of the budget a stack of positions. But certainly at those council meetings it was Dot, and for parts of the meetings Barbara Kahn.

And whenever the business came around to anything financial, budget, personnel, my sense was this was not what people – the council members define their role as being there to do, it was Dot will take care of that, she's managing this for us. And in an executive session, I do know it was an executive session, and I don't know, because I'd never been there before, whether that was typical to have executive sessions with Dot or not. And I only remember the motion, I don't remember how she was saying to them, but the emotion I remember was that she is really out there alone making these decision, the financial decisions, the budgeting, it's not – the council really wasn't paying a lot of attention to it, but trusting her – take care of that for us. And that was not, both a comfortable and really appropriate way, that there needed to be counsel, and more knowledge on the part of council members about those management decisions.

Siegel: So C-O-U-N-S-E-L.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: So are you saying that she was asking for it, or --?

Smith: That is my – Yes, that's my memory.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: And before coming today, I didn't have a lot of time to look up things, but I did look to see if I had something about the formation. And in my files, I had a page I kept out of the minutes. I don't think I kept the minutes, but I had the page with the motion on it, of this finance committee being formed, and it was at that spring '82 meeting. And it stated that the executive officer, Dot Eichorn requested a finance committee to be appointed, and the way it reads, I assumed that she had decided who she wanted on it, and it was myself from the council, and it was you and Bob Sears, and that was in the motion. And then with the charge there was a motion to pull together the financial policies and work with the executive officer on the budget and on the investments and all of that.

So I think there's some pieces missing there that I don't know what might have built up to that occurring, and given my first meeting, I don't know what might have happened in prior meetings and so forth. I do know that Dot and I had gotten to know each other through the Social Policy Committee, because when these committees met if it was at all possible she was always there for them. And through that means that over meal functions at those meetings and on breaks and so forth, we had had conversations about the management of associations. And I just sort of recalled that feeling that here was someone else that she could talk to about the management, what exec's have to do to manage these organizations.

Siegel: So your role in many ways is similar to hers, although you run a much, much, much, much larger organization.

Smith: But the functions –

Siegel: But the functions –

Smith: -- are the same.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: Exactly. So that's what I – I do know it came from a motion, and it clearly was stating at her request.

Siegel: And probably the idea of Bob Sears was that he was a past President, and that he was available to her at a nearby university. And with me it was probably that I was a past member of council, and nearby.

Smith: And dealt with financial matters, both you and Bob. Your being – your service – your long-term service on the board of the bank. I assumed that perhaps while you were on the council you had helped with that role. I didn't know.

Siegel: No.

Smith: I thought perhaps – Okay.

Siegel: I had not. But Bob had the reputation of being, not only a splendid administrator, but also a canny investor, and – as does Dorothy. Dorothy has the reputation –

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: -- of being a canny investor. And so that undoubtedly was part of it. I was noticing here that I think it was John Flavell who was President in that biennium '79 to '81 –

Smith: But you had just before –

Siegel: -- and then Eleanor was President-elect. Eleanor Macoby. I seem to remember that John was uncomfortable about the financial matters, as was Dorothy, and for the same reasons; the feeling that this was a big organization, and maybe there needed to be more oversight from council on financial.

Smith: Oversight in involvement, participation in the decisions. It's, of course, in those days I guess we weren't as aware we had to share a responsibility of boards and councils that maybe people are now, but I assume that some of that was a piece of it as well. Because it could truly be said if there had been a problem – my sense is it could be said, that the council had not really delved into checking on –

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: -- the financial matters.

Siegel: Yes. So you took the matter in your hands and ran with it.

Smith: It's interesting that the reason I thought that it might have been evolving for a while, probably is really from comments from, I remember clearly, Harold Stevenson saying privately to me, "I know that this committee's been formed and you're chairing it, and I'm so glad. That's really needed." And I remember thinking -- well, this must have been something that some others in the leadership of the organization had understood was needed.

So, of course, that started a series of meetings and it -- for the first we met -- first time in September of '82, and then in '83, so we had two meetings of the committee to get ready before the next council meeting. And we met out here, and I remember we were going to meet at Dorothy's office, but I never was in Dot's office, so I assume that -- although it started out thinking that's what we would do, we always came here to the Stanford campus to meet. My memory of all the meetings were --

Siegel: That's my memory, too.

Smith: -- all here.

Siegel: It was probably Bob --

Smith: He really didn't want to travel, I think.

Siegel: Yes. It was probably a courtesy to him.

Smith: And he always got us a room, and you always arranged for us to go to faculty club for lunch and it was a pleasant affair. By the time I'd got back to the council meeting in that next -- in '83, one year later, we had done the financial policies. We had gone through a lot of things were in practice but they'd never been recorded, or they were even in the bylaws and we'd pull them out. Or then we found things working with Dot that needed to have policies or procedures that didn't, and so we had a document to present to council to adopt financial policies.

Siegel: Well, I remember the reason those meetings went so well here at Stanford of the Finance Committee, is that you came so well prepared and you brought worksheets for us that showed us what the questions were and where the lacunae were and what we needed to do. And by the time the meeting was convened, it was just so clear from your workup where we needed to go.

Smith: And, of course, that was fairly easy because the model in my mind I already had from my work at NAEYC.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: It was the basic questions, the policies that needed to be there. But I must say that a letter I kept -- or letters I kept, both from you and Bob Sears, writing letters afterwards about the satisfaction of coming into a meeting and it being organized and the feeling of getting so much done. But it was a wonderful group to work with, and we did not all agree, which we can talk about some, there were certainly points of disagreement, but high respect and regard, and as long as you have that, working with a group is enjoyable.

Siegel: Yes. Bob had his strengths and weaknesses, but one of his strengths was that he worked well with women. He respected his women colleagues, he took them seriously, but he wasn't intimidated by them. He had good collegial relations with women, and I think he was -- well, maybe I'm wrong about that, but I was going to say I think he was a pretty good judge of women. I've always thought that about Berry -- Berry Brazelton as a pediatrician. I've always thought he was a very good judge of women, and maybe it's because he found you for us, you see.

Smith: Oh, what a compliment!

Siegel: But I've seen it in other cases too, but I think that, you know, with Bob you never had that problem thinking, well, I'm talking but they're not listening. He listened.

Smith: Oh, yes. Yes.

Siegel: And he was a very different temperament from Dorothy. Dorothy talked so fast, and he would say, "Slow down Dorothy."

Smith: He was wonderful. I remember when I learned that he was going to be on with me, I was intimidated. I mean, here was a giant, and I had no knowledge – for me to set up, he could chair it, but for me to chair this with him on it, seemed incongruous. The first meeting, that's all it was – he obviously – he was very straight-forward and very factual, but always right to the point and respectful. So it was another one of those wonderful experiences, another person I wouldn't have known without that.

I remember getting the other big task of that first year was working the budget, and that was not – the policies were a wiz, that was easy, working on – putting a budget together was more difficult because the information we had – I didn't have – we didn't have. And I remember our spring meeting we first set for maybe February, and I kept checking with Dot and we weren't going to have the information from the auditors. We weren't going to have a financial statement from that last year, and for me, I didn't know how we could work on a budget efficiently and accurately without knowing what had happened the prior year, and that information was hard to get.

Now it was hard to get, I learned, for a number of reasons. The auditors, they were back in New England on the east – I'm not even clear on all of that. A lot of the records had to come from University of Chicago Press, because it was so much of our money spent there, for obvious reasons. Then you had all of these editors located in different places, all with their own budgets, their own bank accounts, so it was complicated to pull it all together. So I remember we put that meeting off until just as close up to the council meeting as we could, we waited until later in the spring. And I remember we didn't have it ahead of the meeting. I can remember, I think, Dot still grabbing stuff, getting it from all these offices and bringing it in to us. We really only saw it there on the spot.

But somehow we got through that and got a budget developed, and then had to get into salary setting and evaluation. I remember Bob not wanting to deal with those kinds of matters. So it became, after lunch, you and Dot and I would go back into session and work without Bob on first some of the salaries and budget, and refining some of those budget figures. I don't know whether that happened always, but I can remember some years in our meetings.

Siegel: I remember that now, I'd forgotten it, but we stayed at the faculty club and just sat in the lounge in the faculty club and did that part of it.

Smith: That part of it. Yes.

Siegel: Because Dorothy wanted – she wanted to share those decision-making responsibilities with other people.

Smith: Absolutely. And sure enough, if you would recall – I don't know whether it was the second or third year, it wasn't long into this scheme of working before there were complaints about setting salary schedules - just played out the fact that she needed to have someone backing her up and working with her. We had to work on – and she did a lot of the gathering of the information, but we helped on it, doing comparative – gathering comparative information about levels of work, levels of responsibility, and what people were paid in comparable positions in different places, to put that together.

Siegel: I think when the Finance Committee was set up, she had the responsibility of investing the Society's assets, and that she was doing that more or less on her own.

Smith: Yes. We started working on that that first year, but, of course, we had so much to do that first year. And by the second year, I do know that we went back into – we met twice that second year, again, the fall and the spring, and worked on formulating investment policies, which hadn't been in our first set of policies because we knew that they needed to be done but it took more thought, so we really focused on that and got those adopted out of our second years work.

I think that what has been known as the “horse investment,” that had been, obviously a concern of council - among the Society had been rumored about and not understood, and looked at almost suspiciously. And my memory is that we hit that one head on the first meeting, and first dealt with trying to understand what that really was, and it was, if I recall, an investment in a horse breeding farm, but somehow it really was an investment in a particular horse.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: And I can recall when we figured that out that it wasn't an investment sort of in an institution that did this, but an investment in a particular horse, getting quite concerned and then being assured that this horse was unwritten by Lloyd's of London, I still remember that part. And the thing that – one point I know was referred to as the “Jockey Club,” and another time is the “Bellefonte.” I never was clear on whether Bellefonte was the name of the horse or – all of that wasn't clear to me. And the whole idea of stock investment was totally unknown to me because in my operation at NAEYC we never put the savings in stock at all, only in cash equivalents and federally insured.

Siegel: Dorothy had the assets of the Society largely in stock.

Smith: Yes. And it took a while, and I don't know when I just learned all this, but over the time I gradually learned more and more about that, that she really had been very successful for the Society, but that also she inherited a tradition of – because my understanding is that, was it Bill Martin that had been a paid person before and handled the executive office –

Siegel: There were some people in between. After Bill Martin and Kate Hoffman, then it was -- for a brief period it was Bob Hess, and then for an extended period of time it was Peg Harlow. Margaret K. Harlow, and she had, in fact, done very well for the Society in investments.

Smith: Maybe that was the one.

Siegel: But I don't know what the nature of her investments was. I don't know whether it was stock or whether it was – I just don't know. I wasn't involved.

Smith: Somehow I thought – this would have been some kind of informal conversation with Dot that I had pieced together that when she became Executive Officer, that it was like already a practice, that the Society's savings were in stocks and had done very well for the Society this way – had been very successful. And it was almost as if this was just assumed as the mode of operation.

Siegel: But she was the one who bought the horse?

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: And she didn't buy a horse, she bought a certificate that made the Society a part owner of a horse.

Smith: It was a breeding horse.

Siegel: It was a breeding horse.

Smith: It was a breeding horse.

Siegel: And as I recall, you check me if I'm right about this, we set up a policy whereby only a certain fraction of the Society's assets should be in stocks, and a certain proportion should be in money-market equivalents, and a certain proportion should be in other, and when all was said and done the horse just didn't fit those guidelines. Is that a correct memory of what happened?

Smith: I think early on we expressed concern about that particular investment, and I think it got – made the recommendation, it was – in memory it was like a hundred and fifty thousand approximately. And your right, Bob Sears, I can remember helping on this saying, “We need to take that down to a lower level.” Approximately down to a third of that, get it down to around fifty thousand in terms of just diversifying.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: We shouldn't have – it was such a huge portion of our total portfolio that it needed to be taken down to a – it just seemed quite reasonable when you thought about it that way, so that that I think was the first year that we recommended that be done. And then in writing the policies, those investment policies, which took us until the second year to do, I think that's why it took us a while, was figuring out how – I don't think we finally came up with rigid percentages, but it was definitely wording towards, it needed to be diversified, and we need to have things in various places and not all in only certain amounts in stocks and a lot more in cash equivalents.

But it was really I think not until maybe the third year, because we continued to worry with that situation, of how much was in stocks and so forth, when we really said we need to go a little more aggressive and really go ahead and move out of the stocks. I can remember, we finally were able to get enough background information, because my way of working was, okay, let's look at the history. And I remember when we finally were able to recap enough information then we could look at six years of experience and say, “Well, three years we did great in the stock market, but three years we didn't,” and it was like so that over the long – and then taking that same six year period, saying, “We could have done as well in money-markets or other cash equivalents. – because I can remember Bob being the key – when we decided to get out of the stocks, Bob being asked to really work closely with Dot on how to do it without getting hurt, that it shouldn't be immediate, it had to be gradually, carefully done. Because I can remember some of his correspondence, because this was all happening in between our meetings when he was getting concerned about the stock broker, who was, I know, someone back in the East, and why that was I don't know.

Siegel: He was back in Princeton as I recall.

Smith: But that he was doing so much frequent selling –

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: -- frequent moving --

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: -- and then some particular ones, because I think Bob – I've seen correspondence then with you involved as well, where Bob was obviously talking a lot with you about it when he really started delving into it and being concerned about some of the investments, and that we really would have to take a loss. But somehow through his council and working with him, and you working with Dot, that that part they finally they got moved out, totally, I think.

Siegel: Well, one of the strategies that I remember we worked on was saying that all of the investments had to be of a certain grade. They had to be –

Smith: The class or something.

Siegel: -- the rating agencies had to give them a B+ or something like that. I don't know that it was B+, but it was some rating. And I remember Dorothy saying that she was a contrarian, and that she believed that you didn't go with all the other investors, you went contrary to them, and that's the way you picked up some good values and then surprised people as they improved.

I remember trying to say to her, "Look, Dorothy, the way you invest your personal funds is one thing, and if you find that a contrarian strategy works for you, great, teach me how to do it. But that it's a different thing to be investing an institutions funds, and that there you have to defend yourself by showing that you have only bought stocks that are considered excellent by other sources," that kind of thing. That was the kind of dialog we were having with her.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: She was exposing herself needlessly to possible risk by some of these strategies that might have been high gain strategies for the Society, but if they hadn't been, she would have been the one with egg on her face. That's the nature of the conversation I remember, and the same with the horse.

Smith: Yes. Exactly.

Siegel: She was –

Smith: Because it had been extremely – I remember the rate of return on the horse was very high.

Siegel: That's right.

Smith: But you've described what the difference was. Also my memory is that it was all done in such a respectful setting, and being able to just lay things on the table. And never, I think, on any of our parts questioning that her intentions were to keep building funds for the Society.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: And we started turning attention to the fees, giving more attention to trying to analyze both the expenses and where our fees were coming from, what they were paying for and making that part of the operation more solid.

Siegel: Were we charging sufficient dues? Were our subscription rates sufficient?

Smith: And you'll remember one of the things we did was we found that in the bylaws, the council couldn't even increase the dues without taking it to the biennial meeting for a vote to be ratified by the membership, and we recommended bylaws change, and got it through.

Siegel: That's right, I'd forgotten that.

Smith: And then after that, I think that maybe that was – it was our second or third year, probably, I don't know, '84 or '85 that that was accomplished. Then we started recommending dues raises, I think almost every year, and definitely subscription raises every year. Our strategy was, inching it on up gradually, and – were getting into challenges in a way with Publications Committee because we started recommending things like limiting the number of pages a year, that didn't set well the first time we sent that one to council. It didn't set well with the Publications Committee.

But I gradually saw a change occurring in council that they were paying more attention, because in these financial matters in these reports ■ many became major parts of the agenda for them to adopt these policies, to see this budget laid out, to have these very specific issues they had to think about and vote about. So you begin to see more thought being given to what things cost and where the funds were coming from, and although I think that first recommendation didn't fly when we sent it to Publications Committee.

By the next year they were talking to Chicago Press and investigating the cost and coming back to us and asking our help in doing an analysis of what it cost to service members. The way the financial records were done was they tried to – I remember this so clearly. It was shown as supporting all those publications, the monographs for Child Development from subscription fees and the library fees, and trying to support them almost totally with that and not the membership dues, but members are receiving them.

And so we finally got enough data to present to the council and the Publications Committee reports on what it cost to send Child Development to [redacted] and at a profit. They could at least put that into their thinking and into the formula. It would be interesting to know, and I don't know how all of that has evolved.

Siegel: In subsequent years?

Smith: Subsequent years.

Siegel: You got off council, I suppose in '87 or '88?

Smith: Yes. Six-year terms. Yes.

Siegel: So the Presidents you worked under were?

Smith: Eleanor Maccoby and Parmelee, and I guess Berry came in as I was leaving. I'm missing one.

Siegel: We should have brought a more recent directory.

Smith: Yes. What I remember Parmelee's came because that was new at the end. We hit that situation where I think it finally surfaced that we began to figure out how much we owed the University of Berkeley. (Quick Break)

Siegel: You were about to say something about the Berkeley situation, where the Society owed some money to the University of California at Berkeley.

Smith: It was a situation we hadn't been real – I think it just came to our attention very gradually, and mostly from comments from Dot about back pay to Berkeley for her, because, of course, they were paying her salary. That's something we haven't mentioned, that for many of the Society's employees, their salaries were actually set by the institution they were primarily employed by, for her it the University of California at Berkeley, and for the editors [redacted] whatever university they were in. And then the Society's payments were reimbursements to that university institution for the salary and benefit package, which also had implications for – I remember when we were setting salaries for the Washington staff, that was an unusual thing because for the most part we didn't set salaries, those were set by the institution, even the University of Chicago Press was determined by those other policies.

Siegel: We typically didn't pay a salary to an Editor, but the editor would have an Editorial Assistant who was an employee of the –

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: -- institution where the Editor worked, and was paid according to the policies of that institution --

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: -- and salary schedule and so forth.

Smith: Right.

Siegel: Right.

Smith: So we were just in to reimbursing institutions, and I think what had happened is when there would be a short fall, and rather than selling stock to pay, but when there would be a short fall in cash flow for a particular year, the checks just weren't getting written to Berkeley. That part, why it was happening, I'm not sure, but it kept accumulating. And because there was a Director of the program there who was, I guess, very lenient and supportive of the Society and Dot's work – how it happened I'm not sure. But it was very slow in coming to my enlightenment, in fact, that we really did owe money there. I think there was also the possibility of even Dot questioning whether the Society would ever really have to pay it, that's maybe part of it as well.

Siegel: It may also be that she was essentially working more than full-time –

Smith: Oh, okay. I see. Ah ha, yes. I think you're right.

Siegel: Part of her work was for the institute as the Associate Director, and part of her work was for us as the Executive Officer of the SRCD, and SRCD was supposed to reimburse Berkeley for that fraction, but she may have actually been working for –

Smith: And knowing Dot, she was.

Siegel: And knowing Dot, she was working more than full-time, but was only collecting one full-time salary. She was working more than she was being paid for.

Smith: Exactly. I'm sure that was the case.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: But it was somehow – and how it was all coming to light, I think may have been because Dot was starting to talk about retirement, or maybe the institute – This part is vague in my mind, why it even was coming to our attention, or was it that they were changing their leadership at the institute? That may have been it, and therefore it was unknown. But somehow Parmelee got information about it and was concerned, and was asking us as a Finance Committee to look into it and to think about it.

What I remember being struck by, because it's been such a lesson to me of the value of accrual accounting versus cash accounting, because the Society then, and I guess now, used the cash methods for the financial reports, which means that you therefore do not see as a council or a finance committee, what is owed. It isn't included in the statement. That's the part that I remember most because that's always a quarrel that you have to think about which method and what the pro's and con's are of those. And I really don't know how all of that ever was resolved, because that was at the point where I was leaving.

Siegel: I recall hearing that Holly Parmelee did travel to Berkeley and sit down with the Director of the institute and work it out, and I always thought that was so interesting because he was the mildest of men. And I don't think he was any more interested in finances than any the rest of us were.

Smith: But it became an ethical, almost responsibility --

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: -- is how I recall him approaching it.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: And wanting to do the right thing.

Siegel: And I recall hearing that the Director of the institute wanted to buy that horse from the Society.

Smith: Oh, I hadn't heard that part!

Siegel: He also had some discretionary funds that he was investing, and his attitude was, that's was a heck of an investment and if we didn't want it he'd take it. And I'm trying to remember who that Director was. It was before Paul Mussin. I think it was Guy Swanson – I'm not sure. It was before Paul Mussin, and Dorothy and he were both convinced it was a very good investment and they'd take it off our hands if we didn't want it.

Smith: And on paper it was.

Siegel: In terms of whether it was paying out in cash every year.

Smith: Yes. It was.

Siegel: It was a wonderful investment.

Smith: Yes. It was.

Siegel: On paper, in terms of demonstrating the probity and integrity and sobriety of the Society, maybe it looked a little crazy.

Smith: The Society made a lot of money off this horse.

Siegel: Yes. Well, Dorothy has always been a very, very hard working person, and my fix on that era was that she was working much more than full-time, and was not being paid more than full-time. And I think that's how some of this money piled up that Berkeley ended up owing us money. I think that's how it happened.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: Dr. Marilyn Smith, March 10th, 1994. We might say something about the Washington liaison office. I know you've interacted with them from time to time and they were certainly an important part of SRCDC in the era that you were on the council. With your own interest in policy for children, you probably have some opinions about the SRCDC's activities in that domain.

Smith: From the prospective of being on the Washington scene since 1970, I think the first thing I would comment on is that the Congressional Fellows Programs sponsored by SRCDC, it probably is one of the most significant impacts that I can think of through the mechanism of identifying young professionals, or mid-career professionals who had an interest in policy, and who would specialize experience and training and that one year experience then in Washington, that fellowship program, I mean, and I'm sure this will be captured from other people to really get all of the names, but the number of those fellows who moved into significant policy positions in congressional offices, in administrative offices, not only in Washington but in state government, I think is extremely significant, and a very, very important program.

And, of course, I was on council – I don't have the dates in my mind of all of this, but I know I was on council and we were working on the Finance Committee and that money began to dry up from foundations to continue that program, and it started having to be cut back, because one of the beauties of it also was bringing in a cadre of sort of a cohort of maybe six to eight people at a time.

Siegel: Yes. Certainly six. I think one year seven.

Smith: And then having a staff there to support them in their work for the networking and what they learned from each other and so forth. Then, of course, because you could have people there to run that

Congressional Fellow Program, then the Society had someone right there in Washington that could follow the activity, keep the Society informed. And, of course, that program itself has been cut way back, and so its, I think it's one person at a time now. I think I just read that some more money, maybe it was going to increase to two, but it certainly was cut back. The newsletter does continue –

Siegel: The Social Policy Newsletter.

Smith: Social Policy Newsletter – in my way of thinking, makes a very important contribution. But I think there are a variety of signs that the Society has always struggled with the question of its role in terms of policy, and I think I've always found that a fascinating question. I understand people who would say the research that we have does not inform us enough and that to a degree that's true because policy decisions are very complex, interdisciplinary decisions. But to stay out of the policy arena because we don't have all of the information, but for me the decision has always been you use the best knowledge you have and then you have to lay on professional judgment, and you use a society or an organization and colleagues to debate with each other and to stimulate each others thought about what the best policy decision might be, that that's better than staying out of the fray, because the policy decisions are going to get made, whatever they are, or they don't get made and things continue to happen because the children continue to be there the problems continue to be there and programs continue to operate. But I think it's a debate that continues to go on, and I just feel that –

Siegel: I think that one thing that happened was that with the advent of the Regan era followed by the Bush era, there wasn't as much happening in the child policy arena in Washington in Congress, and people were just drawn to the Congressional Science Fellowships as they had been during the Carter era and – attractive a setting. And one of the things, you know when I interviewed Harold Stevenson, one of the things he said is that he thought it had been too bad for that program, which he favors just the way you and I favor it, we think it was an outstanding program. I think, and I think you do.

Smith: Yes.

Siegel: But he thinks that it was unfortunate that almost all of the science fellows ended up working with a democratic congressman, and that it would have been better for the program if more of them had worked with a republican congressman. Well – and I don't remember in my time even discussing that, we felt that a fellow should be free to choose which ever congressman they wanted, and make a match, make a deal on their own, we didn't think that it was our business to influence that. But in the aggregate it may have put a tilt on the program.

Smith: Yes. Here your comment about not as much happening – things were happening, but they weren't fun things to work on, so I can see that it wouldn't have been attractive, because what was happening was just trying to fight to keep from losing too badly on programs that were already in place. So you didn't have the excitement of creating new programs, it was just like it was hanging on by your fingernail.

Siegel: Getting the appropriation.

Smith: Trying just to maintain and to keep the loses from being even greater than they might be. And, of course, we also were going through decentralization, deregulation, and so now so many of the decisions are really made at the state level, which it's got its good and bad points. It's harder to have an impact easily because it's so decentralized. On the other hand, if you can get people at state by state to make a commitment to children's program, maybe it'll last longer because it is closer to home, more intimately held than when it's the feds, but, which all is to say that it just means we need even more people who are well informed.

And it also, I guess, leads to statements about the kind of research that we need. We have so little of the longitudinal careful following the impact of programs like the High Scope research. You see how much we've had to rely on that programs research for policy, and you – the void of having other research to inform those policy decisions, it really speaks to a very grave need. -- public and business people can listen

to that kind today, that can be convincing. It's also scary because they frequently don't – the general public or the policy makers who are listening to it (High Scope data) don't hear what kind of comprehensive intervention program that really was.

Siegel: Yes.

Smith: They don't hear the high level of qualifications of the teachers and the very carefully designed curriculum and all of that.

Siegel: Well, I think we're getting ready to wind down, and so I'm about to ask you if you have any parting shot for the SRCD – do you have any topics that we have –

Smith: The only one that is sort of an overriding thing, it's another thought about how SRCD and NAEYC are both associations that try to be interdisciplinary, and certainly the Society is based on that. At NAEYC I guess you – interdisciplinary isn't the term as much as comprehensive, not getting so specialized, but it's all type of service programs for children. But the Society has truly always tried to be interdisciplinary, and I guess it's a plea for how important that is and how much we need to foster it far beyond what we do, because it seems to me that looking at children's programs today and where we are in our society and the lack of progress, in many ways I feel we're going backwards.

We're missing it in terms of how we really impact on the values of our society and the policy makers, and that it's an interdisciplinary answer, if there is one; its got to help us figure out how we've got to do a better job. I've been around Ernest L. Boyer [President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching] a lot in the last two or three years – national education goals work and so forth, and I feel fortunate to have been in a fairly small meeting with him within the last year when we got off on professional training, which happens – the whole issue of how we improve professional training is the biggest new thrust that NAEYC is trying to work on right now. And he made an impassioned statement that I could no way recall what, you know, it was well the way he stated it, how much our whole society is losing because of our professional training being so boxed in and segmented.

And he first talked about in the medical sense, if you really looked at people whose -- individuals whose work has moved us forward, that you would almost never find their work captured within one particular segment of the medical preparation or medical – all the specializations, that almost always you could find those individuals are people who cross over disciplines and themselves create information by putting different pieces together and putting teams of people together that work across disciplines.

And you know he was applying the same thing to what our challenges are for better programs for children, for better educating professionals that are the people who run our schools who can make better decisions and build better programs, and that as long as we keep ourselves so locked in to the kind of professional – we're losing ground.

Well, I say this because we're trying to listen to that message and think what we can do within the early childhood field, but I think it's also the challenge for SRCD even more important than ever to maintain – forward in a greater sense the interdisciplinary – so many peoples professional meetings they go to, keep them in the same narrow line of thinking, whereas the Society meetings can really provide that cross-fertilization because our higher institutions –

Siegel: -- very busy life, and I've learned a lot from talking to you, and I thank you.

End