

A REVIEW OF THE EFFECT OF THE 1962 SOCIAL
SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS ON THE PUBLIC
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF WHATCOM
COUNTY

Bellingham, Washington, USA

by

RUTH M. RYAN

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK
in the School of Social Work

Accepted as conforming to the standard
required for the degree of
Master of Social Work

School of Social Work

1965

The University of British Columbia

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

School of Social Work

The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date April 28, 1965

ABSTRACT

This review was undertaken to present the 1962 Amendments to the Social Security Act of the Federal Government of the United States of America; what they are; the rationale behind them; and what they are expected to accomplish. Attention was given to the administrative problems involved in putting such an ambitious service program into effect, including those of the individual caseworkers.

The impact of the program on the problem of dependency was reviewed in terms of 85 cases closed after the inception of the program. Answers to 2 questions were sought: 1. Did concentration on services, particularly those prescribed by the Federal Government result in termination of assistance? 2. Were the caseworkers able to make valid judgements concerning severity of problems and potential for avoiding dependency in classifying their cases?

It was concluded that the majority of the case terminations were fortuitous and likely to have occurred with or without services, though service was a factor in a minor percent of the cases. Caseworker judgements, however, were found to be reasonably reliable.

Some other general conclusions were also drawn concerning directions for focus of casework service and additional research. Experiences in other areas were reviewed and found not to be too different from those in Whatcom County.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful thanks is expressed to:

Mr. Bruce T. Berglund, Administrator of
the Whatcom County Office of the State
Department of Public Assistance for per-
mitting the use of the materials for
this review.

To:

The Ben Tidball Memorial Library, Whatcom
County Branch

Mrs. Mildred Beairsto, Chairman
Mrs. Carol Bright, Librarian

and

Mr. Collin Carlile, Casework Supervisor
Whatcom County Office, State Department
of Public Assistance

and

Mrs. Jacqueline Swanson, ACSW
Co-ordinator of Services to Handicapped
Children
Whatcom County Department of Health

for source material and consultation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. <u>The Content of the 1962 Amendments</u>	Page
The changes in the Social Security Act of the United States of America offering federal matching premiums to States undertaking service programs. The legislative base of these amendments	1
Chapter 2. <u>The Administrative Approach of Whatcom County to the 1962 Amendments</u>	
The Washington State Department of Public Assistance's preparations for inaugurating a service program in Aid to Dependent Children. The efforts of Whatcom County Office to set up service caseloads, to arrive at case classifications and appropriate definitions of services.....	7
Chapter 3. <u>Observations on the Impact of the Program on the Problem of Dependency</u>	
A study of 85 cases closed between Sept. 1963 and Sept. 1964 as to the reasons for terminating Public Assistance, including speculations on what role services may have played in the clients' achieving independence.....	20
Chapter 4. <u>Conclusions</u>	
There is little evidence that service resulted in termination of Public Assistance. The validity of using independence as a criterion for success in services is questioned. Experience of other communities reviewed.....	45
Appendices:	
A. <u>Excerpt from Public Welfare, Poverty-prevention or Perpetuation</u> A study of the State Department of Public Assistance of the State of Washington by Greenleigh Associates, Inc.	
B. ADC Caseload Size in Whatcom County between Jan. 1960 and Dec. 1961	
C. Turnover in the ADC Program from June 1959 - June 1960 in the State of Washington	

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

TABLES IN THE TEXT

	Page
Table 1. Reasons for Closing 85 Cases.....	26
Table 2. Classifications of 220 Open Cases and 85 Closed Cases in Terms of Potential for Avoiding Dependency and Problem Level.....	28
Table 3. Classifications of 49 Cases in which services may have been a Factor in Termination	30
Table 4. Classifications of 17 Cases Closed due to Employment	31
Table 5. Further Characteristics of 17 Cases Closed due to Employment	32
Table 6. Classification of Cases Closed due to Reconciliation	33
Table 7. Classifications of 15 Cases Closed due to Marriage	34
Table 8. Number of Cases Closed per Caseload	37
Table 9. Classifications of 85 Closed Cases per Caseload	38
Table 10. Reasons for Closings by Caseload	39
Table 11. Number of Service and Fortuitous Closings per Caseload	40
Table 12. Refined Breakdown of Number of Service and Fortuitous Closings per Caseload	41
Table 13. Reasons for Closing 6,629 ADC Cases in the State of Washington from June 1959 to June 1960	42
Table 14. Reasons for Closing ADC Cases in the State of Washington June 1959 - June 1960 and in Whatcom County Sept. 1963 - Sept. 1964	43

A REVIEW OF THE EFFECT OF THE 1962 SOCIAL
SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS ON THE PUBLIC
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF WHATCOM
COUNTY

Bellingham, Washington, USA

by
Ruth M. Ryan

CHAPTER I

THE CONTENT OF THE 1962 AMENDMENTS

To better appreciate the impact of the 1962 Social Security Act Amendments on the Public Assistance Program in the Whatcom County Office of the Washington State Department of Public Assistance, it is of value to take a somewhat historical approach to their content.

The 1962 Amendments did not arise solely from the convictions of the President of the United States, nor his advisors or members of his cabinet. They represent the culmination of years of public concern, as well as the desires and recommendations of those working in the field of social welfare. That services had always been a part of public assistance programs was officially recognized when the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act gave explicit recognition to the need for services designed to maintain and strengthen family life and to help recipients achieve self-care or self support.¹ The 1962 Amendments were devised to make this explicit recognition a mandate, and to provide the financial means for carrying it out.

That services in public assistance were to become a concrete reality as well as a philosophic dream first became clear at the 'grass roots' level when the President, John F.

¹Hoshino, Geo. S. 'Will the Service Provisions of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments Reduce Costs?' Social Casework Vol. XLIV No. 8 Oct. 1963 p.439

Kennedy, devoted his February 1962 message to Congress to public welfare, stating that it must be more than a salvage operation, picking up the debris of human lives. He stressed prevention and rehabilitation.

This was equivalent to asking Congress for specific legislation, embodying services and rehabilitation measures into public welfare programs. The result was House Resolution 10606, which encompassed the provisions later to become enacted in the 1962 Amendments.

The Whatcom County Office was well informed on legislative trends and the thinking behind them. Of particular interest was the January issue of Public Welfare, which featured an address by the then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Rubicoff,¹ and an article on 1962 legislative priorities in Social Security by the Assistant Secretary, Wilbur J. Cohen² which anticipated legislation to come and highlighted the ideological basis on which it was to be founded.... Services, Prevention, Incentives, Rehabilitation, Independence and Training, the ingredients of a new 'SPIRIT' in welfare laws was discoursed on, particularly by Mr. Rubicoff.³

¹Rubicoff, The Hon. Abraham 'An Address by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare' Public Welfare; The Journal of the American Public Welfare Association Vol. 20 No. 1 Jan. 1962 p.3

²Cohen, Wilbur J. 'Legislative Priorities in Social Security' Op. cit. p. 15

³Rubicoff, The Hon. Abraham 'An Address by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare' Public Welfare; The Journal of the American Public Welfare Association Vol. 20, No. 1 Jan. 1962 p.3

The July 1962 Letter to American Public Welfare Association Members¹ reported on the progress of House Resolution 10606, 'the bill for Public Welfare Amendments of 1962', which had just cleared the Senate Finance Committee, with amendments. This information was received with great interest in the local office, and generally with enthusiasm on the caseworker level. Meanwhile the State Office in Olympia sent out recommendations to the county offices urging the support of H.R. 10606. It was recognized at the administrative level that this bill, if passed, would result in major changes in Public Welfare practice. These changes were anticipated with welcome, but it cannot be said that staff actually realized what they would mean in terms of concrete implementation and on the job responsibilities.

Two aspects of H.R. 10606 received particular attention, not without suspense, as it went to the Senate floor for action:

One was the Aid to Dependent Children eligibility for the children of unemployed parents, which expired as of June 30, 1962, but would be continued as part of the Federal program if 10606 passed. Washington is a state which had made extensive use of this particular category of assistance, and it was considered vital to the Public Assistance service programs in counties of periodic underemployment such as Whatcom.

The other aspect of special concern was the decision of the Democratic Party leadership in the Senate to attach a

¹Letter APWA to Members Issue #6 - 1962 July 6, 1962
American Public Welfare Association 1313 East Sixtieth St.,
Chicago 37, Ill.

modified version of the King-Anderson health insurance bill to the Welfare bill as an amendment.¹ This particular stratagem threatened for a time to kill the entire measure.

In its final form, the Senate bill did not include any medical insurance provisions, but did extend the eligibility of children of unemployed parents until June 30 of 1967.

One of the most vital features of this measure concerned the financial premiums offered to those states willing to adopt service and rehabilitative focused Public Assistance programs in accord with Federal recommendations. The bill provided that, effective Sept. 1, 1962, Federal matching in certain services and in the cost of staff training is increased from fifty percent to seventy-five percent.

Also of importance was the stipulation that "...the Secretary (of Health, Education and Welfare) was to prescribe the minimum services necessary to help applicants and recipients to attain or retain capability for self-care or self-support, or help them maintain and strengthen family life. These are to be provided under the state's plan for Old-Age Assistance, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled ... The Secretary will also specify services to applicants and recipients that prevent and reduce dependency."

"To further improve and coordinate services to children, another provision for a state plan is added to the requirements

¹Letter APWA to Members Issue #6 - 1962 July 6, 1962
American Public Welfare Association 1313 East Sixtieth St.
Chicago 37, Ill.

for the dependent children program effective July 1, 1963. Each state plan must provide for the development of a welfare and related services program for each child recipient as may be necessary because of home conditions and special needs of each child."¹

The above stipulations constitute the basis of the prescribed services, to be discussed at greater length later, which have had a significant effect on the implementation of the programs initiated by the 1962 Amendments.

It is, at this point, appropriate to call attention to the fact that the federal matching proposals did not confine themselves to services in the Aid to Families with Children category. It was the choice of various States in the United States, including Washington, to accept this option, only, as a preliminary step. Extension of services to other categories is under consideration in Washington State and may be inaugurated shortly, particularly in the Disability Assistance program.

Further provisions of the 1962 Amendments deserve consideration. The full effect of many of these is yet to be realized.

Of interest is the fact that Federal participation was made possible for grants to individuals involved in community work and training programs. This was to have special meaning later for President Johnson's War on Poverty. Incentives for

¹Cohen, Wilbur J. & Ball, Robert M. 'The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962' Public Welfare; The Journal of the American Public Welfare Association Vol. 20 No. 4 Oct. 1962

employment through consideration of expenses in earning income, and the exemption of certain portions of childrens' earnings to be used for current or future special and/or educational needs, represented a liberalization of federal law which facilitated vocational counseling with both adults and teenagers. Additional funds were also made available for Aid to Dependent Children, Foster Care, Homemaker Service and Day Care.

Throughout the entire text of the 1962 Amendments, the emphasis was on rehabilitation and other services..as was identified in the purpose clause of each title.¹

H.R. 10606, in the course of joint action by the House and Senate conference committees, became Public Law 87-543. It was finally passed by both houses on July 19, 1962 and was signed into law on July 25 by President Kennedy. To those in the social welfare field who had watched the progress of the 1962 Amendments from their inception to their realization, this was a moment of historical importance. Ahead was the prospect of integrating service, rehabilitation and, hopefully, the prevention of further social and personal damage to human beings, with the giving of Public Assistance.

¹Cohen, Wilbur J. & Ball, Robert M. 'The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962' Public Welfare; The Journal of the American Public Welfare Association Vol. 20 No. 4 Oct. 1962

CHAPTER II
THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPROACH OF WHATCOM COUNTY
TO THE 1962 AMENDMENTS

Preliminary to any meaningful discourse on the Administrative approach of Whatcom County to the 1962 Amendments to the Social Security Act is the need for some understanding of the approach of the State of Washington. Public Assistance in Washington is a State administered program exclusively, making the State decisions binding on all the counties. Thus as little opportunity as possible is left for local variation, as considerable value is placed on uniformity of administration throughout the whole of Washington. Accordingly, no county may move into the implementation of any program to any significant degree without State approval and direction.

There was never any doubt about the wholehearted espousal of the 1962 Amendments by the State Office of the Department of Public Assistance. But there was much speculation as to whether they would be equally well received in the Governor's Office, by the Central Budget Agency and the rather conservative, tax-payer oriented Washington legislature.

At this point, a brief consideration of Washington's peculiar financial structure is appropriate as it had definite bearing on the State administration's attitude toward the 1962 Social Security Amendments. All State revenue is collected and deposited in a large, amorphous entity known as the General Fund. Out of the General Fund, every two years, the

legislature appropriates money for the operating expenses of each State Department. This means that each department must submit to the legislature for action, biennially, a budget of its operating expenses for the next two years. As far as social service items are concerned, such as Education, Institutions, Public Welfare etc., it is expected that the legislature will pare down the budgets, and appropriate less money than has been requested. The Departments, however, must take care to keep their expenses within the allotted amounts, as, in most cases, no additional funds will be available to cover additional exigencies.

Except for the specific funds designated to meet appropriations, very little of the money included in the General Fund is earmarked for any special purposes. The Central Budgeting Agency, an appointed body, has complete discretion as to its allocation. This discretion extends also to some degree to appropriated moneys, in that, should a department under-expend its allowance, the surplus reverts to the General Fund for disposition. A notable exception is that part of the Public Assistance budget appropriated to meet the needs of Old Age Assistance recipients. No unused portion of this may be diverted to any other purpose -- not even to cover deficits that may occur in other categories of assistance.

It is clear from the above that should the State Department of Public Assistance either save or gain any money in excess of what is actually designated in its basic appropriation, (with the exception of Old Age Assistance) this would present the State with an additional asset which could be used

for any purpose considered as most expedient by the Central Budgeting Agency.*

Smaller caseloads and an increase in trained staff would constitute an additional expense to the State. There was some speculation in public assistance circles as to whether this increased cost would be sufficiently offset by the increase in Federal matching to interest the State Administration in adopting the 1962 Amendments. The State of Washington did elect, however, to participate in the new amendments in the ADC program.

Once the 1962 Amendments had been incorporated into the planning of the State, it was perhaps natural to expect that there would be a lag in their actual implementation. Federal philosophy was sufficiently flexible to allow the states time to adjust their thinking and staff planning to the new concepts. Completed case classifications and social summaries were not required in the records before July of 1964.

It is one thing to look forward to a time when services and rehabilitation are an integral part of a Public Assistance program, and it is another thing to be confronted with the actual hour when this becomes a reality. Maurice Powers, Supervisor of Field Services for the State Office of the Department of Public Assistance, expressed some of this feeling in a memo directed to the County Offices. He stated: "At best, the time is very short; the staff is overburdened, and a great deal must be done by way of motivation before we can proceed effectively."

* See Appendix A

" ... emphasize to staff that this is the opportunity to get down to brass tacks in providing constructive service that we have maneuvered for years to obtain. This is not to deny that we are ill equipped to launch into a program of extensive change such as this. Ideally conditions should be much different if we were to implement this program with ease. The fact is, of course, that conditions are never going to be that good. We cannot get lost in an orgy of feeling sorry for ourselves. What we must do repeatedly is to emphasize two points: first, this program is what we all have been wanting; and second, this is the most profound development in the 27 years since the passage of the Social Security Act. In spite of their handicaps, staff must not forget that here we have an opportunity to make history for public welfare."¹

In one sense, the task of making history for public welfare was less difficult for Whatcom County than it was for many other counties in the State of Washington. At the inception of compliance with the 1962 Amendments respecting services to families, ADC cases had already been segregated into separate caseloads for some three years. Although these caseloads were still much too high to satisfy Federal standards, a significant beginning had been made in designating cases that could profit by special attention. The transition between previous practice and the new changes was, accordingly, probably less of an upheaval for Whatcom County than it was for many

¹Memorandum from Maurice E. Powers, Supervisor of Field Services, Washington State Department of Public Assistance
Dec. 1962

other Washington Counties.

Additional staff was assigned to the ADC program. The case workers selected for services to families were those who, in the opinion of the Administrator and the Supervisors, were most skilled and had the greatest interest in and capacity for working with this particular group of clients.

The next step was to reduce caseloads to the level of sixty families per worker as recommended by the Federal Government. This was an unexpectedly slow process, due to an unanticipated and generally unexplained acceleration of family intake.

On the State level a new division was created, a Training Unit, which was to have the responsibility for developing standards for case classification and guides for preparing the social study required in each record. This Division would also be in charge of staff development and in-service training programs. It was recognized that it would not be possible to fill many of the family service positions with staff having graduate training in social work. This made an in-service training program an item of paramount importance.

In June of 1963, a manual revision effective as of July 1, 1963, covering social service in Public Assistance Aid to Dependent Children was received in the County Offices. Provisions of significance were as follows:

" ... This material is organized to show:

1. ...the four groups of cases for whom services will be provided and
2. The circumstances, families and individuals in each of the four groups which are to be identified for services

and

3. The actual services to be provided for families and individuals in each of the four groups.

" ... This dated and progressive development of a total program of services allows for a gradual increase in the coverage of services and allows time for making social studies, providing staff training, developing and improving case management techniques, and permits as much selectivity and priority in types of services provided in a given caseload as is realistically practical!"¹

The four groups designated for services were:

Unmarried Parents and their Children with Specified Problems.

Families Disrupted by Desertion or Impending Desertion.

Families with Adults with Potential for Self Support.

Children in Need of Protection.

This, then, constituted the statement of the prescribed services to be given in the ADC program, as formulated by the Federal Government.

The same manual revision also provided as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1963 social studies shall be undertaken and maintained on all active, new or reopened cases to identify problems for which services are prescribed in Sec. 25.10-25.15, including a study of each child to determine whether he (she) is likely to become in need of protection or in need of help with special

¹Revision #5 Washington Manual II Effective 7-1-63

problems. Such initial studies shall be substantially completed by July 1, 1964."¹

The minimum standard for contacts required that home visits be made at intervals of not more than 90 days.

In this manner, the State gave the Counties instruction on what they must do to implement the 1962 Amendments, but guidance was still lacking on how to go about it. For definition of the criteria on which the case classifications were to be based and the content of the social studies, the Counties were left to their own devices. They were to lack direction in this respect for some months to come.

This resulted in much searching for guidance in Whatcom County. Outlines for social summaries from the Department of Institutions, Juvenile Parole, mental health auspices and other states were collected and studied. Most of these proved too cumbersome for use and not strictly appropriate to the purpose. The most useful material was found in the Casework Notebook of the Family Centered Project of Greater St. Paul, Minn.² It was principally on information gained from this work that Whatcom County based its social evaluations and case classifications. When in November 1963 a Guide for Social Study was issued by the State Office³, it was fairly well in line with what the County had been doing.

¹Revision #5 Washington Manual II Effective 7-1-63

²Casework Notebook Family Centered Project, Greater St. Paul, Minn. 1959

³Memorandum No. 63-59 Issued Nov. 1, 1963 from the Division of Social Services, Kenneth W. Bryan, Deputy Director, State Dept. of Public Assistance. 'Guide for Social Study ADC Social Services'.

As Whatcom County moved into the implementation of the 1962 Amendments in July of 1963, the Administration recognized the need for a tool which could be used to identify the prescribed service need and the classification in terms of degree of dependency and problem level in each case. Whatcom County Office Form #229 was developed for this purpose. (Page 15) A copy of this form was to be prepared for each family and submitted to the supervisor no later than Sept. 30, 1963. A new 229 was to be submitted every three months thereafter.

Also in Sept. of 1963, another step was taken to facilitate the giving of services. Up to this point, the family service caseloads had been determined geographically. This led to much transferring of cases back and forth between caseworkers as clients moved about the City. ADC families have a strong tendency to be rather mobile. Continuity of contact with one caseworker was recognized as vital to any really effective service plan. Transfer of cases between workers, within the city, was, therefore, abolished, except for reasons of sound social planning.

Intake remained a difficult problem. The family care unit did not have central intake at this time. Each worker did his or her own, new cases now being assigned roughly on a rotational basis. With applications running between five and fifteen per worker per month, it was not only difficult to keep the caseloads reduced, but also hard for the workers to find sufficient time for their ongoing service responsibilities.

Date _____

Aged and disabled adults in need of protection . . .
Adults requiring services to remain in own home . . .
Adults with potentials for self-support in whole or part . . .
Adults with potentials for self-care . . .
Adults isolated or estranged from family .

													Service Need	
													Yes	No
													Action Service	
													Pending Service	
													Completed Service	

Client's Plan to Help Self

Caseworker's Action Plan

Potential for avoidance of dependency	High	Moderate	Low
1. The project is a new product or service that has not been offered before.			
2. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is still growing.			
3. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is mature.			
4. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is declining.			
5. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is saturated.			
6. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is highly competitive.			
7. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is highly regulated.			
8. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is highly volatile.			
9. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is highly uncertain.			
10. The project is a new product or service that has been offered before, but the market is highly complex.			

Client(s) have	<u>Financial only problems</u>	<u>Moderate Problems</u>	<u>Severe & Multi-Problems</u>

Summary of individual behavior recorded in case record	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
--	------------	-----------

Copy to supervisor _____ Summary brought up to date _____

Summary of family group behavior recorded in case record Yes No

Copy to supervisor _____ Summary brought up to date _____

Supervisor's notes on case evaluation, plans, changes in situation

Conrad Graham of the State training Unit began contacting the County Offices in November of 1963, bringing more information regarding Federal expectations. The Federal Government recommended central intake. Caseloads were to be kept at less than 60 with central intake. If caseworkers took their own applications, they should not carry more than 30 cases. It was not until May of 1964 that Whatcom County was able to establish central intake in ADC.

All these factors had their effect on the quality of services the caseworkers were able to give.

Initially, the Family Care Unit consisted of one supervisor and five caseworkers carrying ADC-Regular cases almost exclusively. ADC-E cases were distinguished from ADC-R cases by the fact that deprivation of support was due to unemployment rather than absence or incapacity of a parent. These cases were carried in separate caseloads.

ADC-E cases tend to be transient. In Whatcom County, as also in much of the State of Washington, unemployment is seasonal. Hence, ADC-E caseloads are large in Winter and virtually disappear in the Summer. This was one reason for keeping them separate from the relatively more stable ADC-R caseloads. Another reason was that the Federal Government's intentions concerning services to these families was not immediately clear. In Whatcom County it was considered that the problems of these marginal families required as much attention as did those of any other ADC family, and the same services were extended to them from the beginning. It was later confirmed that this was also the Federal point of view.

The particular way in which Federal-State policy is developed deserves some consideration at this point. Instructions to the States are contained in Federal Letters from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In Washington these letters are kept on file in the State Office in Olympia. They form the basis on which manual material is developed for administration of the federally matched programs.

These letters set forth the minimum expectations of the Federal Government. If their provisions are not complied with the State can lose Federal money. On the other hand, the State is permitted a good amount of latitude in elaborating on the minimum requirements, subject, however, to Federal approval. Thus, the Federal Department requires identification of and attention to the prescribed services and the State develops its own plan for case study and classification. Once a plan has been completed it is subject to review and approval by the Federal Office.

The nearest regional office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is in San Francisco, California. When major manual changes are contemplated, the pertinent material is prepared and taken to San Francisco for conference with the Federal Representatives.

This is a relatively time consuming process and accounts for the lag that frequently occurs between the inception of a new program and the receipt of instructions for its implementation. Meanwhile, much direction is transmitted verbally between the State Office and the Counties, through telephone calls, as well as through the visits of the Field Representa-

tives from the State, who supervise County practice. Confusion and misunderstanding sometimes results.

All these factors had their influence on the administrative approach of Whatcom County to the 1962 Amendments. However, by September 30, 1963, the County Office was reasonably clear on how it should implement the ADC Service Program. All family cases had been classified, prescribed services identified and beginning case plans established. It must be recognized that the quality of much of this work would need improvement, but at least the initial steps had been taken.

CHAPTER III

OBSERVATIONS ON THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM
ON THE PROBLEM OF DEPENDENCY

From the beginning the caseworkers had trouble with the prescribed services. They were accustomed to seeing their clients as individuals with varying degrees of social, environmental and emotional maladjustments rather than in terms of whether they were or were not unmarried parents or deserted wives. Long conditioning made them more comfortable with the concept of services to those with self-support potential, but even here problems of definition arose. Caseworkers knew their clients were much in need of services, but correlating their problems with prescribed service needs presented certain dilemmas.

It is, accordingly, not surprising that the first tabulations of prescribed services should be heavily weighted in two categories: 'Support problems in desertion cases' and 'Mothers with children needing training'. It was apparent to Administration that these two groups were being used as a 'catch-all'. Not that there failed to be a certain amount of logic in doing this. Relatively few absent parents supported their children and at least theoretically most ADC mothers could be prepared to seek employment. Much depended on one's definition of 'desertion' and 'potential for self-support'.

Desertion could be emotional and/or financial. It was

not known what weighting the Federal Government intended be attached to these two factors, respectively. Whatcom County (as did many other Washington counties) took a broad view of 'desertion'. If an absent parent met his support order, but maintained no paternal contact with his children, it was considered desertion. On the other hand, if an absent spouse maintained contact with the family, but did not, though financially capable, choose to pay support, it was also considered desertion.

Definitions of 'potential for self-support' were even more difficult to formulate. In theory any ADC mother who had sufficient intelligence had capacity for self-support, provided her family was not too large. Caseworkers tended to the view that any woman with more than five children could not expect to fit herself for employment sufficiently lucrative to support the family at better than Public Assistance standards, particularly since publicly financed training programs were limited to two years. This did not extend, however, to discouraging or failing to plan training with such of these mothers who truly wanted to work.

Otherwise, it was generally believed that good casework service should be able to overcome such factors as lack of motivation, and help the clients deal effectively with any health, educational or child-care problems that might constitute an impediment to self-support. Thus, potential for self-support might be something in the near or far distant future. Guidance from the Federal Government was lacking in this area also.

Another factor was the relative dearth of training facilities at the inception of the services program. Effects of the Man-power Development and Training Act¹ were not to be felt in Whatcom County until late in 1964. The programs of this Act are administered by the Department of Employment and the local office of this auspice was exceedingly conservative. It required Federal pressure before responding to the provisions of the Act.

There were some reality reasons for the Employment Service's hesitancy to implement the Training Act. In an area of persistent underemployment like Whatcom County there were little or no labor shortages workers could be trained to fill.

The State Office of the Public Assistance Department was developing its own Community Work and Training Division. In September of 1963, however, its programs consisted of little more than Work Relief -- that is, the repayment of public assistance by municipal labor -- the training aspects of which were dubious. This Division was to grow and expand during the year to come and by late Fall of 1964 had established some much needed classes in adult remedial education.

The caseworkers, then, as they began their program of giving services in 1963 had only two sources of referral for those with self-support potential but no marketable skill. First, there was the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, a joint State and Federally financed program, limited to vocational training for the disabled. Very few ADC mothers had sufficient disability to qualify for services through this

¹An Explanation of the Manpower Development and Training Act
U.S. Department of Labor Dec. 1962

office. It was most useful in retraining some of the more promising incapacitated fathers.

The other training resource was the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation for the Non-disabled, a State program, whose services were designed for Public Assistance recipients. This was and is an excellent resource, except that its available funds will not extend beyond helping a relatively few clients each year.

The above illustrates that whereas the caseworkers might find a good many clients with potential for self-support, they were, at the beginning of the services program, limited in what they could do to help them toward this goal.

When Mr. Graham again visited the County Office in July of 1964, he gave further interpretation and explanation of the prescribed services. These are the danger areas -- the sources of public concern. This is why the Federal Government had chosen them for particular attention. Where desertion, unmarried parenthood, persistent dependency and children in need of protection existed, there also must exist social or emotional ills needing correction. This was of some help in making better use of the prescribed services, though staff still tended to question their validity as diagnostic criteria.

It was recommended that Whatcom County narrow its definition of desertion. However, where emotional desertion by the absent parent was a factor in the development of the children, Mr. Graham was inclined to consider the County's interpretation valid. This would have to be discussed further with the

Department of Health, Education and Welfare People. Little criticism was made, however, of the County's struggle for a definition for "potential for self-support".

There is in Public Welfare a rather pervasive feeling, sometimes expressed and more often unexpressed, that the only successful case is a terminated case. Dependency has been overcome. It is at least assumed that the former clients' social and/or emotional problems have been reduced to a level where they can handle them unaided. In their report in the San Mateo County Public Health and Welfare projects, John Davison and Robert D. Ripetto reflect this attitude when they state: "Helping recipients of public assistance to become self-reliant and self-supporting is one of the major aims of a public welfare program."¹

Individual caseworkers may often question this point of view, believing it a greater service to assist families to achieve better social and emotional adjustment even though they remain dependent, but the feeling still persists. Certainly the Hon. Secretary Rubicoff's 'SPIRIT' -- Services, Prevention, Incentives, Rehabilitation, Independence and Training² places the greatest emphasis on overcoming dependency.

For this reason, it seems fitting to look at the impact

¹Davison, John and Ripetto, Robert D. 'A Public Agency Program to Strengthen Client and Community' Social Casework Vol. XLV no.7 July 1964

²Rubicoff, The Hon. Abraham 'An Address by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare' Public Welfare; The Journal of the American Public Welfare Association Vol. 20 No. 1 Jan. 1962 p.3

of the services program on the problem of dependency in terms of some of the closed cases. Of some 305 ADC-R cases for which Whatcom Co. Office Form 229 (p.15) was submitted on Sept. 30, 1963 and January 15, 1964, 85 were closed by September 1 of 1964. These are the cases to be examined. They were carried by the five ADC-R workers in the Family Care Unit.

It seems to be implicit in Federal thinking that work with the clients in the area of the prescribed services leads to termination of assistance. Does this hypothesis tend to be substantiated by these 85 cases, or do the reasons for the closings appear to be fortuitous and likely to have occurred in the due course of time without caseworker intervention?

In reviewing these 85 cases, the following reasons for closing were identified.

Table 1. Reasons for Closing 85 Cases		
Reason	No. of Cases	Percent of 85
Marriage	15	17%
Reconciliation	11	13
Employment	17	20
Temporary Employment	4	5
Increased Income from Employment	5	6
*Receipt of Social Security (OASI or OASDI)	6	7
Receipt of Industrial Insurance	2	2
**Receipt of Other Resources	7	9
***No child eligible	6	7
Contact Lost	6	7
#Other	6	7
Totals	85	100%
<p>*Old Age and Survivor's Insurance or Old Age, Survivor's and Disability Insurance</p> <p>**Such as Veteran's Benefits, Inheritance etc.</p> <p>***Last eligible child either became 18, married or is self-supporting.</p> <p>#In the 'other' category were placed cases terminated because the client refused to cooperate in affiliation proceedings; the husband was released from jail; the family moved away on the Indian Relocation Program etc.</p>		

It is apparent from the above tabulation that in only 28, or 33%, of the closed cases could any even tenuous connection with the prescribed services be assumed (Reconciliation - 11; Employment - 17). Temporary employment was seasonal in nature, such as cannery work, and already part of the clients' life pattern before the services program began. Nor could casework take credit onto itself for assisting the recipient to make more money on a job he or she already had.

It is also clear that those cases closed due to receipt of OASI or other resources, as well as because the family no longer contained eligible children, would have been terminated for these reasons with or without casework services. 21 cases, or approximately 25% of the sample fell into this group.

In three of the 6 'contact lost' cases, the client is presumed to be employed. Services could conceivably have played some part in the discontinuance of assistance in these cases. It is also possible that casework service may have been of help to some of the ADC mothers who chose to marry again.

Thus there are 30 cases in which the closings must be considered fortuitous and 49 cases in which casework service may have been a factor. Some of these cases will be examined in greater detail below.

First, however, it is of interest to examine the case classifications and speculate on the validity of the caseworkers' judgements. Whatcom Co. Form 229 provided for classifying the cases according to three levels of client problems, and three levels of potential for avoiding dependency. Dependency was seen as financial dependency only. Criteria for determining whether the recipients' problems were confined to the financial, or were moderate or severe in a social and emotional sense, were left more or less to the caseworkers' discretion. Ideally they were to be based on the Social Study, but in most cases this had not yet been completed.

Classifications of the 220 cases that remained open in September of 1964 as against the 85 that were terminated are as follows:

Classifications of 220 Open Cases and 85 Closed Cases Table 2. in Terms of Potential for Avoiding Dependency and Problem Level				
Potential for Avoiding Dependency	Open Cases(220)		Closed(85)	
	No.	%	No.	%
High	36	16%	40	49%
Moderate	101	46	32	36
Low	83	38	13	15
Totals	220	100%	85	100%
Problem Level				
Financial Only	14	7%	15	17%
Moderate	143	65	60	70
Severe & Multi-Problems	56	25	8	10
Totals	*213	97%	*83	97%
*A few forms were not marked for these factors.				

The above table would indicate that the caseworkers were reasonably accurate in evaluating the clients' potentials for avoiding dependency. Among the closed cases nearly half were seen as having high potential for this factor and only 15% as having low. This is in contrast to the 220 cases which remained open, in which only 16% were seen as potentially self-supporting, whereas nearly 38% were judged as having a poor prospect for avoiding dependency.

Turning to the problem level, and assuming, as most social work thinking does, a link between socio-emotional problems and dependency, it is noted that only 10% of those clients

in the closed sample were seen as having severe and multi-problems as against slightly more than 25% in the open cases. 17% of the clients whose cases were closed were judged to have only financial problems, while less than 7% of the open cases were judged to be in this classification. This latter comparison is not very significant, however, as certainly a great many independent people do have social and/or emotional problems of varying degrees. It would be interesting to apply more refined study methods to the 'moderate problem' classification¹ in order to determine if the problems found in those families so designated, who still remained dependent, were more severe on a continuum than those of similarly evaluated clients whose cases were closed. Nevertheless, the above (particularly in respect to the severe and multi-problem category) does indicate some validity in the caseworkers' judgement of problem levels, at least as seen in reference to the prospects for terminating Public Assistance.

A few words should be said concerning the 36 cases in the open sample identified as having a high potential for avoidance of dependency and the 14 in which clients were evaluated as having only financial problems. Some of these people were still undertaking vocational training and might expect to become self-supporting when this was completed. Others were on the waiting list and would be placed in training when the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation for the Nondisabled was once more in funds.

¹Hunt, J. McV. and Kogan, Leonard S. Measuring Results in Social Casework FSAA 1952

It must also be recognized that all financial problems are not capable of solution. No matter how competent a widow with ten children may be, she remains unlikely to become self-supporting. In Whatcom Co. it was also not considered wise for mothers of infants to plan employment.

The 49 cases in which services may have been a factor in the closings will now be examined in greater detail. In these the potential for avoiding dependency and the problem levels were classified as follows:

Table 3. Classifications of 49 cases in which Services may have been a Factor in Termination.					
Potential for Avoiding Dependency			Problem Level		
	No. of Cases	% of 49		No. of Cases	% of 49
High	25	51%	Financial Only	10	20%
Moderate	16	31	Moderate	33	69
Low	8	18	Severe & Multi	5	10
Totals	49	100%		49	99%

It can be seen by the above that there is no significant difference between the caseworkers' classifications of these 49 cases and their classifications of the closed group as a whole. This was not to be expected. There is no reason to anticipate that those people entitled to benefits or pensions of one kind or another should suffer from a greater degree of socio-emotional problems. Moreover, in evaluating potential for avoiding

dependency, the caseworkers generally know in advance the clients' prospects of acquiring resources, and take this into consideration in their judgements.

It will also be remembered that this group of 49 cases (57% of the 85) includes those of clients who have achieved independence by remarriage or reconciliation. It would not be expected that potential for avoidance of dependency would enter into this choice to any significant degree.

A closer look will now be taken at those cases closed for reasons of employment, marriage and reconciliation, beginning with the group who became employed.

As might be expected, the majority of these people were seen to have a high potential for avoiding dependency. Break-down of the classifications in this group is as follows:

Table 4. Classifications of 17 Cases Closed due to Employment			
Potential for Avoidance of Dependency	No. of Cases	Problem Level	No. of Cases
High	11	Financial Only	2
Moderate	3	Moderate	14
Low	3	Severe & Multi	1
Totals	17		17

The most frequent combination was high potential for avoiding dependency and moderate socio-emotional problems (9 cases).

This may be a promising group for service, as help with socio-emotional problems may lead to release of potential for self-

support. This area might be a profitable one for future research.

In order to observe further characteristics of this sample of employed people, and possibly obtain an indication of whether prescribed services played a part in the termination of their grants, the 17 cases were subdivided as follows:

Table 5. Further Characteristics of 17 Cases Closed due to Employment.	
Employment as the result of Vocational Training	No. of Cases 4
Returned to previous or accustomed work	7
Not accustomed to working	6
Total	17

Of the 7 clients who returned to previous or accustomed employment, 5 could be classed as sporadic workers -- that is, clients who according to past patterns have worked until some socio-emotional crisis has interfered with their employment, -- and therefore not too likely to remain independent. In the remaining two cases, the client was helped during a temporary situational crisis.

Only in the four cases in which employment was achieved as the result of vocational training can any clear link with the prescribed services be assumed. In 8 cases (6 clients not accustomed to working plus the 2 helped during a temporary emer-

gency) the connection is possible, but not established. Giving the prescribed services the benefit of the doubt, this would amount to 12 cases, or 14% of the 85.

Next to be considered is the group of people whose cases were terminated by reconciliation with their spouses.

Table 6. Classification of Cases Closed due to Reconciliation: 11 cases.			
Potential for Avoidance of Dependency	No. of Cases	Problem Level	No. of Cases
High	2	Financial Only	0
Moderate	6	Moderate	9
Low	3	Severe & Multi	2
Totals	11		11

The potential for avoiding dependency was seen as neither very high or particularly low in this group. None were seen as having no problems other than financial. The reconciled group, then, was seen primarily as people with moderate or low potential for avoiding dependency and a moderate degree of socio-emotional problems.

Of these eleven women, three were repeaters, in that they had tried reconciliation before without success. There was no reason to expect the marriages to be any more lasting this time. Accordingly, it cannot be said that prescribed services given in the area of desertion have led to positive solutions for these people. There remain eight cases (app. 10% of the 85) in which such services could have been a factor. In two of these cases, however, the prescribed service need identified

was training for the mother rather than services connected with desertion, but this is not to say the latter were not also considered.

The repeaters might be said to have reconciled in spite of casework service, but in at least 6 of the other cases (7% of the 85 sample), exploring the ADC mother's relationship to her separated spouse was part of the case plan and could have had its effect on the termination of assistance.

The last group of cases to be considered in greater detail is the 15 which were closed due to the ADC parent's marriage to a new spouse. Breakdown of the potential for avoidance of dependency and problem level for these people is as follows:

Table 7. Classifications of 15 Cases Closed due to Marriage			
Potential for Avoidance of Dependency	No. of Cases	Problem Level	No. of Cases
High	11	Financial Only	7
Moderate	3	Moderate	6
Low	1	Severe & Multi	2
Totals	15		15

The most frequent combination in this group involved only financial problems and a high level for the avoidance of dependency (6 cases). Three clients were seen as having high potential for independence and moderate socio-emotional problems.

The prognosis for independence in this group of clients, then, was seen by the caseworkers as even better than that for

those who became self-supporting through employment, and considerably better than for those who tried reconciliation. This raises the question of whether a woman with good capacities and a reasonably well integrated personality might not prefer remarriage to employment as a solution to her future.

In 13 of the 15 cases, the prescribed service need was seen as related to the clients' self-support potential. 'Support problems in desertion case' was also identified for service in 5 of these same cases and in 6 of the entire 15. One case had no prescribed service need indicated.

Possibly these clients might have chosen training and/or employment in due time had they not elected to remarry. It cannot be said, however, that there is any indication that casework services played any part in their decisions. This means that those cases terminated due to the marriage of the clients will have to be considered as among those in which the closings were fortuitous.

30 cases having already been identified as ones which would have been terminated in due course with or without service, we now have a total of 45 which must be considered in this category.

Of the original 49 in which service may have been a factor in termination, 34 (or 40%) are left. These consist of those cases closed due to employment (17); reconciliation (11); and contact lost (6). Of those who became employed, the 5 sporadic workers must be eliminated, and among the reconciled group, the 3 repeaters, as clients whose independence could be related to casework service. Therefore in only 26 (30%) of the

cases can any connection between service and termination be assumed. In regard to the 'contact lost' cases, this assumption could be considered especially dubious.

In 12 of the cases involving employment and 8 of those discontinued due to reconciliation, or 20 cases, the use of prescribed services could have been a factor in the closings. This was clear in only 10, or 12%. At best, therefore, work with the clients surrounding prescribed service needs could only be considered helpful in leading to independence in some 24% of the cases.

An examination of the individual caseloads may possibly throw some light on the elusive service factors. It will be remembered that the caseworkers handling these were especially selected for their skill with ADC families. To what extent was there variation in the way they saw their cases and in the results achieved in terms of termination?

It is in order first to consider the characteristics of these five caseloads. It has been mentioned that an effort had been made to equalize these caseloads at approximately 60 cases per worker. The caseloads will be designated as Caseload: 1; 2; 3; 4 and 5.

Caseloads 1 and 5 tended to run slightly higher than the 60, and caseload 4 somewhat lower. An effort to correct this imbalance after geographic distribution was abolished was not entirely successful.

Caseloads 1 through 4 were reasonably homogenous. Most of the clients lived in downtown Bellingham. Caseloads 2, 3 and 4 included a few clients living in other small towns in the

County or in rural areas. Caseloads 3 and 4 had, perhaps, a slightly higher proportion of clients living in areas of shabby housing than did caseloads 1 and 2. These differences, however, were reasonably negligible as far as the characteristics of the clients were concerned.

Caseload 5, on the other hand, was primarily rural, except for clients living in the small towns of Blaine and Ferndale. As this caseload also included the Lummi Indian Reservation, one might expect the potential for independence to be somewhat lower in this caseload than in the others.

The number of cases closed per caseload is as follows:

Table 8. Number of Cases Closed per Caseload		
Caseload #	No. of Cases Closed	% of 85
1	20	23%
2	14	18
3	23	27
4	9	10
5	19	22
Totals	85	100%

Pertinent to this distribution, of course, are the reasons for closing, but, first, it will be of interest to examine how each caseworker classified his or her closed cases in terms of potential for avoidance of dependency and level of socio-emotional problems.

Table 9. Classifications of 85 Closed Cases per Caseload

Potential for Avoidance of Dependency:

Number of Cases						
Caseload #	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
High	11	6	7	7	9	40
Moderate	7	5	10	2	8	32
Low	2	3	6	0	2	13
Totals	20	14	23	9	19	85

Problem Level

Number of Cases						
Caseload #	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Financial Only	6	3	1	2	3	15
Moderate	11	11	18	7	13	60
Severe & Multi	2	0	3	0	3	8
Totals	19	14	22	9	19	83

Except for Caseworker #3's tendency to use the 'safe' moderate categories; Caseworker 1's seeing a higher proportion of her clients as having only financial problems; and Caseworker 4's viewing relatively more of her clients as having high potential for independence; there is a reasonable amount of consistency among the caseworkers in their classifications. This again would tend to establish the soundness of caseworker judgement. The last two variations mentioned may be related to the particular reasons for closing those cases carried by these two workers.

It is interesting, also, to note the relatively high percentage of cases closed by caseworker 5 (approximately 32% of his

caseload) since one might expect a higher level of dependency in his area. It is observed, however, that those he did close were of clients with good potential for the avoidance of dependency and relatively few socio-emotional problems.

A review of the reasons for closing cases in each caseload is now pertinent and may explain the afore-mentioned variation between workers.

Table 10. Reasons for Closings by Caseload						
Caseload #	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Marriage	5	4	1	1	4	15
Reconciliation	3	1	3	1	3	11
Employment	4	2	5	4	2	17
Temporary Employment	1	0	1	0	2	4
Increased Earnings	3	0	1	1	0	5
Recpt. of Soc. Security	0	2	2	2	0	6
" of Industrial Ins.	0	1	1	0	0	2
" of other Resources	1	1	1	0	4	7
No child Eligible	0	3	2	0	1	6
Contact Lost	2	0	4	0	0	6
Other	1	0	2	0	3	6
Totals	20	14	23	9	19	85

The above shows a reasonable consistency with previous findings. It will be recalled that the greatest number of clients seen as well integrated and having high potential for avoiding dependency were those who married again. Caseload #1 contained one third of the total marriages. Therefore, the fact that proportionately more of this worker's clients were seen as having only financial problems is sufficiently logical.

The majority of caseworker 4's closed cases also fell into

those groups in which one would expect a high potential for avoidance of dependency. This tends to support the reliability of caseworker judgements, at least in terms of those cases likely to be closed.

The question of individual performance does arise, however, and to learn more about this, it is pertinent to review these closings by caseload in terms of the number which were fortuitous and those in which services may have been involved. It will be recalled that only in the categories of Reconciliation, Employment and Contact Lost could any connection between service and termination be assumed. Accordingly, we arrive at following gross breakdown.

Table 11. Number of Service and Fortuitous Closings per Caseload.					
Caseload #	1	2	3	4	5
Service	9	3	12	5	5
Fortuitous	11	11	11	4	14
Totals	20	14	23	9	19

Before indulging in any speculations on this, it is important to eliminate the repeaters among the reconciled group and the sporadic workers among the employed. One sporadic worker was found in each caseload. Of the repeaters, two were found in caseload 3; one in caseload 5. Accordingly, the more refined breakdown of fortuitous closings versus closings in which service may have been a factor is:

Table 12. Refined Breakdown of Number of Service and Fortuitous Closings per Caseload.

	1		2		3		4		5	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Service	8	40%	2	14%	9	39%	4	44%	4	21%
Fortuitous	12	60	12	86	14	61	5	56	15	79
Totals	20	100%	14	100%	23	100%	9	100%	19	100%

Since caseloads 1 through 4 were generally similar in characteristics these figures would tend to indicate that individual skill and service did play a part in the termination of Public Assistance. It will be remembered that caseload 5 covered an area in which not much potential for avoidance of dependency was anticipated. The percentage of fortuitous closings as against service closings is consistent with this expectation.

Figures from the 'Blue Book', the statistical reports of the State Office of the Department of Public Assistance, establish that Fall and Winter ADC caseloads were higher in Whatcom Co. during the 'pre-service' years of 1960-61.* Unfortunately, the Blue Book does not give information on cases closed per County or, usually, on the number of applications received. The fact that an average of only 305 cases were open between Sept. 30 and January 15, in spite of unusually heavy intake, may be an indication that smaller caseloads and focus on services is of help in keeping dependency reduced.

Before ending this chapter, it will be of interest to take

*See Appendix B

a look at the terminations of assistance in Whatcom Co. as compared with those of the State as a whole. The only figures available for this are in the Blue Book for October 1960, and cover the year from June 1959 - June 1960. During this period, 6,628 ADC cases were closed statewide. No attempt is being made to determine what proportion of the total State ADC case-load they comprised, because of the extremely rapid turnover in the ADC category.* Reasons for closing, statewide, are as follows:

Table 13. Reasons for Closing 6,628 ADC Cases in the State of Washington from June 1959 to June 1960		
	No. of Cases	% of 6,628
Marriage	1,044	16%
Reconciliation	417	6
Employment or Increased Earnings	319	5
Benefits or Pensions	228	3
Receipt of other Resources	626	10
No Child Eligible	384	5
Support from Other Person	1,774	27
Other**	1,836	28
Totals	6,628	100%
**'Other' in this tabulation would include Whatcom Co's 'Contact Lost' category, which was not used by the State.		

It was during this period that the Support Enforcement and Collections Unit's efforts to secure support from delinquent fathers were at their peak. Hence the large number in the category of 'Support from Other Person'. By 1963 the backlog of absent parents actually able to pay sufficient support to take

*See Appendix C

their children off of assistance had been exhausted. The following table shows the comparison by Percentages of closings for Whatcom Co. (1963-64) and the State (1959-60):

Table 14. Reasons for Closing ADC Cases in the State of Wash. June 1959-June 1960 and in Whatcom Co. Sept. 1963- Sept. 1964		
	State % of 6,628	Whatcom Co. % of 85
Marriage	16%	17%
Reconciliation	6	13
Employment or Increased Earnings	5	31
Benefits or Pensions	3	9
Receipt of Other Resources	10	9
No Child Eligible	5	7
Support from Other Person	27	--
Contact Lost	--	7
Other	28	7
Totals	100%	100%

The eligibility for Social Security was liberalized between 1960 and 1963, which accounts for the higher percentage terminated due to Benefits or Pensions in Whatcom Co.

Otherwise, it is noted that figures for terminations due to Marriage, Receipt of Other Resources, and No Child Eligible are approximately the same. Whatcom Co. and the Service Program do fare considerably better, however, in regard to closings in those categories where service may have been a factor: 44% as against 11%. Eliminating those cases closed due to increased earnings and temporary employment, the percentage is 33% to 11%, remaining considerably in favor of services, particularly since it is impossible to determine how many in the State sample were closed because of an increase in earnings, etc. It will also be

remembered, however, that eliminating sporadically employed and repeaters of reconciliation left Whatcom Co. with 24% of cases in these two categories in which service could have been a factor in terminating assistance. This is still quite favorable in comparison with the State's 11%.

In the 28% of the 'Other' cases closed by the State as a whole, the 'contact lost' feature could not be said to be very significant. Such reasons as, among others, 'refusal to cooperate with law enforcement officials' could indicate insufficient care in the original determination of eligibility due to the large caseloads then being carried. In general, it can be said that the large number of cases closed for a variety of 'other' reasons were principally fortuitous closings.

The above review of cases closed in the State of Washington June 1959 - June 1960 and those closed in Whatcom Co. after the adoption of the 1962 Amendments gives further indication that although the reasons for terminating assistance remained largely fortuitous, the Service Program did have at least some small impact on the problem of dependency.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Before coming to any further conclusions concerning the results of this review, it is important to emphasize that no attempt was made to evaluate any services given by the caseworkers that did not lead to termination of Public Assistance.

No consideration has been given to the frequent service rendered in the areas of budgeting, homemaking, housekeeping and health practices, or the use of community resources. Little regard has been paid to casework efforts designed to help clients improve their relationships to significant family members or people in their neighborhoods or the wider community. Some of these services would be accessible to measurement in terms of diminished public complaints and enhanced client functioning in the above mentioned areas.¹ The results of such services in respect to the better adjustment of the next generation would be almost impossible to calculate, but who is to say they have not, therefore been effective?

All this raises the question of the value of considering self-support a major goal for public welfare programs. Possibly termination of assistance is something that simply happens when the client meets with a resource in the way of a

¹Hunt, J. McV. and Kogan, Leonard S.: Measuring Results in Social Casework FSAA 1952

job, an entitlement or a spouse and has the qualifications that enable him to make use of it. Should not, then, case-work services be directed toward helping clients develop suitable qualifications for making use of whatever resources seem most likely to meet their needs rather than focused on self-support or self-reliance?

Independence could very well be a by-product of this process, though not a major aim. The first year of the Services Program in Whatcom County seems to confirm this.

Even in those cases where vocational training leads to self-sufficiency, a certain amount of preparation may well be needed to encourage the clients to make productive use of such opportunities. Whatcom County's record might well have been better in this regard had more training facilities been available that first year. There appeared to be, in the 'still open' sample a sizeable backlog of people who could have benefited by them. It is anticipated that more will benefit in the future with the expanded prospects being offered, especially since remedial education programs will make many persons eligible for training in skills which were formerly denied to them.

It is recognized that this sample of 85 cases is too small to be significant for any other purpose than to reflect the operations of one county for one year. It has no validity for generalization for the State as a whole, especially since conditions in other Counties may have been vastly different. It is also impossible to draw any conclusions from this sample

that would have any validity for other States in the U.S. or Provinces in Canada.

Bearing this clearly in mind, however, it is interesting to make certain speculations that might well be tested further in other areas of service.

There is, of course, no way of knowing how permanent any of these 85 terminations of Assistance will be. One can guess that those seasonally employed, the sporadic workers and the repeaters of reconciliation will be back. Of the others who found work, some may fail to remain employed. Some who reconciled may separate again, and become repeaters, and those who embarked on second marriages may find these ending in failure, too. Such 'unsuccessful' terminations could reduce even the small impact the Services Program appeared to have on the problem of dependency in Whatcom County.

This review does indicate that the skill of the worker is a factor in services leading to termination of Assistance. One may assume that the less skilled a worker is, the more the cases will be closed by fortunate circumstance. It would be interesting to learn if the less skilled workers have more clients who need to re-apply than do those who are more able in giving services.

A reasonably skilled caseworker's ability to predict which cases have the best potential for independence stands up rather well in this study. One might conclude that the same acumen would extend to judging the degree and number of inhibiting problems among the clients whose cases were not closed.

None of these five caseworkers had graduate school training in social work, but all had been exposed to considerable in-service training. The Supervisor had one year of graduate school. It would appear, then, that a fairly knowledgeable caseworker is capable of identifying reasonably accurately weaknesses and strengths in the clients.

An unexpected result of this review was the discovery that those clients who married again were seen as the ones with the fewest socio-emotional problems and the highest potential for independence. If this is true for other areas besides Whatcom County, it could have distinct meaning for the choice of service. Marriage and motherhood remain the preferred roles for women in this culture. It might be wiser for caseworkers to abandon the idea of vocational planning with these reasonably well-adjusted mothers and discuss with them, instead, their attitudes toward remarriage. Service might then be given in exploring with them why the first marriage failed, so that a second would have greater prospects of success.

Employment, at least in Whatcom County for the year reviewed, seemed to be the preferred solution for women with a degree of drive toward independence, but a moderate number of socio-emotional problems. Quite possibly, these problems had some bearing on the fact that these women did not choose remarriage. They might also have been of a nature to interfere with the success of another marriage. It seems ridiculously simple to say that the best prospects for vocational

counseling are the women for whom marrying again is not an acceptable solution, but it is probably a fact often overlooked in casework service. One would suspect that encouragement toward employment is frequently done routinely rather than on the basis of sound diagnostic planning.

It is interesting that not much drive toward independence was found among those mothers who decided to return to the same husband. One wonders if they chose to take the course of least resistance, considering that the drawbacks of the known are easier to cope with than the hazards of the unknown. If these women had appeared to be better integrated, one could assume a strong desire to solve their marital problems, but this was not true of them.

In Whatcom County, the caseworkers recognized the needs of this group of clients and services were given in problems created by 'desertion'. That these services were probably effective is indicated further by the comparison of Whatcom County's record of closings in the first service year as against those of the State in 1959-60. Whatcom County had more than twice as many reconciliations.

In spite of the fact that the prescribed service needs identified indicated that the caseworkers were overly optimistic about the vocational training potential of ADC mothers, and there is some evidence to indicate that encouragement toward employment was not always appropriate, some good work seems to have been done in this area. It cannot be considered entirely accidental that 31 percent of Whatcom County's 85 cases were closed due to employment or increased earnings in

1963-64 as against only 5 percent of the entire State's terminations in 1959-60. Economic conditions were not sufficiently different to fully account for this, and Whatcom County has been an area of poor employment prospects compared with the rest of the State for more years than these tabulations encompass.

George S. Hoshino, Assistant Professor of Social Work at the University of Pennsylvania, writing in October of 1963,¹ expressed doubt that the services provisions of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments would reduce costs to any significant degree. There is an element of similarity between his conclusions and those arrived at in this paper. Mr. Hoshino says:

"Probably too much has been made of the essentially unsupported claims that in the past lack of services or insufficient services have been the chief factor in the rising cost of assistance. It seems preferable to advocate the provision of social services simply because they are needed by assistance recipients and non-recipients alike, in the full awareness that such services will necessarily result in greater expenditures. In a society like ours these services are a necessary part of the fabric of social welfare."

Thus further doubt is cast on the validity of considering

¹Hoshino, George S. 'Will the Service Provisions of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments Reduce Costs?' Social Casework Op. cit.

the reduction of dependency as a major goal of social welfare programs, rather than such aims as are directed toward helping people manage their lives better.

Mr. Hoshino also concludes that "...professional social workers need to view public assistance in the broad context of the social security system, perhaps in an even broader societal context."

This is even more true for the public at large and its governmental leaders. There remains still a strong tendency to see social welfare measures as residual services for a minor number of the unfortunate or 'incompetent' rather than as a necessary part of our current social system.¹

It is not meant here to imply that the reduction of dependency has no importance as a factor for consideration in the giving of public welfare services. Certainly, dependency is uncomfortable. In a society where so much value is placed on conspicuous consumption, those who are in a dependent position are at a painful disadvantage. This is especially true for one specific group of people: the long-term unemployed. The aged, the handicapped, the disabled, the deserted, whose stigmata are relatively visible,² may receive a certain amount of community sympathy and perhaps find some compensatory solace in secondary gains. This is not true for the unemployed parents of children, however. Since their disabilities of

¹Wilensky, Harold L. & Lebeaux, Charles N. 'Industrial Society and Social Welfare' Russel Sage Foundation New York 1958

²Goffman, Erving 'Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity' Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1964

education and/or personality are not readily seen, all they can expect is public censure.

It is for this particular group of people that the service provisions of the 1962 Amendments give the greatest promise of reducing dependency. Fidele F. Fauri, Dean of the School of Social Work of the University of Michigan, emphasized this subject in his article on 'The Long-term Unemployed and the 1962 Amendments' in the issue of Public Welfare of July 1964.¹ Mr. Fauri says:

"Like the recipients of the 1930's, those currently on the public assistance roles need economic support, but a much greater percentage of them are in need of preventive and rehabilitative services. Most are in need of constructive social services to help solve or prevent problems resulting from social breakdown. They are in need of education and training to assist them to become employable in an economy that provides jobs for the skilled and the educated, but offers less and less in the way of opportunity for the unskilled and those without more than grade school education."

"Today unemployment rates exceed ten percent in some counties of the nation" ... says Mr. Fauri. "In these depressed areas many unemployed heads of families have exhausted their unemployment insurance. The

¹Fauri, Fidele F. 'The Long-Term Unemployed and the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments' Public Welfare Vol. XXII No. 3 July 1964

Manpower Utilization and Area Development Programs have not been financed on an adequate enough basis to absorb more than a small fraction of the unemployed ... ADC-U (ADC-E, in Washington State) and the work and training aspects of the 1962 Amendments are important to our social welfare programs for the country as a whole. But it is in those depressed areas, where other programs do not provide protection from want for all the needy, that ADC-U and community work and training projects are of major significance."

In view of the above it seems clear, then, that in terms of the avoidance of dependency, this is the most promising group toward which to direct services. With these families in which the breadwinner is unemployed lies the best prospect of preventing future long-term dependency. It is important to help the head of the family to regain his self-respect as a contributing member of society because only in this way can his children best see themselves as productive members of the social scene.

To return now to Whatcom County and the State of Washington, it is interesting to review the finding of the study of the Washington State Department of Public Assistance by the Greenleigh Associates, Inc. in respect to services.¹

First, it is significant to note what this report has to say in reference to factors affecting dependency:

¹Public Welfare: Poverty Prevention or Perpetuation A Study of the State Department of Public Assistance of the State of Washington, Conducted by Greenleigh Associates, Inc. 355 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017, Dec. 1964

"There are many factors causing poverty and deprivation in the midst of our growing affluence with consequent increases in the number requiring financial assistance and other services."

Of services, the Greenleigh Report has this to say:

"The Department (of Public Assistance), as has been shown, has a good record of establishing eligibility. However, this very record tends to interfere with a service oriented program. When it is considered that the service program is relatively new, it is not strange that public assistance cases receive very few services."

This further statement is significant for the State as a whole:

"The State of Washington elected to implement a program of services, initially for ADC families only. However, plans were not fully made for these services until well into 1964. This was partly due to the lack of clarity in the Federal rules and regulations and partly due to the fact that State Office organization impedes planning. In any event, by June of 1964, there was little evidence of services being provided by the casework staff ...

"While there is evidence that the casework staff are willing to provide services, they lack the skill and experience to do so.... When public assistance recipients are viewed from the standpoint of problems alone, very few are without problems which require service.

"At the same time little is being done to resolve these problems. Except for physical health, problems are many times more prevalent than services received. This is due largely to the fact that eligibility determination consumes a disproportionate amount of time, and staff lack supervision, experience and training. There was ample evidence of the desire to help, but equal evidence of the lack of 'know-how'".

Thus, it would appear that whereas Whatcom County had its problems in implementing the 1962 Amendments, these were certainly no more severe than those faced by the rest of the State. The degree of success this county was able to achieve in reducing dependency is much to its credit.

The Greenleigh study recommends that:

"1. Greater provision should be made for a full range of casework services within the Department in accordance with the 1962 Services Amendments to the Social Security Act. This would promote prevention of dependency and facilitate self-care and self-support. It will require improved professional staffing, supervision and direction, and a more extensive and intensive program of staff development for new as well as presently employed personnel.

"2. A specialized intake unit should be established in all county offices large enough to provide for special-

ized caseloads ... The intake worker should be a trained and experienced caseworker. The intake worker should have responsibility for all new cases until eligibility is established, the case study completed, the problems in the case diagnosed, a service plan made, and the case classified for level of service required.

"3. Once eligibility has been established, cases should be assigned to undercare caseloads according to the level of service required ... Each undercare unit should have one clerk who would be responsible for setting up a tickler system for recertification, making appointments and handling clerical work related to changes in grants, recertification and correspondence."

"These recommendations are based on the experience of a number of welfare and probation departments. When staff have two tasks, one of which must be done and another which should be done, the first takes precedence. This results in eligibility being done well, but services being neglected."

Certainly, it was true in Whatcom County that during the period that the ADC-R unit had a central intake worker as described above, the caseworkers were much more satisfied with their ability to give services. It was during these months from May to September of 1964 that the supervisor observed the greatest degree of case movement.

There is no doubt that putting these recommendations into effect will be expensive, as Mr. Hoshino has indicated.¹

¹Hoshino, George S. Op. cit.

But, it is only by being willing to pay the costs, that the public can have any assurance that the services it is buying will have any real quality in ameliorating social ills.

In July of 1964, prescribed services were redefined and expanded to some degree. State Form 9645 replaced Whatcom County form 229.¹ Additional material was also made available to the caseworkers to help them in identifying levels of service needed, and a more definitive guide for preparing the social study was included.²

By September of 1964, the caseworkers were beginning to assimilate this new material. The intent of the Federal Government was becoming more clear. Much of the lag in synchronizing policy had been overcome. It is anticipated that this will gradually result in the better realization of the usefulness of services in the years to come.

Before concluding this review, it is of interest to take a look at the experiences of other States. Very little is being written so far on the subject. The program is still relatively new, and it would appear that other States, like Washington, are too busy trying to come to grips with the problems of its implementation to be doing much in the way of reporting on its results.

Dwight Weiser, Caseworker III in the Fond du Lac County Department of Public Welfare in Wisconsin, echoes some of the

¹Revision #13 Washington State Public Assistance Manual II-Supplement ... effective 7-1-64.

²Revision #14 Washington Manual II ... effective 8-1-64

problems of the caseworkers in Whatcom County in his article on 'The Caseworker and the 1962 Amendments.'¹ He speaks of the additional demands on the worker's time in recording and regarding the determination of what service is.

"For example," he states, "there are times when real scrutiny of the 'problem and service classification' list in the new service chapter in our Manual is required. This happens when a worker has conducted some type of interview which is, by first observation, somewhere between the definition of service and non-service.

"More than likely, after reading the possibilities listed, he will make the decision to report it as a service interview assisted by liberal interpretation of the problem list, fortified with the optimistic rationalization that practically any interview is ultimately linked to the solving of a pre-defined problem..."

This is indeed reminiscent of Whatcom County's struggle with the prescribed services.

These difficulties notwithstanding, Mr. Weiser takes a positive view of the program:

"The other side of the coin, minted in 1962, has been enthusiastically applauded by the average caseworker. Perhaps in the most general terms, caseworkers in public welfare settings are optimistic about the amendments because they suggest quality at their level of endeavor ...

¹Weiser, Dwight O. 'The Caseworker and the 1962 Amendments.' Public Welfare Vol. XXIII No. 1, January 1965

"The worker can feel he is part of the profession of social work if his job is focused on qualitative, therapeutic casework. The new emphasis on service suggests to the worker that he can do something more than merely 'supportive' casework so characteristic of public welfare in the past.

"Some very good 'modifying-behavior' type of casework is beginning to be done now because of increased supervision and training provisions."

Mr. Weiser finds that the Amendments have given the caseworkers many advantages in terms of casework tools for organization, study and diagnosis. This thought is also expressed by Mrs. Merlene Wall, Public Welfare Worker, Mecklenburg County Department of Public Welfare, Charlotte, North Carolina.¹ Mrs. Wall, like many other caseworkers, experienced an initial resistance to the social study, but speaks to the eventual value she found in compiling it:

"I had many gratifying experiences when I took time to really listen to my clients...

"There were daily rewards while working on the study. Children who were seldom seen and almost never heard were sought out. For many it was the first time I had taken time to talk with them individually. Development of a much closer relationship with the children in my caseload is most certainly assured.

¹Wall, Merlene K. 'That Bit of Red Tape from the State Office' Public Welfare Op. cit.

"I also discovered with growing awareness that my clients are individuals, have foresight, have insight into their own problems and are capable of formulating plans. I can now see the client follow through with some of her own plans for improving her situation."

It will probably be many months, possibly even years, before any definitive evaluation can be made of the results of the 1962 Service Amendments. Like Whatcom County, the State and even the Nation seems still to be struggling with the implementation phase. The Federal Government has recognized the amount of reorganization necessary to do this and has allowed for a "gradual increase in the coverage of services and ... time for making social studies, providing staff training, developing and improving case management techniques..."¹ Only when implementation has been completed, as scheduled for 1967, can any truly valid estimate of the results of the program be expected.

"We have come to the end of what might be called the 'handout era' in modern public welfare." George K. Wyman writes in the January 1965 issue of Public Welfare.² "Caseloads are being cut to manageable size for the first time in the history of public welfare. Caseloads are being analyzed in depth. A variety of other needed activities are under way

¹Revision #5, Washington Manual II Effective 7-1-63

²Wyman, George K. 'Where to in Public Welfare' Public Welfare Op. cit.

for reorganizing and upgrading local and state welfare organizations; improving social services; carrying out research projects; setting up literacy and vocational training programs; establishing day care and homemaker services; and in other areas. Public welfare has never before made so much progress in so short a time. The promise is great. We must realize it through performance that is at least as great."

It has been, and still is, an effort fraught with problems in Whatcom County, but there remains a clear intention to move determinedly toward achieving this level of great performance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Explanation of the Manpower Development and Training Act
U.S. Department of Labor Dec. 1962

Casework Notebook Family Centered Project, Greater St. Paul,
Minn. 1959

Cohen, Wilbur J. 'Legislative Priorities in Social Security'
As below!

Cohen, Wilbur J. & Ball, Robert M. 'The Public Welfare
Amendments of 1962' Public Welfare; The Journal of
the American Public Welfare Association Vol. 20 No. 4
Oct. 1962

Davison, John and Ripetto, Robert D. 'A Public Agency Program
to Strengthen Client and Community' Social Casework
Vol. XLV No.7 July 1964

Hoshino, Geo. S. 'Will the Service Provisions of the 1962
Public Welfare Amendments Reduce Costs?' Social Case-
work Vol. XLIV No.8 Oct. 1963 p.439

Hunt, J. McV. and Kogan, Leonard S. Measuring Results in
Social Casework FSAA 1952

Letter APWA to Members Issue #6 - 1962 July 6, 1962 American
Public Welfare Association 1313 East Sixtieth St.
Chicago 37, Ill.

Memorandum from Maurice E. Powers, Supervisor of Field Services,
Washington State Department of Public Assistance
Dec. 1962

Memorandum No. 63-59 Issued Nov. 1, 1963 from the Division
of Social Services, Kenneth W. Bryan, Deputy Director,
State Dept. of Public Assistance. 'Guide for Social
Study ADC Social Services.'

Public Assistance in the State of Washington State Dept. of
Public Assistance, Leonard Hegland, Director Vol.20
No. 16 Oct. 1960

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Cont'd

Revision #5 Washington Manual II Effective 7-1-63

Revision #13 Washington State Public Assistance Manual II-Supplement...effective 7-1-64

Revision #14 Washington Manual II...Effective 8-1-64

Rubicoff, The Hon. Abraham 'An Address by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare' Public Welfare; The Journal of the American Public Welfare Association Vol.20 No.1 Jan. 1962 p.3

Wilensky, Harold L. & Lebeaux, Charles N. 'Industrial Society and Social Welfare' Russel Sage Foundation New York 1958

Goffman, Erving 'Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity' Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1964

Fauri, Fidele F. 'The Long-Term Unemployed and the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments' Public Welfare Vol. XXII No.3 July 1964

Public Welfare: Poverty Prevention or Perpetuation A Study of the State Department of Public Assistance of the State of Washington, conducted by Greenleigh Associates, Inc. 355 Lexington Ave. New York N.Y. 10017, Dec. 1964

Weiser, Dwight O. 'The Caseworker and the 1962 Amendments.' Public Welfare Vol. XXIII No. 1, January 1965

Wall, Merlene K. 'That Bit of Red Tape from the State Office' Public Welfare Op. cit.

Wyman, George K. 'Where to in Public Welfare' Public Welfare Op. cit.

General
BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck, Dorothy Fahs, Ph.D. 'Potential Approaches to Research in the Family Service Field' Social Casework Vol.XL No.7 Jul 1959 p.385
- Bieber, Irving & Associates Homosexuality - a Psychoanalytic Study of Male Homosexuals Basic Books Inc., New York 1962
- Carter, Genevieve W. 'Problem Formulation in Social Work Research' Social Casework Vol. XXXVI No.7 July 1955 p.295
- Finestone, Samuel 'Some Requirements for Agency-Based Research' Social Casework Vol. XLIV No. 3 March 1963 p. 132
- Goldstein, Harris K. 'Making Practice More Scientific Through Knowledge of Research' Social Work Vol.7 No.3 July 1962 p. 108
- Goldstein, Harris K., DSW. 'Criteria for Evaluating Research' Social Casework Volume XLIII No. 9 Nov. 1962 p.474
- Heyman, Margaret M. 'Criteria for the Allocation of Cases According to Levels of Staff Skill' Social Casework Vol. XLII Number 7 July 1961 p. 325
- Shyne, Ann W. 'Evaluation of Results in Social Work' Social Work Vol. 8 No. 4 Oct. 1963 p. 26
- Towle, Charlotte Common Human Needs FSAA
- Use of Judgements as Data in Social Work Research National Association of Social Workers 95 Madison Ave., New York 16, New York 1959

APPENDIX A

From:

PUBLIC WELFARE, Poverty-prevention or Perpetuation A Study of the State Department of Public Assistance of the State of Washington Conducted by Greenleigh Associates, Inc. 355 Lexington Ave. New York, New York 10017. December 1964

D. Budget

The Department of Public Assistance has a budget which is highly inflexible. This is due to the fact that there are a number of line appropriations. Such line appropriations appear to be unique to this Department and have resulted from the pressures of specific interest groups. The result has been appropriations which are generally adequate to carry out the programs for medical care, hospital care and nursing home care, to provide normal grants for the aged and blind, and for administration. However, line appropriations for assistance grants to families with children and disabled adults have been made with the full knowledge that they are not adequate to provide minimum standards of health and decency.

Because appropriations for some parts of the program have been more than adequate to meet needs and have resulted in unused funds, appropriated funds have reverted to the General Fund. In the biennium 1961-63 there was an average of \$13,998,102 between the total Department appropriation and its total expenditures. A portion of the appropriation was never realized,

Appendix A

however, because it represented unearned Federal funds. If the Department had had a total appropriation, rather than line appropriations, and if the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Central Budget Agency had had authority to transfer funds from one line item of the budget where it was not needed to another where it was urgently required, total basic requirements for ADC, AD and GA recipients could have been met in that biennium. There also would have been a larger share of Federal funds to be used in the State. It is false economy which allows families with children and the disabled to suffer want. It is also false economy to fail to realize a maximum amount of Federal matching funds when they are needed. Over the past several years the proportion and the amount of Federal matching funds available to the states has increased. As a result, the Federal funds available to the Department have increased from \$70,129,066 in 1955-57 to \$120,712,296 in 1963-65. At the same time, the amount of State funds going to the Department decreased from \$133,850,380 to \$125,932,113 over the same period. In fact in 1957-59, the State funds were \$150,969,613. In other words, increased Federal matching has not resulted in an improved public assistance program, but has been offset by a decrease in State funds. This was clearly not the intent of Congress in providing increased Federal funds. If the problems of poverty and dependency are to be overcome, it will be necessary to maximize, rather than minimize Federal matching monies.

Appendix A

It is recognized that there are increasing demands on available State funds. It is also apparent that the Legislature is sensitive to the public, as it should be, in making appropriations. However, the Department has been at a disadvantage in this respect. Public assistance recipients, particularly families and the disabled, are not a vocal public. Children and the mentally ill do not have a lobby, while at the same time vendor groups do lobby effectively. There are, however, interested citizens' groups which have wanted to present the case of the public assistance recipient, particularly the needs of children, before the Legislature. They have not been permitted, however, to know what the Department has requested for these groups. This has created a public relations problem and has resulted in the least defensive population's being discriminated against.

Recommendations

1. Separate line appropriations for categories of assistance and vendor groups should be abandoned. The Department should be given a single budget appropriation based on a line item budget. At the same time, the Director should have responsibility for administering the total budget and, in concurrence with the Director of the Central Budget Agency, to shift funds from one budget line to another to meet unforeseen line item deficits, or in the event of an overall deficit of funds, to distribute this shortage on a pro-rated basis throughout all

Appendix A

categories of assistance and supporting vendor groups. Budget projections have to be made by the Department more than two years in advance of the end of the biennium in which the expenditures will have to be made. Because it is dealing with problems caused by economic fluctuations, ill-health, and other factors which cannot be entirely predicted, some flexibility is necessary.

2. Unspent funds should not revert to the General Fund until the end of the biennium. Under present fiscal policies, unexpended funds in any one quarter are difficult, if not impossible to recover.

3. Increased Federal matching should be used to expand and improve the public welfare program of the State. The effect of increased Federal matching should not be offset by decreasing the amount of money appropriated from State funds.

APPENDIX B

From:

Public Assistance in the State of Washington (Blue Book)
State Department of Public Assistance
 Olympia, Wash. Leonard Hegland, Director

ADC Caseload Size in Whatcom County:

Vol. 20	No. 7	Jan. 1960	405
" "	" 8	Feb. 1960	406
" "	" 16	Oct. 1960	383
" "	" 17	Nov. 1960	382
" "	" 18	Dec. 1960	398
" "	" 19	Jan. 1961	403
" "	" 20	Feb. 1961	407
" 21	" 4	Oct. 1961	333
" "	" 5	Nov. 1961	324
" "	" 6	Dec. 1961	328

APPENDIX C

From:

Public Assistance in the State of Washington op. Cit.
Vol.20 No. 12 June 1960

Turnover in the ADC Program from June 1959 - June 1960 in the
 State of Washington

	Total Cases	Cases Opened	Cases Closed
June 1959	11,732	407	669
July "	11,623	338	982
Aug. "	11,144	387	704
Sept. "	10,871	539	641
Oct. "	10,884	514	490
Nov. "	10,880	519	435
Dec. "	11,018	605	464
Jan. 1960	11,149	541	481
Feb. "	11,361	541	381
Mar. "	11,512	581	470
April "	11,637	569	456
May "	11,719	578	523