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THE STRUCTURE OF PUBLIC CHILD WELFARE SERVICES IN THE UNITED STATES.
INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND CONSTITUTIONAL
ARRANGEMENTS ON THE ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT OF
PUBLIC CHILD WELFARE SERVICES IN THE U.S.A.

Public administration is an integral part of its political environment. It is useful to think of the culture of capitalism as centered around two main ideas: the interrelated concepts of "individualism" and "the free market". These also provide a clue to some social problems that do not stem from industrialization but are a product of, or are intensified by, the culture of American capitalism. Wilensky and Lebeaux¹ point out that although these ideas grip us less firmly than they did in the late 19th century, they still shape the size and organization of our welfare effort.

Of basic importance to American capitalism is its great emphasis on the rational, acquisitive, self-interested individual. Individual initiative - an acquisitive spirit, highly developed, widely diffused - is the mark of a society where labor is a commodity, sold on a more or less competitive market. American capitalism is distinguished by the fact that all labor is formally free to compete for better jobs, better

Individualism is both a theory of human behavior and a doctrine in justification of laissez-faire. As a political doctrine which has always held an unassailable position with the American people, individualism states that the good of all will best be served if each individual pursues his self-interest with minimal interference from government or any other sources of power or authority. For business this doctrine sometimes has a more concrete and restricted meaning: individualism becomes freedom for acquisitive enterprise, unhampered by government restriction, unchallenged by labor organizations and let the devil take the hindmost.

If there is any formula summing up these beliefs it is the one repeated in the American home and school: Everyone has equal opportunity to get ahead; everyone has the moral duty to try to get ahead (make the most of himself); if a man fails it is his own fault and he should feel guilty.

American experience with British colonial administration was such that the people reversed the model of the powerful chief executive when they themselves came into control after 1776. In organizing their new State governments they vested preponderant power in the legislative assembly. Aside from the hard-won exception of the presidency, it took the nation approximately a century to overcome its fears and suspicions of centralized administrative authority, even under popular and legislative control. Administrative
integration under a strengthened executive has been the key to much of the recent progress made in State Government.

The pioneers had and needed a fierce spirit of self-reliance. As a result the ideal of limited government became deeply ingrained in American political thought. This has resulted in the twentieth century adaptation of Jefferson's preference for that government which governed least. Another influence has been a simple faith in direct relationships between the citizen and his public servants, coupled with a stubborn refusal to combine inefficient small governmental units into larger and more resourceful ones. Until near the close of the 19th century, virtually every important administrative office — whether in town, city, school district, county, or state — was on an elective basis. Many still are, particularly in the counties. Terms of office are relatively short, seldom running over two years. As for appointive positions, the presumption prevailed from the early days that there should be frequent rotation in office and that every newly elected official had the right to dismiss incumbents inherited from his predecessor and fill their posts with appointees of his own choosing.

**Hamilton and Jeffersonian Tradition**

These two opposing titans of Washington's first cabinet have been a historic influence upon modern American administration.
Hamilton, brilliant, logical, conservative, believed that commercial strength constituted the only sure foundation for national welfare and favored bold use of federal authority to advance that end. Hamilton had no fear of power in government provided that those who wielded it could be held responsible for their acts. This philosophy though often challenged, has been one of the significant factors in American government and is stronger today than ever before.

Jefferson disagreed with Hamilton. He saw the country developing into an agrarian democracy. He saw little need for national administration other than that required for the conduct of foreign relations. Beneath this belief lay a more fundamental conviction. Jefferson held the opinion that power tends to corrupt the man in whom it is vested, making imperative its limitation to the barest minimum. His philosophy still deeply affects many who are earnestly concerned over "centralized control".

The philosophy of government non intervention was not at great variance with the facts of American economic life in the early days of settlement. Widespread ownership of land, actual and potential, provided at least some justification for laissez-faire theories. It required a long and slow development through decades stained with innumerable instances of helpless poverty and social injustice, to raise political thinking above the concept of freedom from regulation of any kind to the higher standard of freedom under regulation
designed to safeguard the general welfare. Our democratic philosophy of individual freedom protected property more than human right until well into the 20th century.

From this history of governmental regulation during the late 19th century it is evident that public administration was in a sense the unwanted child of a nation bent on material gain. Gross rapacity and prodigal waste first had to demonstrate the folly of assuming that competition worked like an invisible law to insure the protection and promotion of the common good. Only then did the representative bodies again begin to emphasize the positive note in the American philosophy of government - the idea that government exists to safeguard the general welfare. Only then did they begin to enact the statutes and create the agencies which became the stepping stones for contemporary public administration including those in public welfare services.

Morstein Marx points out "though favoring in theory a restricted scope of government, Americans have shown no less consistency in basing their action on practical considerations whenever these have pointed strongly in the opposite direction."¹

This is the line of argument implied in Cleveland's famous sentence, "It is a condition and not a theory which confronts us." In the last analysis "government has to do

what it has to do."

One device still widely used in state and local government is that of placing many offices on an elective basis so that the electorate is compelled or allowed to choose not only its political representatives but a considerable body of administrative officials as well.

Because of the ideology of local government the principle of states' rights has been jealously guarded and upheld. This has caused considerable lag in centralized administration of some of our most desperately needed Public Welfare Services in the United States and has left, by default of clear national policy, a large gap to be filled by the voluntary agencies.

The Political Setting for Child Welfare Administration and Services

There are differences in the framework of politics and administration of a country within which any program of child welfare must operate. For example a continuity of program and personnel is provided in Britain by the tradition of the nonpolitical administration of public services. The British have insulation against direct manifestations of political power such as are implicit in the U.S. in the still prevalent spoils system, the common favoritism in awarding contracts, and special consideration in allocation of governmental privileges. This is especially unfortunate in the
administration of child welfare services where specialized knowledge and continuity of program are particularly desirable. British departments of National government operating within a unitary system of government, exercise more control over substantive programs in local government than do most of our federal departments or agencies over the States. In turn, American states frequently exercise little or only nominal control over state-aided programs under local government.

An identical framework of political and administrative organization for the major units of local government in Britain contrasts with the wide differences in organization from one state to another or from one local government unit to another in the U.S.

The U.S. has a materialistic system of political values which attaches less importance to social service than to industrial production and commercial activity. In the American value system we discover a basic antagonism to governmental activity and especially to extension of social services. This may be one of our reasons for trying to perpetuate many of our voluntary agencies although the real differences between public and private agencies are becoming increasingly difficult to identify.

John Galbraith in *The Affluent Society* has reminded us of one of the consequences of our mistrust of public expenditure on communal services. He points up the willingness of Americans to tolerate squalor, neglect of social services,
and even scanty police protection because of their obsession with the notion that governmental services are a great waste of the wealth produced by industry. He describes American attitudes:

The children, though without schools, subject in the playgrounds to the affectionate interest of adults with odd tastes, and disposed to increasingly imaginative forms of delinquency, were admirably equipped with television sets.1

For the fiscal year 1956-57, Congress appropriated a total of $8,361,000 to be divided among the states and territories as grants-in-aid of child welfare services. For the same year Congress appropriated $49,972,000 for agricultural research, for plant and animal disease programs $26,294,000. In 1957 Congress refused to appropriate any funds for federal aid to education in any form, either for school buildings or to subsidize the educational programs of the states. In other words children just barely got on the agenda.

In Ohio, one of the richest and most highly industrialized states in the Union, not one cent is appropriated by the state legislature to local governments for child welfare services, although all direct services to children must be carried by local units of government. In 1954, Ohio failed

to use any of the current federal grant-in-aid to the state for child welfare services.

There Exists a Heterogeneity of Administrative Framework for Child Welfare Administration in the United States

At first glance it would seem that organization for child welfare services in the U.S. is largely a matter of whim. There are great variations in organization and range of responsibilities among the states. The functions which may be embraced by a state department of public welfare, apart from public assistance and child welfare, range all the way from crippled children's services to unemployment compensation and employment service in one state - Kentucky - where the department is called "Economic Security".

Although some states require all counties to establish welfare departments or maintain a child welfare service program, and a few of these states allocate money to counties to subsidize part of such services, stipulations about inspection of services are frequently forgotten and seldom accompany such grants. In other words, in most states, local governments may wallow in as poor and backward administration of child welfare as they choose.

Gladys Kammerer\(^1\) tells us that only half the counties in the United States in 1958 had the services of a professional

\(^1\) Kammerer, Gladys M., British and American Child Welfare Services: A Comparative Study in Administration, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1962, p. 115.
child welfare worker, and that thousands of children in need of care were unprotected by law or fiscal obligation to secure that care.

The United States does have a fairly well-defined delegation of authority over technical matters to the professional administrator at state levels, but less clear-cut definitions of jurisdiction in local child welfare administration.

Other political features include a resistance of many local officeholders outside U.S. urban centers to employment of professionally qualified social workers in child welfare work and lagging development of public responsibility for either short-term or long-term training programs in child welfare work.

The System of Spoils Survives in Child Welfare Administration in Many States and Local Government Agencies

That the spoils system is still alive and thriving in many states is a truism of American politics and administration. Reluctantly many states had to accede at least in principle, if not in practice, to the federal requirement of merit system coverage over state child welfare positions. This was required for other social security programs through the 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act, but child welfare services were omitted from this requirement. In practice, this is an administrative requirement laid down by the federal government, and it is the only control over state
administration of child welfare services which the federal government possesses.

Lack of Status for Public Child Welfare Positions in the U.S.

The low prestige value attached to state and local government employment in most states applies, of course, to child welfare work as well as to other types of positions. Many social workers have reported their preference for work in the better private welfare agencies, citing as principal reasons more freedom from red tape and restrictive policies in their work and no meddling with individual cases by board members.

There is nothing corresponding to spoils in the private agencies and certainly no political campaign assessment on salaries. Many public child welfare directors admit the loss of good professional staff to the private agencies and cite difficulties in recruitment in competition with the private agencies.

It is safe to say that American public child welfare administration suffers from serious disadvantages because of the hostile environment in which much of it must be carried on. Certain attitudes may be noted. In a booming industrialized society which worships gadgetry and sees its standard of living as the highest good to be achieved, it seems almost sinful to be poor. A stigma still attaches to a client of a welfare agency. These attitudes are in sharp contrast to
those prevalent in Britain for the support and extension of modern social services to mitigate ills beyond individual control.

It is difficult to attract the best trained professional staff into American public child welfare agencies in view of the prevailing climate of American opinion regarding public social services. Purposive, intelligent planning by public child welfare to meet the problems created by increasingly rapid industrialization and urbanization is difficult when funds are arbitrarily limited. This in turn makes the role of the voluntary agencies more confused and throws a heavier financial strain upon them than they can meet.

The British can say with truth that every child in need of care anywhere in the United Kingdom will receive services of reasonably good quality. They have quietly wrought a revolution in the last eight years. No American can say this about the United States as a whole.

Both countries share a common commitment among professional authorities to the kinds of treatment service needed. The values are virtually identical. Only the conventional wisdoms are not.
THE SCOPE OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Child Welfare Services have been defined as those social services that supplement, or substitute for, parental care and supervision for the purposes of: protecting and promoting the welfare of children and youth; preventing neglect, abuse and exploitation; helping overcome problems that result in dependency, neglect or delinquency; and, when needed, providing adequate care for children and youth away from their own homes, such care to be given in foster family homes, adoptive homes, child-caring institutions or other facilities.¹

Social services typically provided within the child welfare field have been classified in a recent publication as follows:

Casework services in behalf of children in their own homes.

Protective services, provided on the initiative of community agencies - to protect children from conditions seriously detrimental to their welfare.

Services to unmarried parents.

Services designed to supplement the care which the child receives from parents or to compensate for certain inadequacies in such care, such as:

Homemaker services

Day care services

Services designed to substitute for parental care, either partially or wholly, according to the child's individual needs and problems, such as:

Foster family care services

Group care services:

- emergency, shelter and detention care
- children's institutions
- residential treatment services for emotionally disturbed children
- training schools and other group facilities for delinquent children
- institutions for physically handicapped children
- institutions for mentally retarded children

Adoption services.¹

An understanding of the essential tasks and goals of a child welfare agency helps to differentiate it from other modern welfare functions. Child welfare agencies may be distinguished from the public assistance grant system of monetary allowances to dependent families with children. Public Assistance allowances are known as ADFC, or aid to dependent children. Distinguishing a child welfare program from an ADFC program is based not merely upon a separation of the two in the Social Security Act in the U.S.A. but also upon a discrete set of purposes for the two programs. The commission for intergovernmental relations recognized the divergent purposes of these two programs and described ADFC payments as principally devised for financial support whereas the child welfare programs are designed to perform

---

services. It remains to be seen how much the 1962 amendments will change this traditional distinction.

A further distinction must be pointed out between a child welfare program geared to social work services and a maternal and child health program embracing medical services. Both types of grants-in-aid in this country are administered by the Children's Bureau but their execution is in two entirely different sets of agencies in the states because of the differences in nature of professional skills and services.

1 Kammerer, British and American Child Welfare Services, p. 18.
FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

The agency charged by law with responsibility for administering federal activities in the child welfare field is the Children's Bureau located in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Bureau was established in 1912 to perform an investigatory and reporting function. It was established as a research not an action agency.

As its name implies, the Children's bureau was created for the purpose of gathering information and preparing reports, nationwide in scope, on problems of child care and child welfare.

The Social Security Act of 1935 created new responsibilities and programs for the Children's Bureau by establishing the legislative authorization for present child welfare grants-in-aid to the states. However, the Children's Bureau was given no real statutory controls over the states and was in a weak administrative position. The only control delegated to the Bureau was the requirement that to receive federal grants each state and territory must submit its own plan developed jointly by the state and the Chief of the Children's Bureau. There are few statutory guide lines for what must go into such a plan.

Child welfare services suffer from this lack of national control of state quality of administration and also
from a lack of state control of local child welfare services. The U.S. Children's Bureau is primarily an information and educational agency. The Bureau does not have power to compel a state to institute a child welfare program nor authority to police the quality or scope of services in any program adopted. The Bureau was charged with seeing that the merit system requirements in the selection and tenure of child personnel were not violated by the states.

The U.S. Children's Bureau has encouraged the states to promote the development of better qualified child welfare staff through the use of federal funds for educational leave. However, only 464 child welfare workers among the states, territories, and the District of Columbia completed educational leave in the peak year 1952.¹

Many local government Child Welfare Agencies are either indifferent or hostile to the educational leave program because they have not been able to retain on their staffs those who have benefited.

In states which still have children's institutions managed under the spoils system one could scarcely expect staff development for institutional personnel.

Federal legislation is merely for the purpose of encouraging state and local government in this field. There is a lack of any mandatory character in federal legislation

¹ Kammerer, *British and American Child Welfare Services*, p. 36.
vis-à-vis the states for the establishment of administrative organization or creation of programs for child care, licensing or any other activity.

From the year 1935 on there was an emphasis on grants-in-aid for rural areas. Not until 1958 was the emphasis on rural areas and rural population changed in the law.

Both the basis and formula for allocation of federal child welfare grants were changed by the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act and equally important a matching formula was written into the law requiring for the first time that states must match on a variable basis federal grants in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

Because federal law over child welfare services is limited to grants-in-aid merely to "stimulate" state and local services and no powers are given to the Children's Bureau over the quality or scope of state administration, each state is permitted to establish such laws and administrative devices as it desires. In fact, no compulsion exists in national law for any state to have a child welfare program. As already pointed out, even when a state accepted a federal grant, it could, until 1958, escape any state financial responsibility for child welfare services. Furthermore, unless a state is required by law to underwrite a sizeable portion of local child welfare costs, state supervisory powers over local units will be minimal. States which administer direct services can do so on any scale, extended
or limited, that they desire. One common outcome of this permissive type of legislation is failure at the local level to establish professional child welfare services. Only half the counties in the United States in 1958 had the services of a professional child welfare worker, and thousands of children in need of care were unprotected by law.

The organization of the federal Children's Bureau today reflects its original purposes more than any control function. Only a few controls are exercised over the states in the administration of federal child welfare grants-in-aid. The original purposes of the Children's Bureau, as set forth in 1912, were fact-getting, investigation and reporting. To these have been added the responsibility of consultation which has consistently grown since the grant-in-aid program was added in 1935 and is itself a potentially valuable means of influencing state policy.

Money with little power, except to require appointment of personnel on the merit system and the spending of funds according to the purposes for which they are given, might be the most appropriate description of the Federal Children's Bureau's status vis-a-vis the states. Only one state in the history of administration of these grants ever had its funds cut off. However, the Bureau's influence through its specialist consultant staff in each of the divisions is considerable with the states, especially in those states where professional training and standards in social
20

work are respected.

In a way the Children's Bureau may be said to have negative rather than positive power in the sense that certain things may not be done by the states in their expenditure of child welfare grants. On the other hand, the Bureau cannot compel any program or any extension of existing services to be undertaken by the states, a fact which helps to account for the great variety in depth and scope of services in this country. No state is required to have child welfare services.

In this respect the Children's Bureau occupies a very different position from that of similar institutions in England. The latter has back of it a law which requires the rendering and financing of child welfare services by local authorities, and the Home Office may and does regulate the way in which certain functions must be carried out.

The states have provided an unparalleled laboratory for the compilation and evaluation of data about organizational patterns and administrative procedures used in the rendition of services; it should be possible after twenty-five years of federal grants to draw some conclusions as to what elements constitute good organizational structure and good management in this field. But the material is largely unexamined, ostensibly for lack of sufficient research staff. To some extent this neglect has had serious consequences for the states. Much guidance has come from the Children's
Bureau on program activities but not on how to set up and administer these activities.

The American use of professional specialists and the lack of extensive controls over state or local administration compel the Children's Bureau to emphasize research, development of professional standards, and education of professionals and the public in voluntary adoption of new programs. Therefore, the Bureau's work is largely centered around encouragement of substantive program building.

Public reporting is seldom carried on with any completeness or regularity in the United States except by the U.S. Children's Bureau and the units in a few states.

For a comparison of federal grants-in-aid to states for child welfare services from the year 1936 through to 1962, see Table 1.
Table 1. Federal Grants-in-aid to States for Child Welfare Services: Amounts Authorized, Appropriated, and Expended by States, Fiscal Years, 1936 to 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Appropriated</th>
<th>Expended by States*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$84,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,376,457</td>
<td>851,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,499,543</td>
<td>1,312,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,526,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,505,000</td>
<td>1,492,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,523,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,554,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,495,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,473,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,365,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,276,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>1,852,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,077,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>4,046,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>4,046,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,075,000</td>
<td>4,858,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,590,400</td>
<td>7,116,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>4,370,922</td>
<td>7,409,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,228,900</td>
<td>6,988,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,228,900</td>
<td>6,883,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,228,900</td>
<td>6,953,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>8,361,000</td>
<td>7,908,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9,541,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>11,940,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>13,024,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>13,666,000</td>
<td>13,695,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>18,750,000</td>
<td>17,811,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Checks issued less refunds.

The scope of activities varies less among the states than does the responsibility for conducting such activities. It would be neither feasible nor desirable to examine the different systems of child welfare administration found in each of the fifty states. From the multiplicity of programs, however, it is possible to distinguish three major types of organization within states for the provision of public child welfare services. These are (a) wholly state administered programs, (b) locally administered programs under a uniform state requirement for administrative organization, and (c) locally administered programs under various state options for organization. Within each of these categories varying degrees of integration with public assistance programs can be found.

A further source of variation lies in the fact that states which administer child welfare services directly through state field workers permit local autonomy in the development, organization and financing of purely local programs of child welfare service. This has come about because the nature of child welfare problems is such that the making of new policy is a constant necessity in order to meet the complexities of life for children in a continually changing urban, industrial environment.
Because statutory law is made slowly and often reveals a lag between emergent problems and the recognition of an existing set of conditions as a problem by the average legislator, administrative agencies in the welfare field need broad delegations of authority to adapt their programs to fundamental changes in society. Legislators themselves recognize at least tacitly the need to make adjustments in policy more rapidly than they are prepared to do, especially in American states where the majority of legislatures still meet only biennially for relatively short sessions. They have tended to make broad delegations of policy making authority to state welfare agencies.

The following examples of the major types of organization are based on studies made by Gladys Kammerer of the University of Florida of public child welfare services in Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio. In Ohio several counties were studied intensively.

Kentucky has long had a state administered system of direct services to children but it has retained in its state legislation provision for two different locally administered programs of direct services, and these two counties, locally directed and locally financed, were included in the study.

---

1 Kammerer, *British and American Child Welfare Services*.
Ohio - an Example of Locally Administered Programs Under Various State Options for Organization

In Ohio, the law vests the responsibility for child welfare administration in the county, insofar as the rendering of direct services to children is concerned. However, the organization from county to county may vary and the quality of the program is virtually untouched by the state administration.

State legislation for state responsibility in Ohio is not too clear cut in the sense that the Division of Social Administration is given supervisory powers over local public and private child welfare agencies and institutions as well as authority to care for children directly. One of the principal supervisory responsibilities of the Division is the annual examination of certification of children's institutions and child-placing agencies, an examination which may take the form of a written report only. The resultant certification or licensing is a vital supervisory duty as no juvenile court in Ohio may commit a child to an unlicensed institution or agency, and all courts must receive a list of certified agencies and institutions annually.

The sections of the federal Social Security Act on child welfare services have been specifically accepted in law by Ohio. This will mean state matching contributions in support of direct services to children in the future and also, inevitably, a larger supervisory organization to carry out
the enlarged financial responsibilities.

The Ohio organization for services and treatment of juvenile delinquents is, as in almost all other states, organized entirely separate from that for child welfare services, as commonly understood.

The first state provision for children was the county home for dependent children authorized in the post-civil war period. This provision placed Ohio in the forefront of American states in the care of children. A 1938 law permitted counties to establish child welfare boards, under which they were to place county children's homes. In 1946 Ohio made mandatory the creation of a county welfare department in counties without such a department or a child welfare board. A 1957 law removed this option, and all counties had to establish a welfare department. However, child welfare services need not be organized under the welfare department as any county may still utilize a separate child welfare board and transfer to it all administration of children's services and institutions.

The county children's welfare board is empowered to appoint an executive secretary to serve as executive officer, which position is exempt from civil service coverage. In this way, political friends may be rewarded or enemies discharged indiscriminately and without reference to the welfare of children.
Duties and powers of the county child welfare board are numerous on behalf of children in the county deemed by the board to be in need of public care or protective services. This is the loophole which allows a do-nothing board in a parsimonious or a poor county to escape responsibility for program.

As to the financing of Ohio's child welfare program, the state had up to 1958 appropriated no money to the counties to assist in carrying on the services to children. Small amounts of the federal appropriation could be channeled down to counties for special projects, but the entire cost of direct services to children, including institutional care, had to be carried by each individual county under the terms of Ohio law.

**Indiana - An Example of Locally Administered Programs Under a Uniform State Requirement for Administrative Organization**

Indiana is another of those states which has a local government administration of direct child welfare services, with the task of state supervision and only a few direct services left in the State department of Public Welfare. Indiana provides some state moneys to local units in contrast to Ohio. The state agency is a general Department of Public Welfare, which embraces the public assistance program and services to crippled children as well as the child welfare program. The state department is headed by a Board of
Public Welfare of five members appointed by the governor for staggered four year terms. The board is responsible for policy-making and adoption of rules and regulations of the department.

The only line responsibility which the Indiana Department of Public Welfare must legally carry is the licensing of all child caring and child placing institutions, public and private, boarding homes, day nurseries, and children's homes.

Despite the uniformity of local administrative pattern required in Indiana, a fierce desire for local autonomy pervades the state, as in Ohio. The state is deprived of any real supervisory power.

County departments in Indiana have both the right and the duty to assume responsibility for any child in the county who needs help unless there are other agencies in the community serving particular functions. Indiana has provided a more liberal and tighter law with respect to local responsibility for care of children than has Ohio and has also incorporated a later day concept in attempting to keep children in their own homes.

Kentucky - An Example of Wholly State Administered Program

Kentucky offers a sharp contrast in its legislative history as well as in its actual legislation to that of the other states heretofore described. The major characteristic
of Kentucky legislation is provision for unified administration in a single state agency of social services and institutions for dependent, neglected and delinquent children. In the second place Kentucky has long had a state-administered system of direct services to children and third, Kentucky has retained in its state legislation provision for two different locally administered programs of direct services.

The department of Kentucky state government charged with administration of casework and institutional services to dependent, neglected and delinquent children is the Department of Child Welfare, which is independent of other state departments and whose head is directly answerable to the governor. Into this department, newly created by the 1960 legislature, were transferred all field child welfare workers and supervisors responsible for casework services, placement of children, licensing, homemakers' services, adoption investigations, and certain probation and parole supervision.

The state's responsibility for care of dependent and neglected children is so loosely worded in the law as to be almost meaningless, as the department is not required to accept children committed by the county courts. The law places no duty upon either state or the county to provide care for such children as should be given public care or to render casework services to those in need of them, and this is a very real gap in Kentucky legislation. Almost all Kentucky counties and the state simply plead lack of funds for child
care and, because they are not compelled to render services, budgetary and appropriating agencies find it easy to deny requests for funds. Furthermore, there is no requirement that children placed in a public or private institution receive casework services on that individual boarding homes be licensed - two glaring gaps in existing legislation.

Summary

In conclusion one can say that child welfare services in the United States are uneven in quality and scope of coverage. Indiana has a state law which assures that every county will have a general welfare department which will provide at least some child welfare services along with other welfare programs. Indiana, however, does not subsidize with state funds any part of the county's care costs or direct services to children except for a part of the personnel costs of the county welfare departments. Indiana also has made no attempt to integrate its child welfare services with the institutional program for delinquent children, and the latter is rather out of date.

Ohio can do little in its state legislation or weak supervisory authority to encourage the lifting of standards for child welfare administration in its backward counties, and the state has denied any state financial responsibility for child welfare. Counties have a choice as to form of organization for child welfare, but because of indifferent
personnel standards for appointment to the administrative direction of the local program and because of divided authority with the head of the county children's home, the local programs may never advance very far in many areas.

Kentucky is unique in uniting institutional and social services in a single, unified child welfare department, the only full-fledged state department of this kind in the county. Kentucky law, however, makes it impossible to locate ultimate responsibility for services to children with either state or local government. Child welfare administration in Kentucky has an anomaly. In the United States there are five states with state-administered child welfare programs which also permit local government units to provide child welfare services independently of the state. This means not only independence of state supervision except through the licensing function, but it also signifies lack of state or federal money for the local unit. Kentucky is one of these states. Two Kentucky counties operate their own locally administered child welfare programs through agencies authorized by state law. Each of these is entirely locally financed without state subsidy. No state supervision has ever been extended to these local government agencies except through the state licensing function. The reason for these units appears to be purely historical, for the local units existed long before a state responsibility for child welfare services was recognized and established in law. Local government
legislation for child welfare in Kentucky is uneven, confusing and inadequate. These variations are typical in greater or lesser degree for all the states.

It is noteworthy that for the United States as a whole and two of the states used for illustrative purposes in this study (statistics were not available on Indiana) about two-thirds of all children served receive these services from public agencies, the other one-third being cared for by voluntary agencies (See Table 2).

The major public effort tends to be concentrated on casework services to children living at home or with relatives or in foster homes while private agencies are more heavily involved in institutional care for dependent and neglected children and unmarried mothers. For the U.S.A. as a whole 85 percent of dependent and neglected children living in institutions are served by private agencies and the majority of children in group homes are similarly served. Ohio departs significantly from the national pattern by having a majority (62 percent) of its dependent and neglected children in institutions under public auspices while all of its delinquent children in public training schools are served by private agencies! Contrary to what one might expect, the majority of emotionally disturbed children being treated in residential centres are served by public agencies (62 percent) and this is true too of institutional care for the mentally and physically retarded.
It is worth noting that for Kentucky there is no report of children being served in residential treatment centres, by either public or private agencies. Tables 2 or 3 indicate the variety of situations in which child welfare services come into play as well as the absence of any consistent pattern or rationale for the distribution of responsibilities as between public and private agencies.
Table 2. Distribution of Children Served by Public and Voluntary Child Welfare Programs. March 31, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whereabouts of Children</th>
<th>Percentage served Primarily by Public Agencies</th>
<th>Percentage served Primarily by Voluntary Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For dependent and neglected children</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity homes for unmarried mothers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment centres for emotionally disturbed children</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary institutions for delinquent children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total in institutions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Children Receiving Child Welfare Casework Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In homes of parents</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In homes of relatives</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In independant living arrangements</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In adoptive homes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In foster family homes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group homes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public training schools for delinquent children</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In institutions for mentally retarded children</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In institutions for physically handicapped children</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whereabouts of Children</th>
<th>Percentage served</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage served</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other institutions</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Children Served by Public and Voluntary Child Welfare Programs, March 31, 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whereabouts of Children</th>
<th>Children Served Primarily by Public Agencies</th>
<th>Primarily by Voluntary Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>378,400</td>
<td>29,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children in Institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Ky.</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Ky.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For dependent and neglected children</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>67,700</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity homes for unmarried mothers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment centres for emotionally disturbed children</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary institutions for delinquent children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total in institutions</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>80,300</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>2,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Children Receiving Child Welfare Casework Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Ky.</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Ky.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In homes of parents</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148,300</td>
<td>11,763</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In homes of relatives</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whereabouts of Children</th>
<th>Children Served Primarily by Public Agencies</th>
<th>Children Served Primarily by Voluntary Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In independent living arrangements</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In adoptive homes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In foster family homes</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132,800</td>
<td>9,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group homes</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public training schools for delinquent children</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In institutions for mentally retarded children</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions for physically handicapped children</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other institutions</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>24,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 2.
LOCAL PATTERNS OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Since colonial days the county has been the principal unit responsible for welfare services and their administration in most American states. Only within the memory of living persons have the states and federal government in this country assumed fiscal and administrative responsibility for services other than custodial institutional care. The county is the most commonly utilized local unit of government for welfare administration. Because child welfare problems are county-wide in scope and require consistent treatment services, regardless of municipal boundary lines, the county is the logical unit for such services.

Much of the administration of direct social services to children is carried on by local governments rather than by the states. It is practically impossible to present a definitive picture of this side of American Child Welfare Services. It has been possible to examine a few local units which may be deemed representative.

The two kinds of local structure most commonly found are the general welfare department under a county director and the independent child welfare department with its own governing board. These are the basic types. Within the single welfare department, child welfare services may be wholly integrated with public assistance, using the same set
of welfare workers to handle all cases on an undifferentiated basis, or such services may be organized into a separate division or section with its own casework supervisors and separate caseworkers. The raison d'être of the independent board form of organization is a distrust of the elected political officers of government. At the county level this popular distrust is based on a suspicion of favoritism in appointments to positions, in the awarding of contracts, and in the dispensing of benefits or services. Courthouse politics in most counties do not inspire confidence. In any event, the electorate has from time to time sought as one remedy, laws creating independent governing boards for services from which the most blatant spoils and political practices were to be excluded by making the boards bipartisan, requiring the presence of both sexes, having a judicial officer or a school superintendent make some appointments, or having long staggered terms. The latter device in particular makes it difficult for any one county administration to control the board.

The all-purpose county welfare department is the other type of organization commonly used to perform child welfare services at the local level. In some states, this type of agency is headed by a statutory board which establishes policy and appoints the director with full discretion to establish policy as well as to execute it. In Ohio there is no statutory governing board, merely an optional
advisory board. The county commissioners, the elected heads of county government, appoint the county welfare director, and he is accountable to them.

Important as the cultural patterns, ethical values, and quality of civil leadership will be in a community in determining the standards for local administration of child welfare services, the administrative structure for such services will also have a major effect on the way in which such services are performed and the imagination shown in program development. The way in which community ideas may be enlisted in broad policy-making will certainly have a profound effect upon a child welfare agency. This is true because local welfare programs, especially child welfare programs, are in a peculiar way an expression of the values of the community as no other set of services are. Their administration is a direct reflection of what the people of the area demand in man's treatment of his fellow man.

Three of the five local child welfare agencies examined for the present study make use of the board form of organization, with general policy-making and selection of the executive director of the agency vested in the board, and execution of broad policy delegated to the executive director. Two of the agencies are subunits, each with its own separate chief and staff, within a county welfare department operating under a single head. Each of these subunits was originally established under an independent board and was later transferred by action of the county commissioners to the county welfare department.
In one case, no marked change in policy or program resulted from the transfer; in the other instance, marked improvements were effected, in part from much strengthened budgetary support.

Two of the agencies under board leadership have demonstrated strength and, on the whole, strong policy leadership for sound progress in program development. One revealed over many years a total lack of imagination and inadequacy in program and might be said to have exhibited all the worst weaknesses alleged for the board type of organization. In all fairness, however, one must admit that the same weaknesses would have prevailed under a single-headed department had the same person who served so long as executive secretary been that department head. Still under a board, it has within the last two years shown a remarkable renascence and potentiality for overhaul of program.

What is one to conclude from the experience of these agencies with the board form of organization? Certainly one may say that in county government in this country, where spoils and courthouse politics are primitive in nature as well as morally reprehensible, there is much to be said for protecting child welfare services by the insulation of a policy-making board of prominent citizens more distinguished for their civic responsibility than for their skill in political manipulation. Inasmuch as locally administered child welfare units in this country are normally county agencies, one must take realistic account of the nature of
county government - the unexplored terraine of American politics. Those who ignore the political setting in organizing administrative services do so at great peril to the services. It was with realism, it must be remembered, that federal administrators required the merit system in administration of child welfare services wherever federal grants were to be used, whether in state agencies or channeled down to the local level.

It is clear that all three child welfare boards studied succeeded in keeping spoils politics out of child welfare administration. As to the two single-headed departments, the fact cannot be overlooked that Ohio requires that merit system procedures be followed in county welfare departments. Only a minority of states have such a requirement, however, for county departments which do not use federal funds. Even though one of the independent boards did not until very recently insist upon professionally trained social workers in its staffing, it did not suffer personnel changes as a result of purely political changes, a point which could not be made about the local welfare agency in the same county. In another county studied where the child welfare board had a far better record in appointment of well-qualified social workers and administrators as well as in program development, this record prevailed during a long period when the county welfare department was subjected to many changes in directors, most of them mediocre in qualifications, and to radical changes in policy.
One important conclusion of a different nature can be drawn from the organization of the larger child welfare agencies studied; that is, the desirability of placing institutions and services to delinquent children committed by the courts in the same department with general child welfare services. This unification of services to children regardless of the labels attached to the children makes optimum use of the professional services available to a large children's agency. Why should such unification or integration of services not work equally well at the state level? This is a question seldom raised and never answered.

Separation of institutions for juvenile delinquents from the child welfare program may deprive those institutions of the leadership for establishment of a treatment program and cause them to deteriorate into mere custodial care or junior penitentiaries.

Although today there are only two states - Pennsylvania and Kentucky - which combine administration of their programs for juvenile delinquents with those for the usual range of child welfare services in one unified state agency, there are a number of local governments which, through their child welfare agencies, operate institutions for the rehabilitation of children committed to their care as juvenile delinquents.

One child welfare agency has successfully provided institutional treatment for many years to both delinquent and
dependent and neglected children with no separation within the institution. Both types of children are cared for successfully within the same institution and are assigned to cottages without reference to the label with which they came to the institution, thus refuting the arguments of those who insist on segregation. The institution is Ormsby village, operated by Louisville and Jefferson county, Kentucky.

Concluding Remarks

As a result of investigation in the field of Child Welfare Services and of the obvious lacks in the system, certain recommendations would seem to be in order.

1. Enlargement of federal fiscal responsibility.
2. Compulsory state appropriations as a condition antecedant to federal grants.
3. Administrative controls over state program and administration.
4. Expansion of professional educational programs.

Americans particularly need to be reminded that strong federal guidance and even controls over state use of grants are quite as important for quality of child welfare services as for roads.

A dynamically oriented child welfare administration will be concerned continuously with the development and enunciation of public policy that will meet the ever changing challenges of our time. It will be value-infused administration led by dedicated, highly trained men and women who also
have an understanding of the management of large scale, complex public programs and who will be concerned with adapting programs and techniques as new frontiers of knowledge are broken. It can be neither value-infused nor dynamic unless it is so organized and so led that program will be under continuous and critical review to discern new and unsolved problems and align resources to meet those problems.
IMPLICATION OF THE 1962 PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS
OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES IN THE ADPC PROGRAM

Item 4270 in the Handbook of Public Assistance Administration states in part as follows:

Public Assistance and child welfare programs are basic resources for meeting the responsibilities which State public welfare agencies carry to provide social services to families and children.... The State agency carries responsibilities for planning to develop and utilize to the best advantage the program resources of both public assistance and child welfare. This provision, which is identical in both titles, calls for a State plan of coordination between the two programs in respect to the major aspects of State and local program assessment and planning, including policy development, provision of intake services which are related in knowledgeable and responsible manner to the full range of services provided, inter-referral cases for direct services; and collaboration in consultation, training and community planning. Joint responsibility in community planning is essential to identify gaps in services and resources and to enable the State and local agencies to establish priorities and give effective leadership in regard to unmet needs.1

Maximum use of other agencies is also provided in these amendments. Item 4280 states in part:

The legislation specifically requires that the State plan describe the steps taken to assure... maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services. This means that the State must know

what resources are available and take steps to assure that they will be utilized.... The steps that assure maximum utilization include (1) co-operative agreements with State-wide services, (2) operational policies to carry out such agreements and (3) guides to local departments on the development of cooperative planning with other local services.

The important point to remember about these 1962 amendments is that they mark a new level of purpose and aspiration and an apparent intent of the Federal Government to show leadership in development of services to children. All experience would seem to indicate that initiative for this must be taken at the federal level - both in the financial sense and also in the development of standards.

Public welfare departments are hereby given more responsibility to see that services are planned and coordinated for better care of children and this means the use of both public and private agencies.

These amendments are significant from the point of view of introducing the idea of casework services to children for the first time under the public assistance programs. The ADPC program becomes as much a child welfare service as a public assistance program.

Before these amendments there has been no concentrated effort to bring casework services to recipients of public welfare but the emphasis from here on will be on services as

---

1 Handbook of Public Assistance Administration, p. 2.
well as the money payment as on objective. This is a substantial change for the better in welfare thinking and becomes especially significant when one remembers that over the years, the ADFC program has come to be comprised of families suffering the most severe social problems, including among others, desertion and separation.

These amendments also provide federal authority to improve staff and quality which will be so necessary in the extended casework services proposed.

The objectives as set forth in Item 4270 and 4280 are certainly commendable. They do raise the problem as to how this will be worked out in actual administrative practice.

Questions present themselves regarding the feasibility of combining child welfare and public assistance functions without detriment to the quality of the former, and which administrative arrangements will provide the best service: a common staff rendering both types of service or some differentiation of personnel according to the nature of the service required but within the same administrative agency.

The 1962 amendments raise in acute form the question of administrative separation of child welfare program from public assistance function as well as the question of public subsidies to private agencies and purchase of care from private agencies.

This latter issue has been discussed by Martha Branscombe who maintains that there has been a principle
long established in this country that public funds be spent by public agencies in accord with statutory authority and that full and complete accounting be made to the people. With this accountability necessarily goes control of expenditures. She feels that the corollary principle, that private agencies should be voluntarily supported is equally basic to the freedom and flexibility of private agencies and that they must retain final responsibility and control of their purpose and program.

However, as she points out:

Application of these two principles does not preclude public policy permitting the purchase of care or services from a private agency for an individual child for whom the public agency has responsibility...and whose needs it cannot at the time meet through its own resources. Nor does it preclude joint undertakings by the public and private agencies on a co-operative basis, as in the case of research, training or demonstration projects.1

She goes on to say:

Purchase of care means payments based upon actual total cost of care for each individual child from public funds and must be undertaken in accordance with the basic principles of continuing responsibility and accountability. Such responsibility can be discharged by appropriate arrangements for periodic reporting, staff conferences, continuing joint planning and any other devices that seem necessary in any particular situation. The principle of continuing responsibility as related to purchase

of care is based squarely upon the democratic concept of trusteeship, which applies equally to public and private agencies.1

There is great diversity in public policy at the present time with regard to the use of voluntary services. Pennsylvania, for example, began in 1951 to grant lump sum subsidies to all types of eleemosynary institutions. Massachusetts for almost half a century has prohibited the granting of public funds to voluntary agencies. There has been a marked shift in the field of child welfare from voluntary to public care in the past two decades. It would seem that with the increasing child population, cooperative arrangements will be essential.

Under the broadened scope of the social security program, public agencies will now provide some of the casework services to families and children which have been regarded as the special province of voluntary agencies.

Arlein Johnson feels that,

Some voluntary agencies have supplemented rather than complemented the expanding public services by becoming paid agents for the public authority. When this happens, as it has in many places, the distinction between public services and voluntary agencies becomes clouded. Changing conditions require solutions democratically arrived at but such solutions are guided by values held by the greatest number of people.2

1 Branscombe, "Basic Policies and Principle of Public Child Care Services".

In 18 states as of 1959, payments for child care were made only when the public administrative agency accepted responsibility for care and made a plan with the voluntary agency. An additional 19 states made the same kind of payment on a per capita basis.

William McCullough concludes that the subsidy system continues to exist primarily from the momentum of historical precedent. It has seriously hampered the development of public child welfare programs and responsible supervision of voluntary programs.¹

The Werner² study based on a 100 percent return from questionnaires to all states and territories, shows that only four states (Arkansas, Mississippi, Nebraska and Nevada) were not using public funds to provide care for children placed with voluntary organizations.

A significant finding of her study concerned the problem of control where care was purchased. Her conclusion was that a strong public child care program requires effective supervision of the kind of care that is purchased from the voluntary agency or institution. It is interesting to note that Lord Beveridge, one of the strongest supporters of voluntary effort, was also the strongest advocate of guaranteeing the child in voluntary care the standards fixed for public


² Werner, Ruth M., Public Subsidies to Voluntary Child Care Agencies, In process, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, cited in Arlein Johnson, ibid.
agencies. Many problems arise in connection with the purchase of care such as (1) relationships between voluntary and public services in a locality. (2) determination of the basis for rates of payments and for amounts, whether to cover full costs or partial costs. (3) the standards to be maintained when care is purchased and who should determine these standards.

New York is probably the outstanding example of the effects of tradition upon public-voluntary relationships. The state in 1894 forbade state appropriation but made local subsidies permissible. At the present time the state re-imburses local welfare departments 50% for payments to private child welfare agencies.

Traditional relationships between public and voluntary services may also result in different practices within the same state. California is an example of this.

It is possible that a well entrenched subsidy system, even on a purchase of care basis, may deter expansion of the public program. In the U.S.A. it would seem that where voluntary organizations are providing a large share of the services, as in New York City and San Francisco, pressure is steadily toward payment for the full cost of care.

A study in 1929 revealed that state supervision of voluntary organizations had been set up by statute in 47 states and that such supervision ranged from visitations only to licensing. In short, a trend toward centralized control is a phenomenon not only of economics and political life in
the U.S. but also of the Social Welfare field.

Where money goes, control follows. This is an axiom of public administration. That a certain amount of supervision by government is now accepted seems evident, especially when payments are made for services rendered. But the establishment of such standards is regarded as a matter of collaboration.

Under the controls set up, subsidies have often improved the standard of voluntary services, but agencies have not been free to expand the quality and the quantity of services at their own discretion. Arliein Johnson on the basis of materials made available by several national organizations noticed that they contained a number of common observations. On the basis of these observations she offers us three principles which may provide guidance in the formulation of policy.

1. Each agency and each community should have a clear definition of the respective functions of voluntary and public services in that community.

2. Community planning councils must be the expediters in making short term and long term blueprints of community services, including division of responsibility between voluntary and public agencies.

3. Professional leadership has a major responsibility for helping in policy development. More social workers in both public and voluntary agencies are needed who have historical perspective, insight into the dynamics of community life and ability to apply the insight from their professional knowledge to the
difficult problems of community relationships.\(^1\)

Miss Johnson asks the question when public funds pay for the cost of almost every child in the care of a voluntary agency at what point does the public welfare authority take over entirely? If the voluntary agency is almost wholly dependent upon the source of support, then eventually the only private agencies for which there is justification will be those who represent a sectarian philosophy.

Dimock and others have analyzed the values in small or decentralized administrative units and have maintained that size has more effect upon function and operation than does auspices, whether private or governmental.

As indicated earlier in this study the division of child welfare services between public and private agencies is still in a fluid, dynamic state and no hard and fast lines can or should be drawn. The realities of the present make expansion and further development of social services for children under both public and private auspices a compelling necessity and require a comprehensive approach.

The transition of political and social thought in no sense weakens or negates our fundamental concepts and our faith in the primary value of and necessity for individual initiative and voluntary cooperation in private enterprises in all spheres of human life. Historically and contemporarily, we have adhered to the basic principle set

\(^1\) Johnson, "Public Funds for Voluntary Agencies", *The Social Welfare Forum*. 
forth by Lincoln that government should undertake directly only those services which the citizens individually or through voluntary cooperative effort cannot do or cannot do as well in their private capacity or with the resources available.\textsuperscript{1}

The 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act point the way towards federal leadership in a more unified, consistent and all embracing program for our nation's children. In the growth of governmental responsibility we must be careful not to lose sight of the special contribution which only voluntary agencies can make.

The task of reformulating the principles governing the appropriate spheres of action of public and voluntary organization remains among the most important of unfinished business in child welfare.

It was Seneca who said "Our forefathers have done much but they have not finished anything."

\textsuperscript{1} Branscombe, "Basic Policies and Principles of Public Child Care Services - An Underlying Philosophy".
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