

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Original Filed

900
organization

Xref'd to

908

Ref. Nursing

San Francisco, Calif.

July 10, 1926

My dear Mr. Fosdick:

As a special member of the Rockefeller Foundation staff it seems to me rather presumptuous to write the enclosed answer to your letter of June 22nd. However, since Mr. Embree has asked me to accept a regular appointment with the Division of Studies and since I have not found myself able to say yes because of the points I have tried to make clear here, it may be proper for me to be as frank as I have been.

You ask me to comment on the questions raised by the President. I think what I have written connects itself with the following topics presented at the Princeton Meeting, - with the topic numbered;

1. Problems of budget making
2. Practical problems of administration, a, b, and c
4. Evaluation of actual accomplishment. And indirectly with
6. Relations between the Foundation and other Boards

In referring to the President's report of the Nursing Conference I am impressed with its value but at the same time I think that certain changes in organization suggested in my letter might have produced more practical and continuing results of that one conference.

I read with interest the "Resolution" of February 20, 1925. I do not believe any experienced nurse could have spent six months in the New York office without being convinced, as I have been, that the Rockefeller Foundation is in a position to embrace "new opportunities" in the nursing field very closely related to present activities. By adopting a program which would perhaps be largely concerned with correlating existing plans for nursing education, stimulating in some directions and discouraging in others, but

chiefly by making known to the various centers what is already going on I think the Rockefeller Foundation might be able to do in this field that which is greatly needed to advance all programs of health education, and I believe that this is work that could not be undertaken so well by anyone else.

Very truly yours,

(Signed)

Mary Beard

Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick
61 Broadway
New York City

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Division of Studies

San Francisco, Calif.
July 10, 1926.

Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick
61 Broadway
New York City

My dear Mr. Fosdick:

I am sorry to have been so long in answering your letter of June 22nd; the delay has been due to some visits which I have been paying to various schools of nursing connected with Universities in some of the Western States.

Nursing is involved in the Rockefeller Foundation program at many points. Medical education cannot advance far without nursing education. Public health programs cannot be carried far without the public health nurse. Public health and medical education must lose an essential element for making wise programs unless the nursing aspect is regularly presented and considered. In Europe the Division of Medical Education, Doctor Gregg, the International Health Board, Professor Gunn, and the Division of Studies, Miss Crowell, have achieved without formal organization so close an inter-relation that this end is secured. In the New York office there is no such assurance. As General Director of a Community Health Association I worked for many years with a Board and officers who had not my technical knowledge. Matters were presented by the General Director to the Executive Committee and the Board. The health program grew out of discussion resulting from such reports and recommendations. It was possible to consider all aspects of the question without prejudice and to see that modifications of a given project came from the exchange of ideas and experiences of the various members of the Board. My business was to see to it that the bearing of my special knowledge upon the subject under discussion was thoroughly understood by those who voted upon the policies.

I think that the nursing projects now being assisted by the Rockefeller Foundation, to say nothing of future possibilities, urgently require considera-

tion of a change in present methods of organization. The following points are presented:

I. At present the nurse in the New York office has no access to the Budget Committee except on special invitation. All nursing matters are presented by the Director of the Division of Studies, whose other responsibilities preclude the detailed attention to nursing education needed in the Budget Committee. Moreover a technical knowledge of nursing and a considerable experience of the nursing field, such as can only be acquired by a nurse, should, it seems to me, make these discussions more intelligent and effective. From such regular and continuing exchange of the experience common to educational programs for health as they affect medical students, nurses, and public health officials, whether doctors or nurses, there might emerge a better coordinated and more constructive program for nursing, both in the United States and in the many other countries where some help is now being given in nursing education or where it might consistently and effectively be started. The value of the Yale project might, for example, be greatly enhanced by such a change in organization methods.

II. The General Education Board deals with medical education in the United States. I have recently visited certain of the University Schools of Nursing closely connected with schools of medicine which have received help from the General Education Board. It seems evident that if there were a means of bringing nursing information into the discussions preceding program making in the General Education Board it would be advantageous. For instance, so close are medical and nursing schools in Washington University, St. Louis, that because the nurses' home will not be finished in time for the fall class, the Medical School has decided to give up its dormitory to the nurses. To make a concrete instance of the St. Louis experience, (1) As a result of my recent visit I gained information valuable, I believe, to Mr. Flexner, to Dr. Russell and indirectly to Dr. Pearce and Mr. Greene, and yet

there is no organized route by which this information may be made practically useful in enlarging or modifying the present or future programs represented by these officers.

(2) A study of the school at St. Louis shows certain immediately helpful steps which might be taken through correlating the experience of Yale with that of Washington University. These steps should be considered by all the officers concerned in work in both universities and by Dr. Pearce also, since his experience includes so much of value to the consideration of adjustments in medical and nursing schools.

III. Nor is it only that accurate information about nursing is needed in Rockefeller Foundation discussions, but it seems to me equally true that the Rockefeller Foundation may be losing a valuable opportunity for constructive work in nursing education in that, through having no nurse representative regularly present, the wealth of experience within the D.M.E., the G. E.B., and the I.H.B. is not available. This experience, (and I ought also to include that of the China Medical Board) so closely related to the needs of the public for better health facilities, might be an important element in helping establish a more rational educational plan for nurses than the confused methods now prevailing.

I hope to be back in the New York office by the first of August; in the meanwhile should you wish to write me my letters will be forwarded.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Mary Beard