

District WF

**WHAT PRICE DEPENDENCY?**

**A Report on a Washington Problem**

**By:**

**The Junior Village Committee  
D. C. Health and Welfare Council**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Dedication . . . . .	i
Acknowledgments . . . . .	iii
Introduction . . . . .	1
Junior Village . . . . .	6
The Families . . . . .	23
Employment . . . . .	30
Housing . . . . .	36
The Public Agencies:	
The Department of Public Welfare . . . . .	44
The Public School System . . . . .	61
The Juvenile Court . . . . .	64
The Voluntary Agencies . . . . .	71
A Progress Report . . . . .	79
A Community in Transit . . . . .	85
Conclusion . . . . .	89

## DEDICATION

On February 2, 1957, Miss A. Patricia Morss, special advisor in the Department of Public Welfare, gave a talk to the Junior League of Washington. She described the Department's dilemma in trying to deal with overcrowding at Junior Village. She asked whether the community could or should afford to go on building more buildings to house dependent children.

Junior Village, she said, could be made a study project to bring to public attention and understanding the problems of family disturbance and breakdown which separate children from their families.

With this understanding there could be better planning and organization of community services, a better use of existing public and private resources with the goal of discouraging--even preventing--dependency.

This was the genesis of the Junior Village Project Committee.

Miss Morss died on February 1, 1958, while the project she dreamed of was still being organized and long before it had a chance to bear the fruits she envisioned.

The Committee hopes that this report will be the "searchlight" Miss Morss would have wished in highlighting Washington's dependency problem, and that the Washington community, which she served so

faithfully and so well over many decades, will be able to use the report to give substance to the vision of a true public servant.

We respectfully dedicate this report to her memory.

THE JUNIOR VILLAGE COMMITTEE

Oscar Cox

Mrs. Philip L. Graham

Co-Chairmen

[Committee names to follow]

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was written by Miss Dorothea Andrews, head of the Information Service branch of the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Committee placed at her disposal the minutes of its regular monthly meetings over the life of the project, materials developed by the staff of the project committee, reports of the three subcommittees of the Junior Village Committee: Junior Village, Mrs. Mary Alice Stoddard, Chairman; Public and Voluntary Agencies, Mrs. Philip L. Graham, Chairman; Community Resources, Mrs. Stanley Temko, Chairman.

In the preparation of these materials, the committee consulted with public officials and other community leaders, visited operating agencies and organizations, held special meetings with community groups, and sought technical consultation from the Federal Government and from New York officials whose experience could give it guidelines.

The staff of the Junior Village project, in preparing twelve reports which pinpointed specific concerns from both a statistical and an analytical standpoint, drew heavily on the staff resources of the Department of Public Welfare for background and for informed experience judgments.

Miss Gizella Huber, economic consultant to the project staff, used source material from a wide variety of public and voluntary organizations in her "Economic Indicators" report..

Mr. Gerard M. Shea, Director of the Department of Public Welfare, and Mr. Isadore Seeman, Executive Director of the Health and Welfare Council, served throughout the life of the project in an advisory capacity both to the full committee and to the executive committee.

The acknowledgments of time and effort which follow are not, however, an inclusive listing of all the contributions which were made to this report. Many other individuals, because of their continuing interest in Washington as a city, also gave freely of their time in advising both committee members and project staff as the work of the Project developed.

#### Public Officials

The Honorable David B. Karrick, Commissioner for the District of Columbia; Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia; Mr. Donald Clemmer, Director, Department of Corrections; Dr. Daniel L. Finucane, Director, Department of Public Health; Mr. Milo Christiansen, Superintendent, Department of Recreation; Judge Orman W. Ketcham, of the Juvenile Court; Howard V. Covell, Deputy Chief, Metropolitan Police Department; Mr. Chester H. Gray, Corporation Counsel; Mr. Fred Hetzel, Executive Director, United States Employment Service.

#### Other Community Leaders

The Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington;  
The Right Rev. Angus Dun, Bishop of Washington; Bishop G. Bromley

- v -

Oxnam, Methodist Churches of Washington; Judge Walter M. Bastian, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Swartzell Home for Children; Dr. R. Frank Jones, President, Washington Urban League.

Visits to Operating Agencies and Organizations

Junior Village; Barney Neighborhood House; National Capital Housing Authority; housing developments; Planned Parenthood Association; Baltimore Family and Children's Society; D. C. Department of Recreation.

Special Meetings with Community Groups

Adams-Morgan Project; Commissioners' Youth Council, D. C.; 1960 White House Conference Committee; Health and Welfare Council; Juvenile Court Advisory Council; Public Welfare Advisory Council; Social Hygiene Society; Southeast Neighborhood House; Washington Urban League; Homemaker Service.

Technical Consultation

Mr. Elliot Richardson, Assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Mr. Frank Greving, Associate Director, Community Research Associates, New York; Miss Eleanor M. Snyder, Research Director, New York Interdepartmental Commission on Low Incomes.

The Project Staff

The Project Staff consisted of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Ross, Director; Mrs. Elizabeth de Schweinitz, Social Work Consultant; Miss Gizella Huber,

Economic Consultant; Dr. Helen Burstein Redl, Child Development Consultant; Mrs. Carolyn C. Costa, Secretary.

Staff Reports

In the preparation of her report, "Economic Indicators of Family and Child Dependency in the District of Columbia," Miss Huber used material furnished by the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations; Clerks Retail Store Employee Union #400; Department of Labor; District of Columbia Apprentice Council; District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board; Federal Housing Administration; Greater Washington Central Labor Council; National Capital Housing Authority; Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board; Department of General Research and Statistics, Public Schools of the District of Columbia; U. S. Census Bureau; U. S. Employment Service; U. S. National Office of Vital Statistics; Washington Board of Trade, Research Division.

In preparing other reports, staff members consulted with officials at Children's Hospital, Department of Psychiatry; Commissioners' Youth Council, Maximum Benefits Project; Social Security Administration officials in the Office of the Commissioner, Children's Bureau and Bureau of Public Assistance; Department of Public Welfare officials in the Office of the Director, Child Welfare Division, Public Assistance Division, and Junior Village; officials at the National Institute of Mental Health, the Department of Sociology at Howard University, and Health

and Welfare Council officials.

The five reports which Mrs. de Schweinitz prepared considered the problems and needs of extended care children; Junior Village children in the caseloads of the Child Welfare and Public Assistance divisions and administrative considerations at Junior Village.

Mrs. Helen Burstein Redl reported on a demonstration of methods for counsellor recording.

The Department of Public Welfare Statistics and Research branch made a study of discharges from Junior Village over a 39-month period.

Other staff reports developed a number of statistical analyses of factors affecting placement and length of stay of Junior Village children.

## INTRODUCTION

Why was there a 900 percent increase in the number of children housed at Junior Village from 1947 to 1958?

What are the desperate situations which send children to Junior Village?

Why do some children have to grow up in Junior Village?

Are more buildings the only answer to the needs of these children?

These were the basic questions that the Junior Village Committee set out to answer in March 1958.

Established as a part of the D. C. Health and Welfare Council, and financed by a grant from the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, the Committee was spurred to action by the very real concern in the Department of Public Welfare about over-crowding at Junior Village. Designed as the city's principal public institution for the emergency care of dependent and neglected children, it seemed to be bursting at its seams although the city's population had not grown in anything like comparable proportions.

As the Committee found the answers to its basic questions, it had to ask more questions -- questions which cut across life in the Washington community. By the half-way mark of the project, these questions were:

What causes social dependency in Washington?

How can the number of dependent children who must be cared for away from home be reduced?

How can the services offered by the voluntary and public agencies be re-meshed to meet the problem of social dependency effectively?

Can any institution do a good job of providing emergency and long-term care simultaneously?

In issuing this report, the Committee has a single question, which it asks of every member of the Washington community:

CAN THIS NATION'S CAPITAL AFFORD TO PERPETUATE DEPENDENCY?

It is an enormously complicated question.

The whole purpose of this report is to help residents of this city face it squarely.

If Washington has no answers for this question, the population of Junior Village -- which rose from 30 to 302 between 1947 and 1958 -- may well be 3000 in the next ten years.

As depressing as this prospect may be, it will represent only a fragment of the social and economic cost of inertia.

For dependency in Washington is like an iceberg -- only a fraction of the problem is visible to the naked eye.

Buried below the placid surface of this outwardly serene and beautiful city is a vast network of conditions which are perpetuating dependency.

The plight of the children at Junior Village is only symptomatic of this social sickness.

Washington presents a bleak picture of inadequacies in every part of the social and economic fabric of the city's life:

\* Most poignantly, inadequacies in the families from which dependent children come.

But just as important:

- \* Inadequacies in the public agencies -- the Department of Public Welfare, the Juvenile Court, the public school system;
- \* In the voluntary agencies;
- \* In the laws;
- \* In job opportunities;
- \* In low-cost housing;
- \* In the program for the care of dependent children at Junior Village.

John Kenneth Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society" helped the Committee arrive at its definition of dependency. He reminds us that "the character-building values of hunger and privation" have unquestionably been exaggerated and recommends for each family "a minimum standard," "as a normal function of society," to "help insure that the misfortunes of parents, deserved or otherwise, were not visited on their children." It would help insure that poverty was not self-perpetuating."

The Committee's definition of dependency certainly recognizes poverty as the most obvious characteristic, but it would also include all the other misfortunes of parents -- deserved or otherwise -- which are visited on their children.

Its conception of the problems which dependency creates goes, therefore, far beyond the legal term which defines a dependent child as a needy child who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of the parents.

Dependency, as this Committee has defined and studied it, is that combination of social and economic factors which render a family inadequate, and which pass this inadequacy along as a grim heritage from one generation to another.

The Committee made no study of the health factors which may bear on dependency in Washington. Such a study would need to be at least as exhaustive as the study of social and economic factors which the Committee is now presenting.

As the Committee's awareness grew that over-population at Junior Village was only a pebble in the ever-widening pool of dependency, and as it enlarged the scope of its inquiries in both public and voluntary areas, its irritation mounted at the fiscal straitjacket this most important of all world capitals has to live in.

The question that we pose to every member of the Washington community has particular relevance for the members of Congress, whose refusal to take preventive action in many areas--suggested time and again by District officials and citizens--is leading surely and too swiftly to an aggravation of the problem of dependency, and is inevitably complicating its solution.

Whether Washington is allowed to govern itself or not, the Federal government, which is more in the Washington real estate business than anybody else, ought to be accountable for maintaining and nourishing the life of this city, instead of, like some absentee landlord, refusing to help patch the holes in our social roof.

If we are not all to drown in the potential deluge of unmet need, the Congress must help to dispel the cloud of dependency which now hangs heavy over Washington.

But the solution of the problem does not lie alone with Congress. It lies in part with the amount of emphasis which the Washington community wants to put on meeting a deep-seated problem which is now costing untold amounts because it has been too long ignored.

The Committee makes no excuses for the fact that many of its recommendations will cost a great deal of money to put into effect.

In the long run, the community may face even greater costs if they are not put into effect.

Its call to action on many fronts suggests priorities on a short-range and long-range basis. These priorities could be stated in different terms. They are priorities on behalf of children. And this report is concerned with the children who already have been or will be born in Washington to families which need major or minor, emergency or long-term understanding help to rear those children for productive and emotionally healthy adulthood.

Until the Washington community fulfills its responsibilities to its children, this Nation's capital will perpetuate dependency.

## JUNIOR VILLAGE

Junior Village is way out past nowhere. It is hard to find and hard to reach. Its location -- at the foot of Nichols Avenue near the Anacostia River -- is characteristic of its physical and social isolation from the Washington community.

Junior Village is the shelter of the city's children who have nowhere else to go.

It has one street. On one side of the street are living quarters for the children. These cottages are named for Presidents. The cottage named for President William Howard Taft, where the chronology begins, houses the oldest boys. The cottage named for President Dwight D. Eisenhower, where the chronology now ends, houses the babies.

On the other side of the street are the administration buildings for the Village, its chapel, its eating quarters.

On Sunday afternoon, during family visiting hours, the parents go to the main administration building and get passes to visit their children. Most of them bring presents: a carton of soft drinks, something to eat, a book.

Then they cross the Village street and sit in the "lounge" which each cottage has and visit with their child who lives in that cottage. If they have several children in Junior Village, they move down the street, from cottage to cottage, visiting.

When they come.

On a fairly typical Sunday early in the fall of 1959, with some 436 children in Junior Village, only about one child in ten got a visit from his parents.

The children are kept in their cottages during the visiting hours on the hope that some one will come to see them. They sit and wait. Some of the older children read newspapers or the funnies. Many of them sit and look out of the window. In Taft cottage -- capacity, 48; population, 74 that day -- the boys raised a bedlam of noise in the lounge as they tried to work off their restless energies indoors, waiting for the parents who never came.

Once visiting hours are over, they can go out -- out to the playing field, out on the Village street. And the counselors take over again and try to give them something constructive to do.

At the other end of the Village street, there was a different kind of bedlam in Eisenhower cottage -- capacity, 51; population, 99.

These were the babies and babies can be very vocal.

Some were not. Some sat and looked with eyes that hardly seemed to see. One little girl banged the skirt of a visitor completely unknown to her and cried, "Mommy, Mommy." The babies who cried would stop crying if you picked them up, or even held their hand. Their tears would dry up for the time the hand was held. They would flow again when the hand was released.

Most of the babies were in one large room in Eisenhower cottage. Some of them stood three to a crib, so the counselor could keep an eye on them. But there are not enough cribs to go around, and many of them also sleep three to a crib.

There aren't enough beds to go around for the older children either. Some of the boys sleep on chairs, mattress-softened. The cottages are filled with double-decker beds. Some of the children sleep on mattresses on the floor. And there are the chronic bed-wetters who endlessly complicate the problem of providing adequate sleeping arrangements -- children made so anxious by their own insecurity and by life in the Village that they cannot keep even this shred of personal dignity.

Three, sometimes four, children share the same locker. Unfortunately, it is usually adequate to house all their personal possessions -- one thin layer of clothes per child, perhaps another pair of shoes, a comic book -- all that really belongs to them.

The older children will be very polite in showing you a locker, or in finding a counselor for you. Polite, incurious, withdrawn.

One of the boys approached his counselor and asked for a clean pair of pants that day. The counselor told him he would have to hold out until Tuesday.

The laundry had acted up again. Sometimes, 40 pairs of pants go to the laundry and 15 come back. The boys have learned to like to be dressed up for school but sometimes their clothes don't come back in time for them to look their best.

On the day of the Sunday visit, one of the mottoes posted in a school room along the Village street was:

"IT'S SILLY TO ARGUE"

This is the philosophical orientation of the Junior Village child who attends the Village school. It is silly to argue-- because nothing can be done.

Accept it.

Perhaps it is silly to argue.

The counselors can't argue with the fact that if you have 45 children under your wing, you won't necessarily have time to listen to all the things each might want to tell you.

They can't argue with the necessity of herding the little children -- the ones who need help in looking after themselves--when there are so many of them that this is a precaution -- even though this means that these little ones, who love to be someone, to be noticed, don't get the attention they crave.

These are far-away children, these children who have been told it is silly to argue.

But sometimes they do argue. They have seen some of their friends leave Junior Village for other Department of Public Welfare institutions -- Children's Center in Laurel, for example. They don't want to go even further away from the mainstream of life than Junior Village.

If there is no chance for them to go home -- truly home to their own families -- then they will argue to stay.

"Tell me I won't be next," they will say. "Tell me I can stay here."

#### Why do children go to Junior Village?

There is a simple answer to this question. All of them go there because they are dependent upon society, without family resources for care in their own homes.

The official channels through which they are funneled into short or long-term life in this institution are three:

\* The Woman's Bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, which because of their police authority can remove children from the home without parental consent and put them in Junior Village if the children are severely neglected or abused. It also puts lost and homeless children in Junior Village.

\* The Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, which tries to keep families together through its Aid to Dependent Children program, can put children in Junior Village when the parent is hospitalized, deserts or dies, or when other emergencies occur.

\* The Child Welfare Division of the Department of Public Welfare uses Junior Village as a "temporary" shelter for children who are dependent or neglected while it tries to make plans for them, and as a "permanent" home for adolescent wards when neither foster homes or some other form of institutional care is desirable or feasible.

How long does it take -- and how long should it take -- to get children out of Junior Village?

Three children, aged 4 to 10, were placed there because their parents were destitute and homeless, Even with the best efforts of the Woman's Bureau, the Child Welfare and Public Assistance Divisions, it took 52 days to get them out.

That was the time it took for their mother to re-establish a home for them, with social work help and a grant from the Aid to Dependent Children program. But this solution may be only temporary. The father disappeared when the family was evicted, later was arrested and jailed on a charge of breaking and entering. When he comes out of jail, the Aid to Dependent Children grant will be discontinued. If he can't find work, and the family again becomes destitute, these children may be back.

Twenty-three percent of the children now being admitted to Junior Village have been there before.

Forty-one percent of the children stay in Junior Village for three months or more. Recently, children under six years of age have been getting out faster. But older children have been staying longer. In 1956, four percent of those over 12 had stayed more than a year before they were discharged. By 1958, twelve percent of those over 12 had stayed more than a year.

What are these children like?

In the spring of 1958, this Committee set aside a spring day to take a census of the 302 children then in Junior Village. It hoped to find out as much as it could about the needs of these children, the triggering reasons which brought them there, the plans which were being made or could be made for their future.

The triggering reasons which put them in Junior Village were varied. Their parents (or the relatives or friends who had been looking after them) were destitute and homeless, or missing, or ill, or unable to provide a home, or in jail, or had been guilty of neglect or abuse of their children. Some of the parents, seven fathers and ten mothers, were dead.

On that Census Day, 20 children could have left Junior Village if a foster home placement could be found for them. But for 16 of these, the Child Welfare Division knew it was at least difficult, and probably impossible, to find a home which could take their disturbed behavior.

Forty-seven children would have to stay in Junior Village until financial arrangements could be made to get them out. These financial arrangements, typically, involved qualifying for an Aid to Dependent Children grant, because their mothers could not support them otherwise, or finding a place to live because the family had been evicted from its previous home.

For 44 of the Census Day children, the grim fact had been faced that they would grow up in Junior Village. Only one boy in this group seemed to have any chance at all for eventual return to his own home. Many of these 44 children are strongly attached to families which will never be able to care for them.

The Census Day population seems mild compared to the frightening increase in Junior Village children during 1959. The daily average by early summer was 346.

In August it was 419.

In September it was 429.3.

On October 1 there were 440 children in Junior Village

The staff has not increased.

The Department of Public Welfare is doing what it can to keep the population down.

From February through mid-September, it had transferred 49 dependent children from Junior Village to Cedar Knoll and Maple Glen schools at Children's Center. During that period, a total of 98 dependent boys and girls were added to Children's Center population--and only 7 were discharged. On September 17, 91 dependent children still were housed in Children's Center, which is designed to help meet the needs of delinquent children and retarded children. \_\_\_\_\_ had also been moved to the infirmary of the District Home for the Aged. A 60-bed capacity is planned at that institution.

As of September 17, the Department's 50 emergency care foster home were filled to capacity with 167 children.

The impact of this dependency load has forced a restricting revision in the policy of Catholic Charities for acceptance of dependent children at St. Vincent's Home and School. Future referrals must be of girls of the Catholic faith between 6 and 13 years of age. Girls over that age level won't be considered unless they have brothers or sisters there. The children will have to be able to attend regular schools.

Is this floodtide?

The Committee has reached the inescapable conclusion that it is not. Unless vigorous action is taken, things inevitably will get worse.

The total report is a catalogue of the action necessary not only to check the steady flow of dependent children into Junior Village, but to face squarely the needs of families who, in the absence of that action, will perpetuate dependency as a major community problem.

This section of the report deals only with the measures which the Committee feels are imperative in establishing a program for Junior Village which will minimize the effects of institutional life for children who now are growing up there or who will be spending weeks, months, or even years there.

One of the questions which the Committee repeatedly confronted in this study was:

Are more buildings the only answer to the problems at Junior Village?

The Committee's answer to this question is an unequivocal No.

Buildings will not solve any basic social problems. But the absence of enough buildings to do an adequate job of housing, feeding, sleeping and schooling children at Junior Village can do a great deal to complicate their basic social problems. For example:

\* Facilities are not adequate to separate sick children from well children at Junior Village.

\* The school building does not allow for the fact that many Junior Village children need special educational attention because of the problems which brought them there.

\* Housing and sleeping arrangements deprive Junior Village children of their basic rights to privacy.

These are conditions which can only be remedied by more buildings at

The Department of Public Welfare has asked for a building program at Junior Village.

The D. C. Commissioners have approved funds for construction of a 60-bed infirmary and admissions building for the next fiscal year. The Department has requested two more cottages for 1962 and recently won approval from the Commissioners to advance construction to 1961. This would add 100 more beds to Junior Village.

The District Public Works program includes money for a third cottage in 1962.

Now it is up to Congress.

The Committee endorses the Department's requests and recommends:

1. THAT EVERY EFFORT BE MADE TO SPEED CONSTRUCTION OF IMMEDIATELY NEEDED BUILDING THROUGH WHATEVER CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IS NECESSARY.
2. THAT ADDITIONAL COTTAGES BE PLANNED TO HOUSE WHAT SEEMS NOW TO BE A MINIMUM CHILD POPULATION FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.
3. THAT A NEW SCHOOL BUILDING BE BUILT, DESIGNED TO SERVE THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF THESE CHILDREN WHO HAVE SO MANY SPECIAL PROBLEMS.

#### Extended Care Children

A major charge to the Junior Village Committee was to find the answer to this question:

Can Junior Village offer good shelter care to children who need it on a temporary basis and at the same time give long-time wards of the Department of Public Welfare the kind of training they need for life in the working world?

The Committee's answer is that it could be done, but that it would be even better if Junior Village could serve the single purpose of offering good shelter care to children who need it on a temporary basis.

The Committee's recommendations for care of long-time Department wards away from Junior Village are contained in another section of this report.

Pending action on those recommendations, the Committee would make these observations:

When children are placed in Junior Village, whether for short or long-time care, the Department of Public Welfare assumes an obligation to meet their social, psychological, physical, recreational and spiritual needs, regardless of the stage of the individual child's development. A child can profit from the same positives in his environment regardless of how long he stays.

But for the children who must grow up in Junior Village there are special obligations. These children must be given a way of life that will let them leave the Village for life as adults without being dependent on an institutional atmosphere for the rest of their lives, and with the strength to move toward self-reliance and life goals worth striving for.

The Committee therefore recommends:

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR EXTENDED CARE CHILDREN AT JUNIOR VILLAGE TO PREPARE THEM FOR PRODUCTIVE ADULT LIVES.

The goals of this program would include:

\* The child's understanding that Junior Village wants to help him; that it is not just an interlude until something else comes along.

\* A program within the cottages and the institution as a whole which has continuity in planning to meet the basic needs of each child, and which gives each child increasing responsibilities as he becomes mature enough to accept them.

\* Those physical changes which will let the extended care child feel at home, instead of in transit; privacy, a chance to keep his possessions intact, his own clothes, chances to earn money, attention to his expanding vocational needs. Each child should be given vocational information and guidance and encouraged to complete the highest level of academic work of which he is capable. The Committee recognizes the fact that some Junior Village children now attend public school. At the same time, experience has shown that some of these children at high school level are too academically limited or emotionally unstable to go to outside schools.

Junior Village needs to offer a school program for such children which includes basic classes which can give them competence in such necessary job skills as reading, writing and numbers.

The program should tie in with the city-wide vocational plan in assuring the Junior Village child an equal opportunity for job training and for guidance in securing employment.

#### Adjusting to Junior Village

For many children, Junior Village represents the first time in their lives that they have been in unfamiliar surroundings.

Some of them come to Junior Village after years of shuttling in and out of the homes of relatives or foster parents. Some arrive after acutely shocking experiences.

Many of these children, naturally, arrive in an upset condition. They have difficulties in settling into Village life.

What can be learned about the reasons they were placed in the Village at the time they are admitted, and what can be learned about what is normal behavior for each child, and what represents seriously disturbed behavior for each, are invaluable guides to planning well for the future of these children.

The Committee recommends:

5. A REVISION IN THE ADMISSIONS FORM OF JUNIOR VILLAGE TO INCLUDE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE REASONS FOR THE CHILD'S PLACEMENT.
6. THE INAUGURATION OF A PLAN TO CLEAR EACH DAY'S ADMISSIONS WITH THE CHILD WELFARE AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISIONS SO THAT THEY CAN BEGIN QUICK PLANNING ABOUT THE CHILDREN ALREADY KNOWN TO THEM, AND SO THAT JUNIOR VILLAGE CAN BE KEPT INFORMED ABOUT THE PLANS UNDERWAY ON BEHALF OF EACH CHILD.
7. THE EMPLOYMENT OF AN ADEQUATE NUMBER OF PSYCHIATRISTS AND PSYCHOLOGISTS ON THE STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE TO OFFER DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT SERVICES TO JUNIOR VILLAGE CHILDREN.

In making this recommendation the Committee is not suggesting that the Department discontinue using those public and voluntary community diagnostic and treatment services which are now available for children needing residential care, psychiatrically supervised day care, and in and out-patient treatment.

But the personnel available through these services are not numerically adequate for the needed job.

The Committee further suggests that there is a very real benefit for the children if psychiatrists and psychologists who see them and try to help them can express a continuing interest in their lives, and can enhance their own contribution to the children's futures through a basic familiarity with the programs of the Department which will help them to identify the social and economic factors that have influenced each child's development.

The purpose of the diagnostic and treatment services for Junior Village children would include:

\* An evaluation of the nature and therapeutic significance of the child's behavior so that his counselors, social workers and teachers could offer him the kind of help and support he needs.

\* A set of differential diagnoses of selected children that would help Departmental personnel, while they seek a placement for them elsewhere, to know the reasonable limits in which the children could be expected to be able to live without complete frustration either to themselves or others, so that the type of placement for each child can be chosen with such expectations in mind.

\* A continuing avenue for suggesting change in the child's environment in Junior Village, if such change would make it possible for him to make fuller use of his capacities.

\* An opportunity to give the child himself a chance to work out his problems with adult, skilled help.

With the provision of these clinically skilled services, it undoubtedly will be possible to identify children whose emotional disturbance is such that they cannot benefit from -- and may suffer as a result of -- life at Junior Village or at any institution or foster home now available to the Department.

The Committee recommends:

8. THAT THE DEPARTMENT BE GIVEN AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP NEW FACILITIES OR OTHER PSYCHIATRICALY ACCEPTABLE PLANS FOR THE CARE OF DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN WITH SERIOUS EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE.

Junior Village Administration

One of the major criticisms that the Committee could initially make of the administration of Junior Village was that it suffers from a lack of focus, and a lack of clear goals. Part of these lacks stems from the overwhelming numbers of children to be served, and their widely differing needs for help.

However, Junior Village's working relationships with other agencies and units of the Department and with community services are far from adequate. Its administrative policy is not clear.

- \* Areas of responsibility are not well defined.
- \* There is no clear supervisory line which will assure that duties are delegated and carried out.
- \* There is a lack of leadership in staff development.
- \* There is a lack of basic communication among staff members.

The Committee considers it imperative that these administrative inadequacies be remedied. Steps in this direction are now being taken. Many corrective measures still need to be instituted. The Committee recommends:

9. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE VIGOROUSLY PURSUE EFFORTS TO SHARPEN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AT JUNIOR VILLAGE SO THAT THERE WILL BE MAXIMUM RECOGNITION OF THE NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN AND OF THE POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS TOWARD MEETING THOSE NEEDS.
10. THAT A CENTRAL FILE, CONTAINING NECESSARY RECORDS AND PROCEDURES TO KEEP PERSONNEL INFORMED AS TO EACH CHILD'S BACKGROUND, NEEDS AND PROGRESS BE ESTABLISHED AS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAM AT JUNIOR VILLAGE.

This file should be based on reports from cottage counselors, school, health and recreation personnel, and should include those recommendations from specialized personnel outside the Village which have pertinence to the care any individual child may need or should receive.

11. THE INSTITUTION OF A PERMANENT PLAN OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR THE STAFF AT JUNIOR VILLAGE WHICH WOULD INCLUDE THESE ELEMENTS:
- (a) Basic information about how children grow and develop, with particular emphasis on ways to work with them, and to plan to meet their needs.
  - (b) Techniques in the comprehension and use of psychological and psychiatric findings.
  - (c) Guidelines to the most effective attitudes in working with children's parents.
  - (d) Methods of improved staff communication about the individual needs of children.
  - (e) Indoctrination in the policies and regulations of Junior Village as they relate to the operation of that institution and to the work of other units in the Department.
  - (f) Encouragement of staff initiative to the extent that they are able to take on additional duties and still meet present demands.

### The School Program

The Committee recommends:

12. A THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL PROGRAM OFFERED AT JUNIOR VILLAGE, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO NURSERY SCHOOL AND PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

The Committee recognizes public school experience as desirable for all Junior Village children who can adjust to it, and suggests that the elementary school program concentrate on remedial work when necessary to make such public school experience possible.

In recommending a review of the Junior Village school program, the Committee has several suggestions:

\* The reviewer will need to be highly trained and experienced in the gamut of educational capacities in children -- gifted children, those with uneven development, those with limited cultural background, and those who cannot use their latent learning capacities.

\* This review should bring forward recommendations for improved methods and content of teaching, an improved educational testing program, and a realistic appraisal of the qualifications and number of staff required to carry forward a suitable curriculum.

\* It should insure that the school program will be of a quality which will permit students who attend school at Junior Village to be accepted into the public school system. To accomplish this objective, the review should suggest ways of establishing and maintaining a liaison with the public school system so that children leaving Junior Village may transfer to the most appropriate school and teacher.

The Committee further recommends:

13. SUPPORT FOR THE DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST, IN THE 1961 BUDGET, THAT A SPECIALIST WITH EXPERIENCE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION BE APPOINTED PROGRAM DIRECTOR OF NURSERY SCHOOL EDUCATION AND PRE-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES.

#### Visiting Privileges

It is essential that a Junior Village program based on the individuality of the children served recognize the right of each child to whatever family ties he has. Brothers and sisters are now separated from each other and may meet only by accident. When parents visit, they must go from cottage to cottage, rather than meeting as a family group. The Committee recommends:

14. THAT A REGULAR PLAN BE ESTABLISHED FOR VISITS BETWEEN BROTHERS AND SISTERS AT JUNIOR VILLAGE.
15. THAT PARENTS ROUTINELY BE GIVEN A LEAFLET OF INFORMATION ABOUT JUNIOR VILLAGE WHICH ENCOURAGES THEM TO VISIT, DESCRIBES HOW TO REACH THE VILLAGE, AND INCLUDES FACTS ABOUT VISITING HOURS AND OTHER NECESSARY CONDITIONS WHICH THE INSTITUTION MIGHT NEED TO IMPOSE UPON THEIR VISITS.
16. THAT THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUNIOR VILLAGE MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR PARENTS AND RELATIVES TO SEE THEIR CHILDREN TOGETHER IF THEY PREFER, UNLESS THERE IS A COMPELLING REASON TO DENY THIS RIGHT IN A SPECIFIC INSTANCE.

The Volunteer Program

Junior Village, despite its isolation from the mainstream of Washington life, already is the concern of a corps of volunteers who devote time to raising money for its auxiliary needs -- such as toys for the children -- and to visiting the children who either are sheltered there or grow up there.

Washington residents who want to do something about Junior Village children as individuals can find it a richly rewarding experience. They can help these children discover that adults are dependable and consistent. They can widen the horizons of these children by individualized attention and interest, and by use of their own special abilities with children.

But any Washington resident who wants to become a Junior Village volunteer must recognize the fact that these children are, initially, likely to be suspicious of the reliability of any adult. They cannot be blamed for thinking that if adults were reliable, they wouldn't be in Junior Village.

The Committee recognizes the signal contribution that informed volunteers can make in the lives of these children. It recommends:

17. THAT THE VOLUNTEER PROGRAM BE EXTENDED THROUGH CONTINUING RECRUITING.
18. THAT VOLUNTEERS RECEIVE PRE-ASSIGNMENT ORIENTATION AND SCREENING, AS WELL AS SUSTAINED SUPERVISORY SUPPORT, SO THAT THEY CAN MAKE THEIR MAXIMUM CONTRIBUTION TO THE LIVES OF THE CHILDREN.
19. THAT MATERIAL BE DEVELOPED SO THAT VOLUNTEERS WILL HAVE NO UNCERTAINTIES ABOUT THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND THOSE OF STAFF MEMBERS.

## THE FAMILIES

The face of poverty in the District of Columbia is as inscrutable as the sphinx.

It poses a riddle for Washingtonians that can be stated in these terms:

What does poverty cost us socially?

What does it cost us economically?

What does it cost us every year and every decade, when it perpetuates itself in dependent individuals and families?

The Committee found no answers to these questions.

Indeed, no answers exist.

Statistics developed earlier this year by the Department of Public Welfare clearly show that the money spent in assistance grants to Washington's needy is no real indication of the cost of poverty. Only one in three of the District's low income persons receive this form of help.

Two-thirds of these people get along somehow on money that is not adequate to buy housing, food, clothing and other essential personal and household incidentals.

Low income, as defined by the Department of Public Welfare, means income so low that persons would be presumptively eligible for public assistance.

The Committee asked the Department to estimate the cost each year to bring all other District low income families, with children under 16 years of age, within reach of public assistance. The answer was \$5,000,000.

Many of these families have several children. Among them are families without fathers, families who must rely on earners with neither training nor skill. Many of them pay high rents on low incomes.

These families must struggle just to survive. It is because of their concentration on that struggle that elements which can produce family unity and prevent family disintegration sometimes die for lack of nurture. The result is not only financial but social dependency.

The Junior Village population comes from families like these.

For some of them, Public Assistance grants have been of help -- but not of enough help. Seventy-five percent of the children in Junior Village on the day the census was taken had been known to the Public Assistance Division.

For the children from some 60 families who were there that day, Public Assistance had never been a financial resource, either because of lack of eligibility or lack of knowledge of its existence.

The one common characteristic which distinguishes these families -- both those whose children are or have been in Junior Village, and those whose children may someday be there -- is that they hover constantly on the brink of disaster.

The Department of Public Welfare estimates that there are in Washington some 11,500 families with an average of four children each, two-thirds of whom probably live on less than the amount of a public assistance grant.

If there is to be successful planning for these families to prevent their children in turn from breeding more dependent families, and to take care of the load they now place on the District's public and voluntary agencies until preventive measures can take hold, much more needs to be known about their potential assets and liabilities as members of the Washington community.

## Family Characteristics

What little is now known about these families boils down to the kinds of jobs they are holding:

\* Nearly all the fathers are unskilled laborers, construction workers, trashmen, street cleaners, laundry and kitchen workers, porters and janitors, truck drivers and general laborers. Few have a trade. Many lack training.

\* The mothers earn substantially less than the fathers. They work as domestics, counter girls in restaurants, as laundry workers, charwomen or elevator operators. In some cases they do not -- or cannot -- work at all.

What is not known is:

\* How many of these are one-parent families?

\* How old are the fathers and the mothers, and what schooling have they had?

\* How steady are the jobs they hold?

\* What is the incidence of unemployment?

\* What proportion of these families are covered by unemployment insurance?

\* How many of the wage earners in these families are unemployable?

This is a minimum statement of the unknown. The Committee recognizes that facts to answer these questions would be only a start toward getting a pool of knowledge about the needs and abilities of these families which can help them to help themselves to the maximum degree. A reasonable start toward this goal can come with the 1960 Census.

The Committee recommends:

20. THAT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT MAKE MAXIMUM USE OF ALL DATA GATHERED BY THE 1960 CENSUS TO ESTABLISH A SYSTEM WHICH WOULD PERMIT A CONTINUING ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE DISTRICT'S LOW INCOME FAMILIES.

In the meantime, the Committee has considered some of the problems facing these families about which some action can and should be taken now.

#### Vocational Help

Educational and training handicaps which exist for the adult members in many low income families in Washington may be so great that they will never be able to enhance their vocational status. However, these handicaps should not rule out efforts to help them improve the quality of family living they offer their children. The Committee recommends:

21. A PROGRAM OF ADULT EDUCATION, UNDER THE SPONSORSHIP OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH HEALTH AND SOCIAL AGENCIES. IT SHOULD BE A PROGRAM WHICH THESE FAMILIES CAN USE AND WILL WANT TO USE TO IMPROVE FAMILY LIVING CONDITIONS. ITS CURRICULUM SHOULD INCLUDE COURSES IN SIMPLE HOMEMAKING, BUDGETING OF MONEY, CITY LIVING, AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT. IT SHOULD MOTIVATE PARENTS TO HELP THEIR CHILDREN MAKE THE MOST OF THEIR SCHOOL EXPERIENCE.

#### Unemployment

Because the economic factor looms so large in the lives of low income families, unemployment, even if it is short-lived, can be a family catastrophe, and can and frequently does affect the lives of children so that they become a public responsibility because of it.

Low income families, particularly, are caught in a squeeze in the present operation of the unemployment insurance program.

The jobless father whose work is not covered by the program is unable to support his family and, if he is employable, he is not eligible for Public Assistance.

Even if the family's principal wage earner loses a job covered by the program, the maximum unemployment insurance compensation is \$30 a week, regardless of how much he earned or how many people he must support.

The low income family can be hit even harder if the principal wage earner is out of work for a long time because of seasonal unemployment, because there is a cut-off point of 18 to 26 weeks on insurance payments in the District.

The Committee recommends:

22. RAISING THE MAXIMUM UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INSURANCE PAYMENT AND GEARING IT TO THE PREVIOUS EARNINGS OF THE WORKER.
23. EXTENDING THE COVERAGE OF THE PROGRAM TO MORE JOB CATEGORIES.
24. EXTENDING THE TIME PERIOD DURING WHICH COMPENSATION MAY BE PAID.

#### Family Planning

The majority of this Committee believes that many low income families in Washington would welcome the opportunity to employ medically safe methods of birth control. It bases its belief partly on a recent report of the Planned Parenthood Association of the District of Columbia which showed that 70 percent of that organization's new patients in 1958 had incomes of less than \$3,000 a year, and that 33 percent of its new clients had more than four children.

The majority of this Committee sees no reason to question the right of low income families themselves to try to determine the number of their children in relation to their ability to assume the obligations of parenthood.

It clearly recognizes that birth control measures through medical means are contrary to the religious tenets of members of the Roman Catholic faith and is not addressing practitioners of this or any other faith which eschews this method of family planning when it suggests:

That there should be some expansion in the present general availability of birth control information beyond those families who now elect it because they can afford to pay for medical and other attendant costs.

The majority of the Committee does not believe that low income families which want help in determining the size of their families should be denied this help because they cannot afford to pay for it.

At the present time, medically accepted and endorsed methods of birth control are not available at the two public hospitals where most babies are born into low income families: Freedman's and D. C. General.

With two attendant safeguards, that the program be restricted to patients who choose it and to medical personnel for whom it would present no religious conflict, the Committee recommends:

25. THAT EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTION IN FAMILY PLANNING BE MADE AVAILABLE UNDER PUBLIC AUSPICES IN WASHINGTON, SPECIFICALLY THROUGH PUBLIC HOSPITAL IN AND OUT-PATIENT SERVICES, PRENATAL CLINICS AND OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH FACILITIES, TO THOSE PARENTS WHO REQUEST IT.

26. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH FURNISH, ON REQUEST, THE NECESSARY CONTRACEPTIVE DEVICES TO THOSE PARENTS WHO CANNOT AFFORD TO BUY THEM.

27. THAT THE MEDICAL AND ANCILLARY HEALTH STAFFS OF PUBLIC HOSPITALS BE TRAINED IN METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF BIRTH CONTROL.

## EMPLOYMENT

Washington is like no other major city in the country in the kinds of jobs it offers.

It cannot be the seat of heavy industry, so it offers few of the job opportunities which are available to residents of other cities.

As more and more different kinds of organizations establish headquarters in Washington to do business with or for the government, job opportunities here may increase in their infinite variety, but the infinite variety is specialized.

The Federal government is the best example of this specialization. It opens its skilled jobs to national competition. Realistic opportunities for local job seekers without special training lie chiefly in the clerical, maintenance and some service functions to support these skilled jobs.

The national organization setting up a Washington office also picks its expert help largely from its own national network, and centers its primary local recruitment efforts on clerical workers.

These factors set up a pattern of limited employment opportunity which inevitably turns many job seekers to the third potential source of local employment: the service trades.

Here the opportunities for employment are less limited, principally because of the wide variety of services which are needed to keep the city's life moving: by department and specialty stores, banks, restaurants, grocery stores, cleaning establishments, filling stations, repair shops; by all the primary and ancillary methods of private and public transportation; by the building trades whose energetic efforts are constantly changing the face of the city.

For the graduates of Washington high schools who don't go on to college--and half of them don't--job chances and job futures sooner or later are measured in these realistic terms.

It is not surprising, for example, that many high school graduates who have learned typing and related clerical skills are increasingly being employed simply because of the heavy demand for such services.

Many of them are Negro girls and employment for them and the families they will some day have, offers a degree of economic security not available a generation ago. It offers them the chance to give their children a better chance for educational and vocational preparation for the life they will be facing some 20 or 30 years hence.

However, many fields of employment still are closed to Negro high school graduates. Some of them are closed simply because most of the boys and girls are inadequately prepared to hold highly skilled and professional jobs.

#### Racial Bias

Some avenues to employment are closed because a hard core of racial bias does exist in filling many of the jobs which otherwise would be open on a merit basis.

Some Negroes, particularly in the building trades, seem to be severely limited because of the opposition of the labor unions, partially based on the fear that the entrenched white worker may not be able to earn an adequate income if building activity hits a lull and if the available labor supply for building needs is expanded.

These are realistic obstacles to the expansion of job opportunities. Time and productive example can prove potent weapons against the racial bias that now exists.

### The Questions

In the meantime, what is to become of the increasing number of highschool graduates--and their more disturbing colleagues, the highschool drop-outs--who each year seek a living in Washington?

What is the potential contribution for good or bad of the boys and young men, largely Negro, if their chances of employment are limited to those occupations now held by their fathers?

What eventual price will the community pay if it keeps these members of its community at a level which offers them no incentive for self-improvement?

Is the potential contribution of Negro girl graduates at the highschool level always to be measured in employment that ranges only from fountain girl to secretary to practical nurse?

These are serious questions. They have importance for every member of the Washington community. They have not been asked often enough in the past.

This Committee feels that these questions--if not resolved--can provide the basis for a new core of dependency in the future. But perhaps the questions persist not only because they are not answered but because they are stated in a way which makes it hard for the Washington community to find answers for them. The Committee thinks this is a good time to restate the questions.

The Problem

Restated, the problem which these young people present to the Washington community falls into these parts: A need for

\*Adequate vocational preparation for Negro youths to fit them for the jobs which do exist and in which they can make an effective contribution to the life of the community.

So far only a token approach has been made to this part of the problem. The D. C. Apprenticeship Council, with some 2,300 training programs in operation, has 12 which train Negroes as apprentices. But even with training, most of these boys now cannot compete for jobs paying full scale wages in some of the trades because they cannot attain union membership.

The only vocational tests which high school students now receive are given in their senior year, by the United States Employment Service.

\*Adequate information about available jobs on a continuing, city-wide basis.

At the present time, the public school system has one placement counselor who advertises the availability of highschool students for employment and who gets calls from employers for their services.

Counselors in vocational highschools, who have no specialization in job placements, do what they can to place youth in jobs; at the same time, they do what they can with student adjustment problems, testing, course selections, etc.

The Federally-sponsored United States Employment Service, as the biggest employment agency in town, has personnel assigned to investigate placement opportunities for young people; but if young people fail in early job placements because of the lack of adequate preparation, neither USES or any other agency, can "make" employers continue to take chances on hiring them.

\*A continuing program to raise the city's standards of fair employment, based on the fundamental criterion that competence is essential to the job placement.

To meet these needs, the Committee urges not only the consolidation of efforts already underway to find jobs for these young workers, but a planned attack, under the official auspices of the D. C. Commissioners, on the continuing problems which these youth will present if their job needs are not met.

There is now no single administrative mechanism in existence in Washington to solve these urgent needs. The Committee has given intensive consideration to the wisdom of offering specific suggestions on the organization form which such a mechanism should have. Some Committee members think the most effective organization would be the creation of a Department of Labor. However, we feel that the final determination should be left to the official heads of our government, keeping certain specific goals in mind.

The Committee therefore recommends:

28. THAT THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS ESTABLISH A MECHANISM TO LAUNCH A CITY-WIDE ATTACK ON THE EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS OF YOUNG WORKERS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE GOALS:
  - (a) Establishing a system of adequate information about jobs and job needs.
  - (b) Helping promote fair employment practice through the cooperation of employers, organized labor groups and civic organizations.
  - (c) Making needed changes in the training and guidance program to help young workers find and serve in jobs which represent their highest level of competence.

The Committee must warn the Washington community that unless major changes are made in the employment picture for the youth of this city, Washington may have to establish a major "make-work" program for them within the coming decade.

It therefore recommends:

29. THE CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF TEMPORARY EXPEDIENTS TO SOLVE THE CURRENT EMPLOYMENT NEEDS OF THESE YOUNG PEOPLE PENDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT PROGRAM FOR THEIR VOCATIONAL HELP.

## HOUSING

Slums breed dependency--and dependency, slums.

Behind the calm, marble facade of Washington's ornamented vistas, this form of propagation goes on and on in substandard housing, over-occupied and under-inspected.

As long as slum ownership is profitable, it will continue. For mean, rundown and crowded housing, slum landlords are extracting huge profits with little or no attention to upkeep--much less repair--of the meager housing facilities they offer.

Trading on the shortage of District housing inspectors, they wink at housing code occupancy standards to pack in the largest possible number of rent-paying tenants.

But the shortage of District housing inspectors is only one of the unsolved problems in the District's long-term campaign for a well-housed, slumless community.

Thousands of families have been or are being displaced from their homes by public and private efforts at urban renewal. Low income families, and particularly Negro families with low incomes who are so displaced, have little choice but to try to find another place to live in the central city of Washington. For them, "flight to the suburbs" is a slim possibility indeed because of economic reasons and reasons centered in racial bias.

## Urban Renewal

Displacement activities under the public program include redevelopment, housing code enforcement, condemnation of insanitary and unsafe buildings, acquisition and clearance of sites in slum areas for public housing, and clearance of occupied sites needed for such public purposes as highways, schools and playgrounds.

Private activities center in such areas as Foggy Bottom, where intensive rehabilitation efforts are underway.

Urban renewal is essential if Washington is to escape decay of the central city. But what happens to the families it displaces?

In 1958, 503 families were displaced by housing code enforcement, condemnation and public works. Only 11 were assured of decent private housing. Public housing was found for 132. Nobody knows where the rest of the 360 displaced families went.

The record is not as bad for families displaced by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Housing Authority, but some of these families, too, "disappear."

The terrible danger in such disappearances is that families may move into no one knows what housing, either to be again displaced, or to be exposed to living conditions and environment utterly devoid of wholesome influences.

## The Problem Grows

The problem will grow more acute. No one knows how many families will lose their homes in the foreseeable future as the result of private developers' activities.

The District Office of Urban Renewal, which keeps estimates on the number of displacements because of public urban renewal expects about 8500 families to be displaced between 1959 and 1963, most of them from low income and blighted areas. But even these estimates are subject to constant revision.

National Capital Housing Authority, as of August 31, 1959, was managing a total of 6,811 dwelling units, had under development 1,195 more such units, and was seeking sites for 1,412 more. Even with these public housing resources, the agency fears that housing, particularly for larger families, will not be enough to meet the needs of low income families in the years immediately ahead.

In early fall, NCHA had an active waiting list of 119 eligible families who needed 4 bedroom units, and 34 families who needed 5 bedroom units.

About a third of these families had been displaced by urban renewal activities. There were 17 families from the Southwest who require larger units than NCHA constructs. There will be more big families in need of housing when the Central Northwest Urban Renewal efforts get underway.

Right now, there are 700 families in grossly overcrowded public housing units.

There is no minimum income limit for families who seek public housing. There is a maximum: families of 1-2 cannot have an income higher than \$3,200; 3-4, \$3,500; 5-6, \$3,800; seven or more, \$4,100. Families must have lived in Washington for a year to be eligible for this housing, and preference is given to those displaced by public action.

A National Goal

The 1949 Housing Act set the nation's sights on a goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

This goal, in theory at least, makes public housing available for those who need it most, and who have the least maneuverability in coping with housing displacement, either by public or private activities.

In practice, however, the story is different.

National public housing legislation, and appropriations in support of public housing in local areas, are twisting this basic goal in obscure and harmful directions.

For example, the Federal contribution to Washington's public housing program is enough to defray the annual cost of amortizing the bonds which NCHA sold to finance its projects.

In theory, this Federal contribution makes it possible for NCHA to maintain a system of rents graded to the incomes of its tenants. NCHA need only produce enough revenue from its properties to pay its operating costs.

In practice, however, rising costs have placed a heavy burden on NCHA to fulfill its obligation to meet its operating costs out of revenue. A greater proportion of eligible applicants now come from the lowest end of the low income group. In order to keep financially solvent, NCHA has had to institute a system of rent range selection, choosing new tenants for admission according to the rent they can pay, so that it can keep in business. At the same time, it tries to guarantee that a cross-section of low income families are included.

These anachronisms are beyond the power of Washington officials to correct. They are embodied in the United States Housing Act and in the regulations of the Public Housing Administration.

Congress should give serious study to the effects of national public housing legislation on the efforts of local housing authorities to meet the housing needs of families with the lowest incomes.

Another Consideration

Many of Washington's lowest income families now live in such complete social isolation that they need help to learn how to become part of a community. Public housing projects and cooperating social and civic agencies can help them mount the first rung in the ladder on their climb to improved living standards.

It is the Committee view that these lowest income families should have the first call on public housing facilities; and that public housing projects should be a major tool in the community's efforts to rehabilitate its socially and economically dependent members.

If the Washington community is willing to accept this rationale, drastic changes will be needed to make it a reality.

The Committee recommends:

30. AMENDMENT OF EXISTING PUBLIC HOUSING LAW TO PERMIT MORE LOW INCOME FAMILIES TO USE THESE FACILITIES. THE COMMITTEE RECOGNIZES THAT IF THE REQUIREMENT THAT PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS PAY THEIR OPERATING COSTS THROUGH RENTS MUST BE REMOVED TO ACCOMPLISH THIS PURPOSE, AN ALTERNATIVE PROVISION MUST BE MADE TO PERMIT A BROADENED FEDERAL SUBSIDY TO BE SURE THAT THOSE WHO MOST NEED PUBLIC HOUSING CAN BE GIVEN FIRST CONSIDERATION.

In order to make life in a public housing project a successful experience for many low-income families, the Committee recognizes that skilled help must be available. It recommends:

31. THAT THE MANAGEMENT STAFF IN PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES INCLUDE PERSONNEL WITH SOCIAL WORK AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION TECHNIQUES WHO CAN HELP FAMILIES IMPROVE THEIR OWN LIVING STANDARDS, ADVISE THEM ON THOSE RECURRING PROBLEMS THEY MAY FACE IN BUDGETING AND ORDINARY FAMILY LIVING, AND SERVE AS THEIR CONTINUOUS LIAISON WITH ALL THE RESOURCES OF THE COMMUNITY IN MEETING THEIR SPECIAL NEEDS.

The Committee is completely conscious of the limits of public housing as a resource in helping Washington's dependent families reach out for independence.

It recognizes the lack of available building sites for public housing, and the high cost of acquiring blighted areas and slums which could be cleared for public housing construction.

In fact, the programmed construction for public housing--some 2,600 units--some of which may not be available for several years, puts very real limits on the contribution which this public resource can make in meeting Washington's housing problem.

The Committee recommends:

32. THAT THE NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY GIVE GREATER CONSIDERATION TO THE PURCHASE OF EXISTING HOUSING THAT CAN BE ADAPTED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING USE.

In recognizing the limits of public housing to meet the problems of Washington's dependent families, the Committee sought supplementary answers to meet the unmet needs which still would exist.

These answers fall into three categories:

Enforcement against bad housing;

Encouragement of private real estate interests to take over  
in meeting housing needs where the public authority leaves off;

A better assessment than now exists of housing needs of  
dependent families.

Enforcement

The Committee recommends:

33. THAT WASHINGTON BE GIVEN A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF HOUSING INSPECTORS TO ENFORCE THE HOUSING CODE AND DEVOTE PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO PROPERTIES IN BLIGHTED AREAS.
34. THAT THE BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS ASSOCIATION AND OTHER REAL ESTATE GROUPS ESTABLISH A CODE OF ETHICS WHICH WILL REQUIRE MEMBERS TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAINTAINING RENTAL PROPERTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY'S HEALTH AND HOUSING CODES.

Encouragement of Private Real Estate Interests

The Committee recommends:

35. THAT A PARTNERSHIP BE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE D. C. COMMISSIONERS AND THE REAL ESTATE FRATERNITY FOR A PLANNED ATTACK ON THE HOUSING NEEDS OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES.

This partnership should include: The Office of Urban Renewal, the Washington Home Builders Association, the Washington Real Estate Board, the Washington Association of Real Estate Brokers, the Washington Board of Trade, the local insuring office of FHA, construction and building trade organizations.

It should have as its goal the orderly reduction of Washington's shortage of decent housing facilities.

It should make use of existing provisions of the National Housing Act which guarantee loans for renovation or for construction of homes for persons displaced by urban renewal projects.

It should--and could--establish a loan fund to enable home owners of modest income to finance home repairs and rehabilitation.

The Committee realizes that no estimate exists of the need either for public housing, or for housing for families of modest income.

A Better Assessment

It therefore recommends:

36. THE FORMATION OF A CENTRAL AGENCY TO:

- (a) IDENTIFY THE NEEDS OF FAMILIES DISPLACED OR TO BE DISPLACED BY URBAN RENEWAL ACTIVITIES;
- (b) ESTABLISH A YARDSTICK OF POTENTIAL HOUSING NEED ON THE BASIS OF POPULATION IN-MIGRATION, HOUSING OBSOLESCENCE AND OTHER KEY FACTORS;
- (c) AID FAMILIES TO FIND DECENT HOUSING RATHER THAN PERMIT SLUMS AND BLIGHT TO SPREAD, THROUGH SUCH "SCURRY TO COVER" TACTICS AS MOST OF THESE FAMILIES MUST NOW EMPLOY.

Only thus will this city be assured of an adequate housing supply for its low income families, which will not only not perpetuate dependency, but will help to end it.

## THE PUBLIC AGENCIES

### The Department of Public Welfare

The Department of Public Welfare's approach to the dependency problem in Washington is diffuse, fragmented and inadequate.

So is it in New York, Chicago, San Francisco or Keokuk, Iowa.

A combination of Federal laws, State regulations, community pressures to let "George" do it have made all Public Welfare departments the dumping ground for the social problems communities would like to sweep under the rug and forget.

With token support -- the tax dollar at minimum levels of expenditure -- communities, cities and States all through the nation have turned their back on the larger environmental problem of social health; they have tried to centralize the cesspool of social dependency into a small area where it will offend the fewest number.

It is not the job of the District Department of Public Welfare to prevent dependency. The very nature of its function is to help children, individuals and families who become dependent for one reason or another.

But if, because of inadequate appropriations, vacillating community support, and a real lack of community understanding of what apathy and inertia about public welfare problems cost, the Department cannot offer the most useful help to the dependent individuals who are its clients, it will "help" them perpetuate their patterns of dependency from one generation to the next.

That is what the District Department of Public Welfare is doing. It is perpetuating dependency in Washington.

It is doing this because it carries a whole spectrum of responsibilities:  
for individuals, old and young;  
for children and families sick and well;

without the adequate financial underpinning which in other jurisdictions spreads the expense burden between local, county, State and Federal governmental jurisdictions.

It is doing this because, in spite of vigorous leadership and imaginative planning, it is subject to a policy of penny pinching which must be laid at the door of Congress. It is this policy which constantly hampers the maximum efforts the Department could otherwise make to use skilled staff in helping families re-establish themselves as socially independent units of the community.

Even with intensive efforts to plan, the population pressures which constantly add to the city's dependency picture keep the Department in the two-steps-forward-and-four-back position which at best sometimes neutralize, and at worst, negate its effort to make the maximum use of the resources it can offer its clients.

The penny-pinching policy which keeps the Department chronically undermanned also keeps its workers, however conscientious, buried under workloads which leave them no time to think of initiating constructive action which would represent even the beginnings of a battle line against the steady pressures of dependency.

The caseloads help to explain why the Department gets glassy-eyed looking at both the forest and the trees of dependency:

\*The Committee found that the average caseload in the program for Aid to Dependent Children was 181. During one week in the summer of 1958, one supervisor and one social worker tried to deal with the emergencies in 900 cases. In other Public Assistance categories, by the fall of 1959, the average caseload was 300.

\*In 1949 there were 64 trained social workers in the Child Welfare Division to carry a caseload of 2,883. In 1958, the Division had 87 social workers--23 more than 10 years ago--to handle a caseload that had nearly doubled: to 4,353. During that period, the caseload of children in institutions more than doubled, from 559 to 1,262.

\*In the Foster Care Section of the Child Welfare Division, workers were carrying caseloads in September 1958 that were 67 percent higher than the maximum which the District Commissioners permit voluntary agency workers to carry.

\*In the Protective Service Section, in March 1958, the caseloads were almost double what the U. S. Children's Bureau found the best agencies throughout the nation permitted their staffs to carry.

Here are some of the results:

\*The Child Welfare Division deals with only the most desperate degree of need. Families are being turned away when their emergency needs are less than absolute.

\*Families which are accepted for service sometimes get much less service than the workers either want to or know how to give.

\*In the Public Assistance Division, a largely untrained staff has workers who are not familiar with ways of meeting special needs of families, do not know how to take advantage of some policies which could be useful to them, and are not well versed in providing some protections which could help the parents' strength and ability to conserve their own home.

\*This untrained staff is trying to administer the Public Assistance program in a way that will reinforce rather than undermine the self-respect of the clients. But legislative and regulatory requirements--which have no bearing on the plight of children--keep a special corps of investigators on this staff busy snooping around to find out whether there is or isn't either a father, stepfather or acting father in homes receiving Aid to Dependent Children assistance. If they find such a man, the grant is out off.

\*There is so much paperwork involved in establishing and verifying eligibility that workers are hard-pressed to find time to help families stay together.

\*The executive and supervisory staff, even with constant and excessive overtime, carry such a heavy administrative burden that they must leave undone many things which they consider essential.

These are symptomatic of the Department's problems, which the Committee recommends must be met from these standpoints:

37. THERE MUST BE A BETTER-TRAINED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STAFF, WORKING AT A HIGHER EFFICIENCY LEVEL. THE FACILITIES AND AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE WHICH ACCEPT OR PLACE DEPENDENT CHILDREN MUST BE BETTER COORDINATED ON POLICIES, PLANNING AND INTER-STAFF COMMUNICATION.
38. THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE MUST ESTABLISH A FOCAL POINT POSITION TO ASSIST IN FURTHER COORDINATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICES FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES.
39. THE USE OF INSTITUTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE CARE OF CHILDREN--BOTH THE CARE PROVIDED CHILDREN THROUGH CONGREGATE LIVING AND THAT PROVIDED BY OTHER FORMS OF SOCIAL PROGRAMS-- NEEDS TO BE EARNESTLY RE-EXAMINED.
40. THE DISTRICT LAWS AND REGULATIONS WHICH DISTORT THE PROPER EXECUTION OF THE DEPARTMENT'S FUNCTION MUST BE CHANGED.

Within these broad recommendations, the Committee makes these specific recommendations:

There Must Be a Better-Trained Public Assistance Staff

The Committee recognizes the keen interest that already exists in the Department for an in-service training program for its Public Assistance staff. The Congress in 1956 specifically underlined the importance of training for this national program, as an aid to strengthening family life, but it has not appropriated funds to provide the training.

Even without funds, the Committee hopes that the Department will be able to intensify its staff development efforts. It recommends:

41. THAT THE DEPARTMENT IMMEDIATELY RENEW ITS REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM THE CONGRESS TO SUPPORT AND EXPAND ITS STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

The Committee encourages efforts already underway to streamline Department procedures by using non-social workers to handle administrative detail, freeing the time of social workers for attention to the problems of children and their families. The Committee also believes that clerical workers who have initiative can be encouraged to assume responsibility for numerous administrative procedures which will free workers trained in social work for those tasks which particularly call for their professional competence. It recommends:

42. STAFF INCREASES TO PERMIT MAXIMUM USE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND CHILD WELFARE PROFESSIONAL TIME IN ASSISTING FAMILIES AND CHILDREN AT THE ONSET OF DEPENDENCY, AND DURING PERIODS OF OTHER CRISES. PROFESSIONAL TIME MUST BE AVAILABLE ESPECIALLY FOR WORK WITH FAMILIES AND CHILDREN WITH A HIGH REHABILITATIVE POTENTIAL.

The very nature of the responsibilities carried by the Public Assistance program and the Child Welfare program create confusion for the workers in both programs and for the children and families they seek to serve.

It is technically and administratively impossible for the Department to assign workers covering both areas of service to families. But if there must be different workers serving the same families, the Committee believes it is imperative that they share a common philosophy and common goals.

The present lack of unity and cohesiveness in discharging the Department's obligations not only hampers the understanding which workers have of the total job to be done, but it can have an adverse effect on the successful discharge of their responsibility toward individual children and families. The Committee recommends:

43. THAT THE DEPARTMENT MAKE VIGOROUS AND CONTINUING EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH A COMMON PHILOSOPHY WITHIN ITS PROGRAMS AND TO ESTABLISH PRACTICES WHICH WILL ENHANCE UNITY AND COHESIVENESS, SO THAT SERVICES TO CLIENTS ARE MORE IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE AND THOROUGH.

Both the Child Welfare Division and the Public Assistance Division need to make earlier decisions on the function each division can best serve, particularly when families seek emergency help. The Child Welfare Division in particular should more quickly spot families where the need is largely economic, so that it can encourage parents to apply for assistance grants in such cases. Both divisions need to be more quickly decisive about whether a parent, with help from the agency, can continue to care for his children at home, or whether placement of his children is the only immediate solution. The Committee recommends:

44. THAT THE CHILD WELFARE DIVISION SET UP CLEAR CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTING OR REJECTING CLIENTS WHEN THEY FIRST APPLY, SO THAT INDIVIDUAL CASES CAN BE HANDLED WHEN THE NEED IS MOST URGENT.

Some children would not need to stay at Junior Village so long if both the Child Welfare and the Public Assistance Divisions were of maximum assistance to inadequate and neglectful parents.

The neglectful parent will only respond if he can reach his caseworker when he wants him, understands what needs to be done, realizes that it is something he can do, and is willing to try to do it.

These approaches in offering acceptable help require the highest application of the helping skills. They need more intensive application by both the Child Welfare and the Public Assistance Divisions. Additional staff should permit both divisions to seek out parents who do not keep their agency appointments and work out long-term plans for children which take concrete advantage of the real-life facts about the child and his family in the most constructive way. The Committee recommends:

45. AN IMPROVED USE OF CASEWORK METHODS BY BOTH THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND CHILD WELFARE DIVISIONS SO THAT STAFF MEMBERS CAN OFFER MORE PRACTICAL AND ACCEPTABLE HELP TO NEGLECTFUL AND INADEQUATE PARENTS, TO KEEP CHILDREN OUT OF JUNIOR VILLAGE WHEREVER POSSIBLE, AND TO GET THEM OUT, ONCE THEY ARE THERE, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Children placed in Junior Village by the Woman's Bureau sometimes stay there weeks--or even months--before the staff of the Public Assistance Division learns that these are children in one of their client families.

The Committee recommends:

46. THAT A REGULAR LIAISON BE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION AND THE WOMAN'S BUREAU SO THAT PUBLIC ASSISTANCE WILL KNOW IMMEDIATELY WHICH CHILDREN IN ITS CASELOAD HAVE BEEN PLACED AT JUNIOR VILLAGE.

The tools of the trade of helping children and families must include facts, and the best use of facts.

The Child Welfare Division is short on the facts it needs to do a good job of serving children and their families in dependency situations. Since the law makes these services available to individuals and families without regard to their income, income data is not a routine part of the existing child welfare records. And yet this can be crucial information in successful planning for a child or for a child and his family.

The Committee believes that a new system of record keeping in the Child Welfare Division could establish basic family characteristics which could be of real use not only to workers who are planning with families for the future of their children but also as a part of a basic pool of information about the District's dependency problems. It therefore recommends:

47. A REORGANIZATION OF THE DESIGN AND CONTENT OF CASE RECORDS KEPT BY THE CHILD WELFARE DIVISION TO INCLUDE DATA ABOUT FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS INCLUDING COMPOSITION AND INCOME. IT SUGGESTS THAT THE DEPARTMENT DRAW ON EXPERTS OF ITS OWN OR THOSE OF OTHER AGENCIES TO INSURE MAXIMUM USEFULNESS OF THE NEW RECORD SYSTEM.

In general, the statistical information that the Department now gathers is contributing a useful function both within the Department and within the District government. However, if a concerted attack is to be launched on dependency, the existing Statistics and Research unit must be expanded so that it can be efficiently responsive to the needs for such special studies as may be required. The Committee recommends:

48. INCREASED STAFF FOR THE STATISTICS AND RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT SO THAT THOSE AGENCIES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT WHICH SERVE THE NEEDS OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN CAN INCREASINGLY USE IT AS A FACT-FINDING BODY TO ASSESS CURRENT AND FUTURE SERVICE NEEDS.

The Committee's final recommendation having to do with the staff of the Public Welfare Department is based on its recognition of the contribution which clerical workers can and indeed must make to the success of any program. The Committee recommends:

49. THAT THE DEPARTMENT ESTABLISH A PROFESSIONAL-CLERICAL RATIO WHICH WILL PERMIT PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED WORKERS TO FUNCTION AT THEIR PROFESSIONAL LEVELS AND WILL PERMIT CLERICAL WORKERS TO FUNCTION AT THEIR HIGHEST COMPETENCE IN MAKING A USEFUL CONTRIBUTION TO THE TOTAL PROGRAM. STAFF INCREASES INDICATED BY THE DEPARTMENT RATIO SHOULD BE FOLLOWED DIRECTLY BY REQUESTS FOR FUNDS TO PUT THEM INTO EFFECT.

The Department of Public Welfare Must Establish a Focal Position to Help Coordinate and Improve Services for Dependent Children and Families

Spread throughout the fabric of the present organization of the Department of Public Welfare are two major agencies, two large institutions, several committees and a number of individuals sharing primary concern about dependent children and their families. They may or may not share common information, methods of communication or participate in common planning. They may or may not work in concert as their preoccupations with dependency are expressed in their contacts with voluntary agencies or with other public agencies.

There is no doubt in the Committee's mind that a more unified approach by the Department to its own plans and responsibilities -- and to other organizations -- would heighten the Department's contribution to the alleviation of dependency in Washington.

It therefore recommends:

50. THE CREATION OF THE POSITION OF A CONSULTANT ON DEPENDENCY, CHARGED WITH BRINGING TOGETHER A DEPARTMENTAL FOCUS ON, AND COORDINATION WITH, THE EFFORTS OF BOTH PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES TO DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM.

The consultant would serve as chairman of the Department's Committee on Long Range Planning and Low Income Families, would be its continuing liaison with the Health and Welfare Council on projects now underway or to be instituted which would attack the dependency problem, would work closely with other public agencies and would help implement those recommendations of this Committee as they affect both the Junior Village program and the administration of the Public Assistance and the Child Welfare Divisions.

The Use of Institutions Available to the Department for the Care of Children Needs to Be Earnestly Re-examined

In testimony supporting the Department's 1960 fiscal year budget request, Public Welfare Director Gerard M. Shea told the House:

"It is our hope that community ingenuity and facilities will help us keep future building at Junior Village to a minimum."

The needs of Junior Village as an institution are discussed elsewhere in this report. The Committee agrees that community ingenuity must be exercised if the Department is to use its institutions with enough flexibility to meet the needs of dependent children. And it will be of little profit to have effective diagnoses available of children's needs if they are not to be met through skillful and effective placements.

The Committee holds the view that some of the most effective ways to arrange for the brief or long-time care of dependent children are outside the institutional setting, per se. Foster home care, homemaker service and adolescent group homes, whether under public or voluntary auspices, are important alternates for meeting the needs of dependent children. The Committee hopes that all of these will be expanded as beneficial ways of helping dependent children.

At the same time, it thinks the time may be rapidly approaching when the Department of Public Welfare will need to redesign the use of all of its facilities for children, because of expanding population pressures. When that time comes, the Committee hopes the new plan will enhance the possibility that each child can be placed in a setting most likely to meet his individually diagnosed social, emotional, and educational needs.

Even without this redesign, much can be done immediately to enhance the flexibility of resources available for the care of dependent children.

Washington desperately needs more foster home care for dependent children. The best institution in the world can hardly offer all the mothering that every baby and young child needs.

Many members of this Committee are parents of children. We have seen the looks of fright -- or uncertainty -- on the faces of our own children who have had to be institutionalized -- in hospitals -- for even a brief time, even though our children knew that hospitalization was temporary.

We do not like to think of the possible consequences to the healthy growth of the babies and young children who are now institutionalized at Junior Village and who do not know how long they will be there, and are uneasy as they try for love, affection and understanding.

The Committee is equally distressed by the fact that when brothers and sisters are placed in Junior Village, they are separated from each other.

It believes that children who have behavior difficulties have only the barest chance not to have those difficulties compounded by even a temporary stay in Junior Village.

It would establish a high priority for the expansion of foster home care to take care of these kinds of children. It therefore recommends:

51. FURTHER EFFORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE TO EXPAND ITS FOSTER HOME PROGRAM BOTH FOR EMERGENCY AND LONG-TERM CARE, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO MEETING THE NEEDS OF BABIES AND YOUNG CHILDREN, BROTHERS AND SISTERS, AND CHILDREN WITH CHRONIC HEALTH OR BEHAVIOR DIFFICULTIES.
52. A CLOSE LIAISON BETWEEN PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES IN CARRYING FORWARD THIS EXPANSION SO THAT THE MAXIMUM USE CAN BE MADE OF ALL COMMUNITY RESOURCES.
53. A CONTINUING CAMPAIGN BY THE CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE TO KEEP THE PUBLIC AWARE OF THE SUSTAINED NEED FOR FOSTER FAMILIES IN WASHINGTON AND THE GREATER METROPOLITAN AREA.

The Committee believes that at present, a real handicap exists in recruiting foster families because of inadequate board rates. These families receive \$60 a month for infants under six months, \$50 for most children, and are given special board rates for children with handicaps.

Such rates hardly take care of the children's basic necessities for food. But in addition, foster parents who are willing to take children of school age know that they will be asked to attend school meetings, they will be urged to provide better clothing for the children under their care, they will be expected to function as own parents in many other ways.

The board rate paid most foster parents is about the same as that paid by the Department to most privately operated institutions for dependent children.

The Committee sees this as a financial roadblock to the chance nearly every dependent child could have for healthy development in foster homes.

It therefore recommends:

54. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE BE SUPPORTED IN ITS REQUESTS THAT A REALISTIC BOARD RATE FOR FOSTER PARENTS BE ESTABLISHED. THIS RATE SHOULD:

- (a) Continue--as now-- to reflect the full cost of medical care, including drugs.
- (b) Reflect the full cost of food, clothes, equipment required because of the age or condition of the child, such essential costs as transportation to and from school, and an allowance for the child's recreation.
- (c) Include provision for reimbursing foster parents for hiring a mother substitute if the foster mother is temporarily unable, because of illness, to carry on her duties. This reimbursement would only be authorized when it would prevent the removal of the child from the foster home.

At existing board rates, the Department of Public Welfare is requiring voluntary institutions, just as it requires foster families, to absorb a part of the cost for discharging a public responsibility. These institutions estimate that the current rate represents about a third of the cost of each child's care. This is unfair bookkeeping. The Committee recommends:

55. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE REQUEST VOLUNTARY INSTITUTIONS WHICH CONTRACT FOR THE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN TO FIGURE THEIR OPERATING COSTS PER CHILD ON THE SAME BASE AS THAT APPROVED BY THE COMMISSIONERS FOR THE DISTRICT'S INSTITUTIONS, AND THAT THE DEPARTMENT'S EFFORTS TO INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL BOARD RATES FOR THE CARE OF ITS WARDS BE SUPPORTED.

The Committee does not believe that Junior Village, as a planned and continuing way of life, is desirable for adolescent children. Even with the finest of programs, it implies isolation from the stream of community living. It would be remarkable indeed if this isolation did not produce children who leave Junior Village to face the world without the security of firm roots in the community and without the confidence that a family setting could well provide.

The Committee therefore recommends:

56. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE GREATLY INCREASE ITS PROVISIONS FOR FOSTER HOME CARE AND SMALL GROUP HOME CARE FOR ADOLESCENTS WHO HAVE NEITHER PARENTS NOR RELATIVES WITH WHOM THEY CAN LIVE. IT BELIEVES THAT THIS IS ANOTHER SUITABLE AREA FOR CLOSE LIAISON WITH VOLUNTARY AGENCIES IN BOTH PLANNING AND EXECUTING THIS PROGRAM.

Another community resource for meeting dependency needs is homemaker service. The Committee looks upon the Washington agency as an important way of avoiding the removal of many children from their homes and of hastening their return when they are removed. It recommends:

57. THAT THE DEPARTMENT EXPAND ITS USE OF THE HOMEMAKER SERVICE AGENCY FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM DEPENDENCY.
58. THAT THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION TAKE ADVANTAGE OF ITS AUTHORITY TO PAY FOR HOME AIDES IN SITUATIONS FOR WHICH HOMEMAKER SERVICE MAY BE INAPPROPRIATE.

The District Laws and Regulations Which Distort the Proper Execution of the Department's Function Must Be Changed

The Social Security Act was a revolutionary development in our American society. The legislators who passed the law in 1935 were explicit in their recognition of the fact that it represented too broad an expression of social policy not to need future revision and amendment. Such amendment and revision has continued up until the present time.

The Aid to Dependent Children program has always been the stepchild of the Social Security Act. Nearly 25 years of national experience with the program has only deepened social prejudice against the parents of children in need of the economic assistance on which the program is built.

ADC has been attacked because of unproved charges that it encourages illegitimacy and slothfulness. The charge is probably true that it does encourage desertion of the family by the father. The public antipathy to this program has been so pronounced that the children it was established to serve have been lost sight of.

As Dr. Eveline M. Burns, Professor of Social Work at the New York School of Social Work, told the House Committee on Ways and Means:

"Ever since the Social Security Act was passed, the provisions for dependent children have been less favorable than those for the other categories. The matching maximum has been lower, the Federal share of the cost less, and until recently, even the number of persons in the family for whom Federal matching funds were available was very limited."

This distortion continues even in the face of a recent amendment to the Public Assistance provisions of the Social Security Act which specifies that services should be available "to strengthen family life."

The administration of the ADC program here and elsewhere is a travesty on one of the original purposes of the Social Security Act: that children should not become public charges because of poverty alone.

And yet it is precisely the fact of the lack of enough money for a family to stay together that sometimes pushes children into Junior Village.

By the time a family is completely without funds and homeless, money, alone, will seldom insure that the child will not be badly neglected if he remains at home.

But when poverty is the main reason for sending children to Junior Village, the public is paying a high cost for its social prejudice when it denies parents of these children the economic sustenance they would need to keep their families together.

The cost is a money cost.

In the fiscal year 1959, the average monthly cost for a grant under the Aid to Dependent Children program to keep a child with his mother was \$70.40 per month.

In that same year, the average monthly cost of maintaining a child at Junior Village -- figuring administrative costs -- was \$192.60.

This Committee believes that until the Social Security Act accurately reflects a nation's concern for the welfare of its children, the purposes for which the Act was passed will be thwarted.

The Committee recommends:

59. AN AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT WHICH WOULD MAKE NEED THE PRIMARY AND OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN, AND WOULD ELIMINATE THOSE QUALIFICATIONS WHICH HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH PRESERVING THE RIGHT OF EVERY CHILD TO FAMILY LIFE.

The District of Columbia, through its laws and regulations, is actually sending children to Junior Village for economic reasons alone because of the restrictions it has added to the local administration of the Federal Aid to Dependent Children program. It rules children ineligible for help if:

1. The family wage earner is unemployed but employable
2. An "absent father" returns to his home, or is replaced by a stepfather or acting father
3. The parent is employed even though he does not earn enough to maintain his family adequately
4. The family has not lived in Washington for one year.

These "economy" devices, created with the intent of legislating a sense of responsibility into dependent families, too frequently have had the net effect of separating children from their families, of encouraging furtive and frequently illicit sexual relationships among parents, and of throwing a public financial burden on the voluntary agencies.

They represent a set of rules so complicated and difficult of enforcement, particularly those having to do with establishing whether a father, stepfather, or acting father is in the home, that they put a heavy policing burden on the Welfare Department's staff. The Committee recommends:

60. THAT THE DISTRICT ABOLISH THOSE REGULATIONS WHICH DENY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY CHILDREN WHEN A STEPFATHER OR ACTING FATHER IS IN THE HOME.
61. THAT THE DISTRICT ABOLISH ITS REQUIREMENT THAT A CHILD MAY NOT RECEIVE ADC IF HIS MOTHER IS EMPLOYABLE BUT UNEMPLOYED.

The Committee believes that the Department is denying itself the use of a potent weapon against dependency in ruling out help to families who have not met a year's residence requirement. A family crisis of minor proportions can become a family crisis of desperate proportions within a year's time.

At the present time, private social agencies are discharging what is essentially a public responsibility in trying to relieve desperate family situations among those people who do not meet the residence requirements. They are spending some \$240,000 a year for these and other crises situations--enough money to finance at least one aspect of preventive service to the community at large.

The fear that the short-time resident would drain the welfare coffers of Washington is not justified by the experience in New York, where studies show that most public assistance applicants are long-time residents; that, in fact, less than two percent of the public assistance caseload had lived in the State for less than a year.

The Committee believes that the District of Columbia should shoulder its public responsibility for the financial relief of needy families, regardless of how long they have lived in Washington. It recommends:

62. ABOLITION OF THE YEAR'S RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT IN THE ELIGIBILITY OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES FOR GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

This may have to be introduced gradually and with elaboration of neighboring states.

#### The Public School System

Unless a miracle happens, children who leave school without adequate educational preparation for good citizenship and vocational preparation for self support will grow up into dependent adults.

This is a cold, hard reality which Washington must face.

The Committee has seen too many children in Junior Village, products of the Washington public school system, who in their adolescent years have neither reading nor writing skills. Many of these children are school drop-outs. For some of them, exposure to the public school didn't "take" because they were in classes which functioned far beyond their abilities to learn.

The Committee is in full agreement with the appraisal of the Washington school system contained in a 1959 Report of the U. S. Senate Judiciary Committee:

"The school system of the Nation's Capital has the competent leadership necessary to make it rank with the best in the country -- it is to be hoped that Congress will give them the funds to attract the personnel and to purchase the tools necessary to fulfill this potential."

This Congressional recognition that leadership is not enough has not yet been accompanied by financial support for the other two essential elements mentioned in the Senate report: personnel and tools.

It was this lack of fiscal backing which caused some public school leaders in Washington/<sup>to</sup> raise questions about the feasibility of extending the multi-track educational system from the high schools down to the elementary grades this spring.

When the Board of Education did vote to launch the track system in the elementary grades, it implicitly recognized the need for more personnel and tools to make this a meaningful change in the way the school curriculum could be carried out.

So far, these personnel and tools have not been forthcoming.

Even before the Board of Education voted to extend the track system into the elementary grades, this Committee had seen the extension of the track system as a vital need for the adequate educational preparation of Washington children.

It was -- and is -- genuinely concerned about the opportunities the elementary schools have to spot troubled children before their troubles become so ingrained that they restrict their desire to learn. It is concerned, too, about the discouragement many children face when they do not have the confidence they could get if they mastered reading and related subjects in elementary school. It appreciates the major difficulties which teachers face with over-large classrooms, stocked with children who may represent, in any one class, a wide range of achievement levels and comprehension.

That some children become truant, that some engage in other delinquent acts, and that many enter junior high school by virtue of age alone and drop out at the earliest possible moment, seems inevitable under the present setup: inevitable, costly and wasteful.

The multi-track educational system in the elementary school seems a step in the direction of salvaging and utilizing the learning capacities of many children who may either under-use their potentials, or whose potentials may not be called into play in the single standard curriculum.

But unless changes in addition to curriculum are made, the multi-track plan may only complicate the appalling staff lacks which already exist in the elementary school system.

Elementary school principals, assisted only by clerks, are being asked to serve as problem solvers for as many as 1200 to 1500 children under their administrative supervision.

Problem-solving can and does range from such basic shortages as lunch for a hungry child to dealing with a seriously disturbed child not only in relation to his school problems but to his total life situation.

The Board of Education has recognized the insupportable load it is putting on its school administrators and has requested the Congress for guidance counselors in the elementary school system. Even though its initial request for 100 counselors -- in the 1959 budget -- was halved in the 1960 budget request, Congress has not granted funds which would permit the establishment of even this token guidance counseling system in the elementary schools.

The elementary school system therefore suffers from a dual handicap:

- (a) It needs a staff equipped to teach children at the levels of their readiness for education and funds to support these staff needs.
- (b) It needs a staff specifically equipped to assist the principals and teachers resolve, at their earliest stage, the problems which children exhibit in school and to refer the children for prompt attention to the kinds of experts who can help them with these problems.

It should have available to it an expanded staff of trained diagnostic personnel to supplement the basic function of the school -- which is to teach -- with those skills which can improve the adjustment of children to school whether in regular or special classes.

The Committee recommends:

63. THAT FUNDS BE MADE AVAILABLE TO PERMIT AN ADEQUATE TEACHING STAFF IN THE WASHINGTON SCHOOL SYSTEM, AND THAT THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BE PROVIDED WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE, HEALTH, COUNSELING AND OTHER SPECIALIZED PERSONNEL INCLUDED IN THE STAFFING PATTERNS FOR JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.

#### The Juvenile Court

The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia has these basic purposes, as defined by statute:

- (a) "To secure for each child under its jurisdiction such care and guidance, preferably in his own home, as will serve the child's welfare and the best interests of the state

(b) "To conserve and strengthen the child's family ties whenever possible, removing him from the custody of his parents only when his welfare or the safety and protection of the public cannot be adequately safeguarded without such removal

(c) "When such child is removed from his own family, to secure for him custody, care and discipline as nearly as possible equivalent to that which should have been given by his parents."

There are two significant points about these statutory purposes:

\* The emphasis on the importance of parents and of family life for children.

\* The equal emphasis on the importance of the child, his present and his future welfare.

These must be borne in mind in a court which has the power to make decisions with far-reaching consequences for the lives of children and their families.

It is up to the court to order a child removed from his home if this is in the child's best interests. But it is the court's weighty responsibility to determine those best interests by establishing the fact of neglect or dependency to a degree that makes removal necessary.

The court is authorized to make this determination only after a petition has been filed, usually by the Department of Public Welfare. The petition must set forth the allegation either that a child is "without adequate parental support or care" or that his parent or guardian has either neglected or refused to "provide support and care necessary for his health and welfare."

When the allegation is proved to the satisfaction of the court, it generally commits the child to the custody of the Department of Public Welfare. That agency then has the legal responsibility to determine where the child is to be placed -- foster home or institution -- to safeguard his health and welfare.

In determining the issue of dependency or neglect, the court must walk a narrow line which allows proper weight to the strengths in a family where a child may be neglected, at the same time that it must consider whether the child's present and future welfare are being endangered by living in such an environment, because the strengths are not and cannot become adequate to his needs.

The incumbent judge has many times demonstrated his awareness of his legal responsibility by dismissing petitions filed by the Department of Public Welfare and refusing to remove children from the custody of their parents, particularly when the child's dependency has been caused primarily by economic considerations.

The Committee would expect honest differences of opinion between the court and the Department on whether neglect does exist. But these differences have become exaggerated by the change in focus which the incumbent judge brings to dependency proceedings.

In previous years, dependency proceedings were informal, fact-finding hearings with the prime purpose of determining whether the child before the court was so lacking in adequate parental care that his welfare demanded his removal from parental custody.

The issue then was, and still should be, whether the child came within the jurisdiction of the court because of neglect, and how the child's welfare could best be served.

Under present procedures, however, when a parent either denies the allegation against him, or protests his child's removal from the home, a trial is held. This means that the hearing is continued, usually for weeks, until legal counsel can be obtained. When the hearing is held, it is focused on the parent and the charges against him, rather than on the child and his welfare.

If the corporation counsel fails to prove the charge -- which may be that the parent drinks to excess, or that the mother is rarely home with her children in the evening -- the judge dismisses the petition without establishing how the overall home situation is affecting the best interests of the child.

This has had two damaging effects:

- (a) The main issue which the court has the legal authority to adjudicate -- the welfare of the child -- has been lost sight of.
- (b) The more time-consuming formal proceedings add to the backlog in dependency cases awaiting hearing before the court. And meanwhile, many of the children of these parents wait -~~f~~ in Junior Village.

In the light of this situation, the Committee recommends:

- 64. THAT THE JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT RE-INSTITUTE INFORMAL, FACT-FINDING DEPENDENCY HEARINGS WHICH FOCUS ON PRESERVING AND MAINTAINING THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILDREN INVOLVED.

The tidal wave of national concern about the alarming rise in juvenile delinquency has swept over Washington as well. It was in the light of this concern that the incumbent judge made a "considered decision" to "give priority to juvenile delinquency cases." Pressing as the problem is, the Committee feels that in setting such a priority, the court has slammed a door in the face of women and children who are dependent.

These are the women and their minor children who are in destitute and necessitous circumstances, because of the lack of support of the head of the family.

Wilful or unjustified non-support is a criminal offense in Washington, but it does not carry the penalties that other criminal offenses carry. The intent of the law appears to recognize that punishment is a last resort.

Punishment, in the form of a jail term, is not only a last resort but a dead-end street. The father jailed for failure to support his family cannot support them while he is in jail, and the very fact that he comes out with a record can compromise his chances for using whatever abilities he has to support them after he has served his term.

The lawmakers undoubtedly recognized this fact of life in specifically providing for probation, in lieu of either fine or imprisonment, when a father does not support his family.

They seem to have been seeking an effective way to secure support for women and their minor children left in destitute and necessitous circumstances.

The social services of the Juvenile Court in the past have paved the way in these non-support cases.

During fiscal year 1957, 1449 valid complaints of non-support were found by the court. And probation officers were successful either in effecting reconciliation between the couples or in getting a voluntary agreement to support in 1122 cases.

Frequently the mere threat of action by the court was enough to bring agreement.

But when the incumbent judge decided to concentrate on juvenile delinquency cases, he closed off these social services. Amounts paid to families under court marital support orders dropped from \$12,466.08 in July 1957 to \$914 in July 1958.

The job of handling non-support cases has been turned over to the Office of the Corporation Counsel, which has no social services available to it, and which is charged with a variety of other functions, down to and including disposition of the problems of traffic violators.

A similar shut-off point in providing social services has occurred in illegitimacy proceedings. The Juvenile Court is responsible for determining paternity, and for seeing to it that the putative father pays toward the care of his child during most of his minority.

But except for recommending the amount of financial support from the father the legal determination is no longer backed up by social services to either mother or child.

The Committee must raise the question: How much does this single court practice contribute to the District's problem of dependency?

Children are in Junior Village because their parents are in destitute and necessitous circumstances. Some of them come from one-parent families. The Committee recommends:

65. THAT THE PROBATION STAFF OF THE COURT BE INCREASED SO THAT REALISTIC CASELOADS CAN BE ESTABLISHED AND THE PROBLEMS OF FAMILIES HANDLED WITH MAXIMUM EFFECTIVENESS.
66. THAT THE COURT REINSTITUTE ITS SOCIAL SERVICES, THROUGH ITS PROBATION STAFF, TO FAMILIES OF CHILDREN DISADVANTAGED BY ILLEGITIMACY OR LACK OF SUPPORT.

The Committee makes these recommendations in the full knowledge that the incumbent judge is overloaded with caseloads which overtax the present facilities of his court. It believes that it is hardly possible to overestimate the potential contribution which the Juvenile Court, as a social institution, can make to the betterment of human welfare in the Washington community. It believes the community has two alternatives in improving the contribution which the court can make. It therefore makes these recommendations:

67. THAT THE CONGRESS ADD TWO JUDGES TO HELP WITH THE HEAVY CASELOAD AT THE JUVENILE COURT.
68. THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN AT A LATER DATE TO RECONSTITUTING THE JUVENILE COURT AS A FAMILY COURT, WITH JUDICIAL AUTHORITY TO HEAR ALL THE PROBLEMS WHICH RELATE TO FAMILY LIFE.

The Committee believes that the time may soon come when a reconstituted court for children and families, incorporating the domestic relations functions now performed in other parts of the local court structure, could perform an effective coordinated service in reducing Washington's dependency problems.

## THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

The voluntary agencies in Washington are handcuffed by a peculiar exception to inflation: the charity dollar.

From year to year, the amount which the United Givers Fund received from residents of the Washington area remains roughly stationary. Voluntary agencies which would like to serve more people in the same or fresh ways must stifle their impulses in a battle for survival.

Orderly planning even for the most necessitous continuum of service cannot go on indefinitely when the same pie is cut smaller and smaller each year because of mounting costs.

And when a new agency, such as Homemaker Service, attempts to expand Washington's weapons against physical and social ills, it must demonstrate community support to be eligible to receive community support.

The budgeteers make hard choices before each fall's campaign between what the community needs, and what they think the community will pay for. Unfortunately, the annual UGF goal usually represents the latter figure.

It is in this financial climate that Washington's voluntary agencies attempt to carry forward the general philosophy expressed by the Child Welfare League of America that public and voluntary agencies work together "to develop services that complement each other," and that this partnership move toward a clarification of the responsibility of each group.

This clarification is badly needed.

What is and what should be the role of the voluntary agencies in Washington?

It is a role which began to change when the Social Security Act was passed and continues in a volatile state.

It should no longer, for example, be the responsibility of voluntary agencies to keep roofs over the heads of the poor, or to feed the hungry. This has been accepted as a public responsibility.

But in Washington, this acceptance--in philosophy--has not been matched by practice and so some voluntary agencies here are feeding the hungry and providing shelter for a few of the poor on a temporary, critical emergency basis.

The Committee has already expressed its belief that the voluntary agencies should be relieved of this responsibility.

The Committee now states its conviction that Washington's voluntary agencies can have an exciting and vital role in establishing a community of concern which will move the city's total human welfare forward.

This community of concern would be built around the goal of maintaining a stable society in the face of change. As the watchdog of the city's social health, the voluntary social agencies, working in concert with public agencies, should be able to undertake social planning designed not so much to alleviate the effects of dependency--for that is the public agency job--as to build on existing strengths to do the job that is not the public responsibility: improving the social climate of

the Nation's capital.

The first step in this program is social planning in concert with public agencies.

Public officials now serve as members of the Health and Welfare Council, participating mainly as technical consultants and fact finders. They are not used in social planning. This is done by board members--citizen representatives of the community--without using the professional know-how which public representatives could bring to the city's problems. The citizen members of the voluntary agencies, in turn, frequently plan for the future without a full knowledge of the problems which the public agencies are trying to solve. These are problems which, one way or another, have a basic relationship to the city's social health.

The Committee recommends:

69. THAT PUBLIC OFFICIALS WHO SERVE ON THE HEALTH AND WELFARE COUNCIL BE GIVEN A FULL SHARE OF THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PLANNING PROGRAMS WHICH WILL ASSURE AN INTER-MESHING OF PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNITY.
70. THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE MAKE REGULAR AND CONTINUING EFFORTS TO KEEP BOARDS OF THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES INFORMED OF THE CRUCIAL PROBLEMS WHICH THE CITY FACES IN MEETING DEPENDENCY NEEDS, SO THAT BOTH PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES CAN ACT IN EFFECTIVE CONCERT IN SOCIAL PLANNING.

This mechanism could be used for a continuing re-examination

of those laws and regulations which limit the effective use of public resources for the reduction of dependency.

The Second Step

The second step in establishing a community of concern is identifying gaps in service to families and filling those gaps.

Both public and voluntary agencies operating in Washington now provide these services:

Financial aid, adoption services, institutional care for children, foster home care for children, psychotherapy for parents and children.

Only voluntary agencies are now providing these services:

Counselling with adults, day care, settlement house service, homemaker service.

The three voluntary agencies which provide child welfare casework services to children either in their own homes, foster homes or in institutions together carry one-tenth of the casework responsibility for the District's children. The Child Welfare Division of the Department of Public Welfare carries the rest.

Most of the voluntary institutions which give general care for dependent children accept some children placed by the Department of Public Welfare.

On the basis of its concern about dependency, this Committee can identify appalling gaps in these services.

Program Gaps

The most grievous is in the lack of foster home care available in Washington.

It will require the best combined efforts of both public and voluntary agencies to meet the already demonstrable needs for more foster home care for dependent children. It will require imagination, new techniques, and more citizen involvement--particularly the involvement of volunteers--if these needs are to be met. The Committee recommends:

- 71. THAT THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES CONTINUE TO COOPERATE CLOSELY WITH PUBLIC AGENCY EFFORTS TO RECRUIT MORE FOSTER HOMES OF EVERY KIND, BUT PARTICULARLY FOSTER HOMES FOR BABIES AND PRE-SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN.

A second gap which the Committee can identify is in services to adolescent youth. It questions whether the community has adequate facilities for the recreational and social outlets that these young people need.

A third gap is in the provision of day care for the children of working mothers. It costs less to avert dependency by looking after young children while their mothers work than it does to put children in institutions because their mothers are destitute and jobless.

Most day care for children in Washington is specialized and expensive, as carried on by the voluntary agencies. The Committee believes that it should be more widely applied to dependent children as

a tool for preventing dependency and that this should be a public responsibility. The Committee recommends:

72. THAT PUBLIC AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES COOPERATE TO LAUNCH A PROGRAM TO INSURE ADEQUATE COVERAGE OF THE CITY'S DAY CARE NEEDS, WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE ROLE DAY CARE CAN PLAY IN AVERTING DEPENDENCY.

### The Information and Referral Service

One mechanism already exists to identify gaps in service to families. It is the Information and Referral Service of the Health and Welfare Council.

This Service chronically admits its bafflement in trying to refer all families in crisis because community facilities are inadequate to meet their needs. It is the most obvious community channel for establishing a chronology of need which can form the basis for action to plan future programs. The Committee recommends:

73. THAT THE INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICE OF THE HEALTH AND WELFARE COUNCIL BE STRENGTHENED SO THAT THIS SERVICE CAN MORE TRULY SERVE AS A CENTRAL CLEARING HOUSE TO HELP INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES FIND RESOURCES TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEMS, AND TO IDENTIFY NEW UNMET NEEDS AS THEY ARISE.

### The Third Step

The third step in establishing a community of concern lies in taking whatever steps are necessary to help this city achieve more than minimum results on the basis of maximum efforts.

Washington, as the Nation's Capital, suffers two unique handicaps in achieving the annual UGF goals. For it is not privy to large-scale corporation giving, which swells the coffers of other cities where heavy industry in many forms is well established and can see its stake in maintaining the welfare of the community.

And many private donors here equate contributing to UGF with paying additional taxes.

Their complaint--and their lack of enthusiasm about the drive--will continue to be justified as long as the voluntary agencies supported by the UGF campaign carry out functions in support of which citizens also pay taxes.

This Committee fervently hopes that the voluntary agencies soon can get down to the business of making Washington a better place to live from a social standpoint.

The historic raison d'etre of voluntary agencies is an extension of the impulse to be neighborly.

#### The Concept of Neighborliness

The voluntary agencies, insofar as they are able, already are trying to give expression to this impulse through settlement houses, through homemaker service, through other community facilities which should be available to every Washington resident.

The Committee hopes these efforts can be intensified. It

recommends:

74. A PLANNED NEIGHBORHOOD-BY-NEIGHBORHOOD ATTACK TO PREVENT FAMILY BREAKDOWN AND DEPENDENCY, USING SETTLEMENT HOUSES AS A BASE, AND WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON HELPING FAMILIES BECOME MORE RESPONSIBLE AND INDEPENDENT SO THAT THEIR CHILDREN CAN BECOME PRODUCTIVE, CONTRIBUTING CITIZENS OF OUR COUNTRY.

This attack should use every community resource: The District Commissioners and every public agency responsible to them; civic and fraternal organizations; churches; labor; business.

It should reach out with services provided both by trained and volunteer workers to help families preserve and strengthen their resources whenever they are endangered by failures in employment, housing, education, recreation, health, and the basic tenets of family living.

This attack should be accompanied by a vigorous program of public education about the proper goals of voluntary agencies and the necessary citizen involvement in their fulfillment.

## A PROGRESS REPORT

During this summer, while the Junior Village Committee was in recess, Committee members were heartened by a number of significant developments which not only indicate new directions in social planning, but bolster the Committee's belief in the rightness of its own recommendations to move forward in that planning.

Here are some examples worth citing, as reported in newspaper accounts:

### The ADC Program

Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare has categorically stated that the Federal law should be amended to authorize Aid to Dependent Children grants based "strictly on need" and "not on the presence or absence of the father."

### Unemployment

The District Commissioners sent a bill to Congress calling for an increase in the maximum weekly payment under unemployment compensation from \$30 to \$40 for a flat 26-week period. Other bills pending before the Congress would almost double the weekly benefits and extend eligibility to 39 weeks.

### Problem Families

The Family Irresponsibility Committee of the D. C. Committee

for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth came out with a recommendation for one social worker to deal with the entire family in troubled circumstances, instead of fragmenting families among several agency workers.

The National Capital Housing Authority and the Public Assistance Division announced initial success with a pilot study of tenant families with special problems who receive ADC grants. The study is designed to do something about their problems through intensive casework help.

The D. C. Health and Welfare Council announced it was giving leadership to four neighborhood agencies who are gearing their service to the changing needs of families in Southeast and Southwest Washington.

The Health and Welfare Council received a grant of \$58,000 from the National Institute of Mental Health to explore how HWC agencies can plan programs for combating child neglect in a slum neighborhood. A program director has been appointed.

### Job Futures

A special Committee on Bridging the Gap Between School and Employment, of the D. C. Committee for the White House Conference on Children and Youth, recommended a planned approach to the problem of school dropouts and enhanced vocational opportunities for Negroes. It asked for the help of a specialist in employment problems.

The public school system was authorized to employ one counselor

to concentrate on the problems of school dropouts, and to help them find jobs.

### The Daily Grist

A single issue of the Washington Post (August 28) carried these stories in almost immediate juxtaposition:

"DISTRICT ASKS TALKS WITH BUILDERS TO END  
JOB DISCRIMINATION"

"HILL HEARING SET ON YOUTH COURT"

"LOW RENT HOUSING LIFTED FROM SW RENEWAL PLAN"

As this report is finished, the subjects of the first two headlines are still under active consideration. It is a pity that the cost of building and land in Southwest Washington may make provision of low rent housing there financially impossible, for this closes another avenue to low income families now so desperately in need of housing.

A newspaper series on Washington's housing problems concluded with this observation:

"The overriding criticism is that the District government and its citizens have failed to develop a zeal, a vigorous spirit, a determination to do the job called for in the District's 1955 urban renewal guide: No Slums in 10 Years."

### The Department of Public Welfare

The Department of Public Welfare has taken a number of steps to carry out recommendations made to it during the course of this Committee's study.

It has appointed Elizabeth H. Ross as its consultant on dependency.

Her salary is being presently financed by a grant from the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, with the hope that the position next year will be paid for out of District funds.

But the Department was forced to maintain its chronic stance of two steps forward and four back in its staffing patterns. Gerard M. Shea had to announce, in September, that the Public Assistance Division had been forced to abandon casework services for more than 1500 District families because of staff shortages--partly because of a hiring freeze between March and July to cut down on Welfare expenditures.

At about the same time, the D. C. Commissioners, alarmed by Department overloads in staff, approved 17 new positions at Junior Village for the 1961 budget, which would permit the employment of 7 additional counselors, if Congress goes along with this action.

Some of the new positions will be for registered nurses, to care for the babies who have been moved to the D. C. Infirmary Building, because Eisenhower Cottage at Junior Village simply can't accommodate them.

The Capital Outlay program of the Department contains an item to extend the physical plant of the D. C. Village Laundry, which does a cleaning job for Junior Village and some other Department institutions.

A regular liaison has been established between the Public Assistance Division and the Woman's Bureau to let Public Assistance know when the Woman's Bureau places its children in Junior Village.

A 24-hour initial adjustment record has been set up at Junior Village.

There is now a centralized system of reporting on ADC children in Junior Village.

Children no longer are being placed in Junior Village while their parents apply for Public Assistance. Child Welfare and Public Assistance Divisions are working together to be sure that economic need alone is not a triggering factor, and are trying to provide emergency assistance immediately when this is what families need to stay together.

Arrangements have been made with the University of Maryland in drawing on educational leadership furnished by the Department, to give a course on human development for Junior Village staff during this current fiscal year.

A revised admissions form has been in effect at Junior Village since September.

The Director of Education and Training at the Children's Center is evaluating the school program at Junior Village.

The D. C. Management Office is conducting an extensive study to try to streamline administrative processes and thus relieve Public Assistance workers of clerical duties.

The Department has requested, in its 1961 budget, a special training project for the mothers of children receiving ADC grants which would include virtually all the courses which the Committee has recommended

for home management in necessitous circumstances.

All this represents progress, in varying degrees. But enough progress? The grimmest statistic of the summer was the report from the Department of Public Welfare that there had been an increase of 1088 in the public assistance caseload in the 12-month period from June 1958 to May 1959: an average increase of 90 cases a month.

## A COMMUNITY IN TRANSIT

Flight to the suburbs is a popular Washington past-time.

Men and women attracted to Washington by salaries in the middle-income range are its principal practitioners.

They usually range in age from 18 to 44 years.

They are white.

It is this suburban flight which largely accounts for the fact that, while 64 percent of Washingtonians in 1950 were white, only 47 percent of the total population were white in 1958. The number of white persons under 45 years has shown a substantial decrease. There has been a gradual increase in the number of white persons 45 years of age and older.

What seems to have happened is that many new white residents in the 18-44 age range do not look upon Washington as their home, but simply as a place to stay until they decide where they want to put down their suburban roots--in Maryland, or in Virginia.

The Commissioners reported to the Congress this year that about 30 percent of the District's white residents had lived in Washington less than 5 years; 12 percent, less than one year.

On the other hand, the Negro residents of Washington are staying put. Denied access to most of suburbia for one reason or another, they settle in Washington for the foreseeable future. The Commissioners

reported that only 13 percent of the city's Negro residents had lived in Washington less than five years.

There is now no substantial in-migration of Negroes into Washington, only a very substantial out-migration of whites from Washington.

Essentially, and as anyone familiar with the Washington scene already knows, these facts mean that the character of the Washington population is changing.

This is a fact that needs to be squarely faced.

Efforts at urban renewal and urban redevelopment are directed at least partially to restoring a balance in the racial characteristics of this capital city.

For just as it would be unfortunate for Washington to be a city of all-white residents, so would it be unfortunate for this Nation's Capital to become identified, in the eyes of the world, as the single urban center in the United States predominantly occupied by Negroes.

This would defeat the basic tenets of democracy.

This Committee believes that the Washington community--its total community, whether in or outside of the geographic limits of the District of Columbia--must stop looking the other way and face this situation before it gets out of hand.

In the first place, there are the children.

A whole generation of Negro children are coming of age. The Washington population in terms of numbers is remaining stable with these

children, and those now being born.

In fact, the 1958 total public school enrollment was almost 20,000 higher than in 1950. In the elementary grades alone enrollments were up by 16,573, despite a drop in white enrollments, since 1950, of over 11,000. White enrollments in the public school system were little more than half what they were in 1940; Negro enrollments were more than twice as great as in 1940--they were up 133 percent.

More than two-thirds of the public school population was registered in the elementary grades and in kindergarten. About 78 percent of these children were Negro. In the junior high schools, enrollments were lower than in 1940 and about 70 percent of the children were Negro. In the senior high schools, also, fewer children were registered. And some 64 percent of those registered were Negro.

These are the children--and they are with us.

If they come from families where no community effort is launched to end the perpetuation of dependency, they, too, will perpetuate it--not just for this generation, but for generations to come.

And yet there are hopeful signs that, given help--and sometimes even without help--dependency in economic terms does not need to be perpetuated from generation to generation.

There has been a 50 percent decrease between 1949 and 1958 in the number of low income persons--as compared to the total population--living in Washington.

At the present time, Washington's over-all economic liability, in terms of low income persons, represents 8.4 percent of its total population. This compares with 16.8 in 1949. In 1958 figures, it means 69,000 individuals. Of this 69,000, some 52,000--three-fourths of the total--are Negro.

Should the Washington community continue to levy on the rest of the Negro population of this city--the Negro population which is law-abiding, self-supporting, well-housed--the total responsibility for these Negroes and their families?

Or should the Washington community assume the responsibility it too long has ignored to make these remaining 69,000 low income families also law-abiding, self-supporting, well-housed--so that they can, or at least their children can--become contributing members of the community?

The alternatives are clear.

If the Washington community spurns the effort that is needed to give all its citizens a chance to be contributing members of society--the effort that requires enhanced educational, housing, welfare, employment opportunities--then the Washington community by its own inaction will encourage the continuation of dependency; and it will downgrade the worth of the capital city of this Nation.

If the Washington community stops its flight to the suburbs, and enlists its vigorous and most productive efforts to make this city a picture window for democracy, Washington will become, in spirit as well as in name, the capital of the world.

## CONCLUSION

Late this summer, a bill was introduced in the Congress calling for an examination of the problems which metropolitan living presents.

Its introduction was explicit recognition that all our lives are being complicated by new elements: the phenomena of the urban complex, the influence of suburbia, the population explosion. These new elements will require our best efforts if we are to cope with them successfully.

We are a nation of more people--with still more people on the way.

It will probably not be in our lifetimes that the population explosion reaches its ultimate--a square foot of land to every inhabitant of this earth--but this and other new elements in our living scheme must make us ask these questions now:

What kind of people are we, and what kind of people are we becoming?

Are we to be bested at the floodtide of a new population crest by planning that is not undertaken soon enough, and that is not well enough designed for the needs of our people?

What gamble are we taking here in Washington with our future--and the future of our children--when we do social planning in a wind tunnel?

Can we continue to buffet along social reform--such as adding judges to the Juvenile Court bench--like errant pieces of paper responsive to any fresh puff of air?

This Committee believes that, no matter how the problem is viewed, the future deserves more adequate social planning, and a more comprehensive understanding of the problems involved in living in a complex urban society.

This planning and understanding must go hand in hand if Washington is to survive, rather than strangle itself on the problems which dependency and other social ills create.

It is no longer enough to keep our collective finger in the dike. The dike must, if necessary, be rebuilt, so that it can be of such sturdy material that social ills, such as dependency, cannot weaken it to the point of community catastrophe.

This Committee advocates a concept of social planning that looks to the future.

Washingtonians, notorious for their political disagreements, MUST reach agreement on the social goals which this city badly needs to set for itself.

There must be an alliance between public and voluntary efforts such as has never existed here; an alliance created out of conviction on the part of all the elements of the community that doing something to prevent the social ills typified by dependency is worth our best efforts.

Robert Maynard Hutchins has told us that a world community "can exist only with world communications, which means something more than extensive shortwave facilities scattered around the globe."

These attributes of world communication apply equally to communication in this nation's capital: "common understanding, a common tradition, common ideas, and common ideals . . ."

We all have been proceeding from our different bases, expressing our different viewpoints, calling always for another study, another review, an investigation of need, as a preface to action.

We have done this because of our failure to communicate to each other those elements of a common understanding--and common goals-- which would make it possible for Washington to launch a fruitful attack upon its social ills.

The Job Ahead

There are two truisms, however hackneyed, about which the Committee would remind the Washington community:

You get what you pay for.

You pay for what you want most.

Washington is now getting what it is paying for--the perpetuation of dependency. It is up to the residents of this city to decide whether they "want most" to do something to reverse the present trend.

Doing something about alleviating the problem will cost a great deal of money, but the Committee questions whether not doing something about the problem will not, in the long run, cost much more in actual dollar terms, in real estate values, in a healthy Washington economy.

It adds these considerations to its primary consideration--the welfare of individual human beings--in urging that the Washington community consider the establishment of priorities which can set in motion the multiple kinds of action needed to dispel the dependency shadow which now hangs so heavy over the city.

### The Priorities

Its first priority--in the light of its initial assignment--must be to do something about the deplorable situation at Junior Village.

\*The Committee calls upon the Washington community to support in every possible way the building program at Junior Village.

Its second priority, closely allied, is getting children out of Junior Village and into foster homes; especially babies, and teen-agers.

\*The Committee not only supports present Department of Public Welfare efforts to accomplish this goal, but urges greater effort, and intensive cooperation by voluntary agencies and informed citizens.

Its third priority is to launch a city-wide attack on dependency.

This is the heart of the matter.

If the Washington community supports the first two priorities which this report suggests, action can be forthcoming quickly.

The third priority requires action on a short-term basis, but action which can lead to the realization of long-term goals as well, many of them embodied in the recommendations contained in this report.

Obviously, recommendations that require Congressional legislation to put into effect cannot be accomplished overnight.

But if the long-range goals are kept in view as the short-term goals are accomplished, this city will be moving forward in an orderly way to solve its dependency problem.

The question becomes: who is to do the moving forward?

For many facets of the problem can be attacked simultaneously.

\*Changes in Federal legislation which would prevent children from being removed from their homes unnecessarily will require hearings, study, cost estimate. But citizens can appear at those hearings. And the Washington community can develop materials to support the changes it considers necessary to help it solve problems common to many urban communities.

\*Changes in Federal legislation to make public housing more available to the families from which children now go to Junior Village will require the same process; and there are the same choices for citizens.

\*The same situation is true for changes in unemployment compensation which, as the program is now operating, may be breaking up families and sending children to institutions.

\*The District has obvious needs for more money in its public departments concerned with dependency; there needs to be enough money for more Juvenile Court judges; for more staff in the Department of Public Welfare and in the public school system.

All these things are the concern of Congress and the Commissioners. They will decide at least to some extent on the basis of community interest.

Whose Job?

Who is to spearhead this interest?

Who is to take on the job of launching a neighborhood-by-neighborhood approach that will help families stay together?

Who is to establish a liaison between the groups that now exist to tackle such problems as adult education, youth vocational training and guidance--finding jobs for young people. Indeed, who is to decide whether creating jobs--and at the same time creating a new kind of WPA when our national economy is prosperous--is feasible to help young people find employment?

Who is to be the effective liaison that is needed between the publicly established agencies which now approach dependency tangentially--the schools, recreation, the police--and the Department of Public Welfare which faces it directly in its day-to-day operations?

These are all important questions.

If the Washington community elects to tackle its dependency problem, it must do so in a way that is structurally sound, so that the maximum benefit can derive to the community, and to individuals in the community, through an organization that is both pervasive and sensitive.

The Committee's Suggestions

This Committee has several suggestions for the appropriate structure of such an attack on dependency,

1. It must have the blessing of the District Commissioners. Only through their efforts and demonstrated interest--particularly the efforts of the Commissioner assigned to welfare concern--can there be true cooperative efforts between the heads of public agencies and voluntary agencies and community leaders toward the common goal of reducing dependency.

This means that the District Commissioners must be willing to assign job responsibility--and at the same time allot job time--to these agency heads for a constructive attack on a pressing problem.

2. Washington's attack on dependency will require a great deal of coordination. This cannot be handled under any existing arrangement within either the public departments or the voluntary agencies.

The crying need for a consultant on dependency, within one department, which the Committee pointed out and which now is being met, is an illustration of the complexities which must require the complete attention of a competent full-time staff to solve on a city-wide basis.

3. A professional staff, assigned full time to Washington's dependency problems, while essential to the attack, will not be enough of itself. There must be the involvement of citizens who are willing to devote time, effort, thought and courage to a frontal attack geared to

reality and to need.

This group must include the heads of the public departments most concerned with the problem of dependency. It must include private citizens who now make up--or can in the future constitute--the city's leadership: in voluntary agencies, in the churches, business, the labor unions, the civic and fraternal organizations, the veterans groups.

This need not be one committee--attacking one part of the problem. It can be several committees, working in a planned effort to attack many problems in unison, and coordinating joint efforts with a professional staff which can constantly advise and, as has been the case with the Junior Village committee, enrich the joint contribution.

Most of all, this committee--or committees--should not be composed of all white members, or all Negro members. The problem of dependency is Washington's problem, and it is up to the responsible residents of Washington to solve it.

In making these suggestions, the Committee is only passing on its own experiences to the larger Washington community. It must rest with the District Commissioners to launch an official attack on dependency in Washington.

It is our hope that this report will arouse enough citizen interest to be sure that the government of the city moves--and that when it moves it will have the full support of the residents of this city.

Full  
DC  
Affairs

PROGRAM AND BUDGET SUMMARY  
PROPOSAL FOR UNITED PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION MANPOWER PROGRAM

CONTENTS

- INTRODUCTION
- BUDGET SUMMARY
- JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
- NEIGHBORHOOD NETWORK SYSTEM
- METROPOLITAN MANPOWER INFORMATION SYSTEM
- YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS PROGRAM
- NORTHWEST #1 RELOCATION PROGRAM
- PREVOCATIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM
- STAFF TRAINING PROGRAM
- TOTAL BUDGET AS SUBMITTED TO OMAT

## INTRODUCTION

The following pages give a summary of the various parts of the Experimental and Demonstration Program proposal submitted to OMAT. There is a short description of each part, followed by a budget for staff. These budgets do not include overall administrative costs, nor an allocation for secretarial help. The overall costs are included in the budget summary. The costs are detailed in the final budget which is part of the OMAT proposal.

BUDGET SUMMARY

	<u>12 months</u>	<u>18 months</u>	<u>2 years</u>
Job Development Program	\$155,000	\$232,500	\$310,000
Neighborhood Employment Network	240,000	320,000	440,000
*The Metropolitan Manpower Information System		205,521	
Youthful Offenders Program	119,000	178,500	
Northwest #1 Relocation Project	96,000		
Prevocational Orientation	69,000	103,500	138,000
Staff Training	14,000	21,000	28,000
Administrative & Secretarial Staff not included above	216,000	324,000	432,000
Direct Costs Other than Salaries	204,300	306,450	408,600
Administrative Costs E/A	106,324	159,476	212,628
 TOTAL COSTS AS PROPOSED	 1,286,124	 1,690,676 ✓	

\*This proposal has been prepared as a supplement to the OMAT proposal, consequently, \$155,521 for services from an outside organization does not appear.

## UPO JOB DEVELOPMENT

Job Development will involve the re-engineering of job content so that lower skill and education entry requirements will permit the employment of the population served by the UPO program. Since the federal government is the area's major employer, this will mean restructuring jobs in the Civil Service as well as in the private sector.

UPO job development will involve working with the Civil Service Commission, private employers and local governments to remove or lower unrealistic entry requirements and other barriers to employment of the disadvantaged. It will include work with the labor movement to open up jobs now unavailable because of institutional barriers in the highly organized trades and occupations.

UPO will also seek to identify growth industry and plan with employers to meet worker needs through advance job structuring and training. It will seek to tailor jobs to meet the needs of the disadvantaged while upgrading employability by training, work orientation and entry employment in low skill jobs.

Job development will also include working with present and potential employers to expand and develop new and improved services--particularly in labor intensive areas--that will offer employment to the population covered by the UPO manpower program. It will seek to encourage new enterprise offering employment to the disadvantaged by assisting small business to obtain loans, seeking to bring growth enterprise into the area, and by programs to encourage the disadvantaged to accept jobs in the growing suburban areas.

UPO job development will also mean an intensive, systematic and continuing search for jobs through direct contact with small neighborhood employers, major employers within the National Capital area, the area labor movement, neighborhood and area employer organizations, trade associations, voluntary agencies and other potential sources of additional employment or training opportunities. It will include a broad on-the-job training program in which UPO will be prime contractor. It will also include working with the school systems and USES to develop appropriate institutional training that can lead to jobs for the disadvantaged.

All jobs developed will be recorded in the manpower central information system. This will furnish a check on the effectiveness of the job development program presenting short term, interim, and long-range solutions for the employment problems of the disadvantaged people. Also, by this systematic approach, the job development program can more efficiently chart its future course for developing training programs and new job opportunities.

APPROXIMATE BUDGET

	<u>12 months</u>	<u>18 months</u>	<u>2 years</u>
I Director of Job Development	\$17,000	\$25,500	\$34,000
1 Coordinator of Civil Service Occupations	15,000	22,500	30,000
3 Job Development Specialist III @ \$14,000	42,000	63,000	84,000
3 Job Development Specialist II @ \$11,000	33,000	49,500	66,000
6 Job Development Specialist I @ \$8,000	48,000	72,000	96,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$155,000	\$232,500	\$310,000

## NEIGHBORHOOD EMPLOYMENT NETWORK

Neighborhood teams will be established in the target areas to obtain information about the employment needs of the disadvantaged population to be served. These teams will include both trained counselors and "neighborhood workers." Because the teams will be detached from a central office, they can more readily become identified as part of the neighborhood's "informal structure." Being so identified, the teams will be able to obtain information not usually available to the usual formal employment program and make more accurate assessments of needs and capabilities than would otherwise be possible.

Because of the nature of their activity, team members will be in a position to develop relationships through which they can learn in detail about past work histories, good and unsatisfactory experiences in past work situations, aspirations and other information important to employment potential. Neighborhood counselors and workers will work closely with the Community Action staff and neighborhood agencies. In so doing, they will be able to supplement information needed for assessment. Neighborhood employers who have employed disadvantaged individuals will also be interviewed to obtain information regarding work history and experience. Through such activity, the teams will create a neighborhood employment information network.

Information gathering and assessment will continue throughout a follow-up period which will continue after the disadvantaged are placed in jobs. Total information, however, will not be required before solutions to employment problems are attempted. UPO neighborhood network services will emphasize actual past work histories and training in assessing individuals for future jobs.

As UPO's teams are accepted as part of the informal neighborhood structure, information not now accessible to more formal employment intake programs will become increasingly available. Having learned that UPO teams are ready to serve neighborhood needs, individuals will more readily approach counselors for discussion of job problems. Family, friends and neighbors will tend to refer those with employment problems to the UPO neighborhood centers and staff. Success in the solution of job problems will be reported throughout the neighborhood by those who have had contact with the employment system, helping to establish "rapport" with the neighborhoods.

Information and assessment will be accumulated and stored in the central information system proposed in the overall UPO manpower program. Out of this system, simple forms will be developed so that

counselors can accurately record information for transmittal to the system. Methods will also be developed for quick reporting of cumulative information on any given individual who has had contact with the system.

There will ultimately be one neighborhood team for each of the nine community action areas within the District of Columbia, and one roving team for the suburban areas. The current proposal seeks to create three teams for three major District areas. There will be a team operating within the Cardozo area; one for the Southeast, and a third for the Northeast. Activity can be expanded as the supply of Youth Employment Center counselors available to UPO is increased.

Youth 16-22 who require replacement counseling, testing and other professional services described in the Washington, D.C. Youth Employment Proposal of December, 1964, will be referred to Youth Opportunity Center counselors. The services of these counselors will be made available either in the neighborhoods or in the proposed USES-YOC office whichever is more feasible.

UPO will not place youth between the ages of 16 and 22 in jobs where prior testing is required until after referral to the YOC counselor for recommendations. Arrangements will also be made with the Employment Service for testing persons over 22. Qualified UPO network counselors may administer tests to those over 22 where required.

Youth 16-22 who are not disadvantaged will be referred to YOC counselors for discussion of employment problems and job placement or training. Non-disadvantaged adults will also be referred to the Employment Service for solution of their employment problems.

	<u>APPROXIMATE BUDGET</u>		
	<u>12 mos.</u>	<u>18 mos.</u>	<u>2 yrs.</u>
2 Area Employment Coordinators @ \$12,000	\$24,000	\$36,000	\$48,000
12 Counselors @ \$8,000	96,000	144,000	192,000
10 Neighborhood Workers @ \$4,000	40,000	60,000	80,000
	<u>\$160,000</u>	<u>\$240,000</u>	<u>\$320,000</u>
1 Area Employment Coordinator @ \$12,000	12,000	18,000	
6 Counselors @ \$8,000	48,000	72,000	
5 Neighborhood Workers @ \$4,000	20,000	30,000	
	<u>\$80,000</u>	<u>\$120,000</u>	

Total costs for three teams for  
a two-year program

\$440,000

## THE METROPOLITAN MANPOWER INFORMATION SYSTEM

This system will be developed by professional consultants and will include consultants as outside monitors during the life of the program. The monitors suggest modification in the system if experience demands such changes.

The system will serve the program in the following ways:

1. to keep current information on all people served. This information will be used in assessing progress and is vital for follow-up procedures discussed above.
2. to keep current information on jobs. This will make it possible to project future employment needs. The system will be able to work across jurisdictional boundaries since it will be sponsored by the United Planning Organization.
3. by bringing together information on available people and available jobs, training needs for the area can be projected systematically.
4. The system will permit cooperation with any program that is currently in operation. For example, the single employment specialist in a neighborhood could work effectively with UPO employment opportunities through the system. Any jobs found by the U.S. Employment Service could be placed into the system, and likewise, any jobs made available through other sources would be available to Employment Service.
5. This system will also furnish information on effectiveness of staff and program.

### APPROXIMATE BUDGET

	<u>18 months</u>	<u>2 years</u>
Services from outside professional organization	\$155,521	To be
Approximate UPO costs	50,000	detailed

## YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS PROGRAM

The Special Employment Program for Youthful Offenders attempts to inculcate the skills, motivation and values needed by youthful felons and misdemeanants to compete in the world of legitimate employment, and to open up opportunities for such employment. Two subsidiary projects are contemplated.

One of these, a program for the post-institutional treatment of youthful felony offenders, involves the placement of youth sentenced to the Youth Correctional Center, Lorton, Va., in a residential center located in the community in a pre-release status. From 20-25 youth will be housed in the center at one time. Priority in selection will be given to successful graduates of the OMAT employment training center now operating at the Youth Corrections Center. Youth assigned to the center will remain for from 2 to 6 months. While many of the youth will possess basic employment skills, it is assumed that most will require substantial assistance in developing the confidence, motivation and work habits needed to effectively use these skills. Counseling, primarily oriented to helping the youth help themselves in job finding and job holding will be used. Others will require basic vocational training such as may be gained through on-the-job training placements. In addition to job and job training placements in the community, it also is anticipated that new sub-professional roles will be developed within the center. These will provide additional job opportunities for the residents.

Despite a substantial school program at the Youth Correctional Center, the academic proficiency of its inmates tends to be marginal, thus leaving them vulnerable to the rapidly growing competitiveness of the job market. Therefore, programmed academic remediation to meet the individual deficiencies of the residents of the center will be developed.

Supervision of the center residents will be provided by Bureau of Prison staff. However, it is expected that the custodial functions of these personnel will be limited and that they will participate actively in the resocialization of the inmates.

One or more U.S. Probation Officers will be assigned case-loads from among the inmates of the pre-release guidance center who are released on parole. While responsibility for the supervision and assistance of the youthful offender shifts to the probation officer upon his parole, the staff of the center will continue to provide such services as are appropriate. In addition, Shaw Residence, a half-way house for released offenders, will be available.

The second component project of the Special Employment Program for Youthful Offenders deals with the population of offenders-misdemeanants for whom treatment facilities are now virtually non-existent. The objective of this project is to provide job

conditioning experience to approximately 1,000 youth annually committed to the District of Columbia Workhouse who are deemed to possess some vocational aptitude. Because of the typically short duration of sentence, little emphasis will be upon increasing vocational skills.

The project will operate in a sequence of stages. All youth will be interviewed and tested during their first 10 days of confinement to determine those who are eligible. Multiple offenders and those handicapped by severe mental or physical illness will be excluded. Those released during this time will be referred to an employment center in Washington near their home. Offenders with sentences of more than 10 days who are selected for participation will be exposed to vocational orientation instruction and, if illiterate or severely retarded academically, to academic remediation. In addition, if they are sentenced to more than 30 days they will be assigned to special work programs either within the Workhouse or on the institutional grounds. For those with sentences of more than 90 days, this phase of combined vocational orientation and intra-institutional work experience will be followed by assignment to work crews for out-of-institution employment. Work sites at two nearby military installations are under development. At whatever point in this project an offender may be released, he will be referred to the employment center nearest his home in Washington. The employment center will be notified of his release and a follow-up contact made with him.

APPROXIMATE BUDGET

	<u>12 months</u>	<u>18 months</u>
1 Director of Special Offenders	\$16,500	\$24,750
2 Senior Counselors of Psychologists		
@ \$12,000	24,000	36,000
9 Counselors @ \$6,222	56,000	84,000
1 Chief of Case Evaluation	12,500	18,750
1 Evaluation Assistant	10,000	15,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$119,000	\$178,500

## NORTHWEST #1 RELOCATION PROJECT

The Northwest #1 project, designed to demonstrate that solving the employment problems of individuals currently living in slums, will permit relocation and integration into other neighborhoods rather than creation of another slum area.

Although the neighborhood network scheme will be applied, all people in the area will be served prior to relocation. The emphasis will be on raising the economic status of families rather than of individuals. All families will be surveyed to assess total need of the area. Plans are being made to train residents in the area in skills related to renovation of buildings.

### APPROXIMATE BUDGET

	<u>12 months</u>
1 Area Employment Coordinator	\$12,000
6 Counselors @ \$8,500	51,000
3 Caseworkers @ \$8,000	24,000
1 Community Organization Specialist	9,000
5 Neighborhood Workers @ \$4,000	20,000
	<hr/>
	\$116,000

## PREVOCATIONAL ORIENTATION

The work crew approach has been designed primarily for 16-17 year old youth who are difficult to place in jobs because of age, educational deficiency and work attitudes. Youth in this program will be given vocational training in work-simulated situations, remedial reading and arithmetic and basic education.

A work crew for building occupation skills is ready to be put into operation. Skilled craftsmen holding teachers' licenses are being retained on UPO staff and a training center has been rented.

### APPROXIMATE BUDGET

	<u>12 months</u>	<u>18 months</u>	<u>2 yr</u>
1 Director of Occupational Orientation	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$20,000
1 Testing Technician	7,000	10,500	14,000
1 Supervisor Handyman Center	8,000	12,000	16,000
1 Supervisor Pre-Vocational Training	8,000	12,000	16,000
6 Foremen @ \$6,000	36,000	54,000	72,000
	<u>\$69,000</u>	<u>\$103,500</u>	<u>\$138,000</u>

## STAFF TRAINING

UPO has developed new concepts in both job development and its neighborhood network program. It would be impossible to recruit a completely experienced staff to implement these concepts. Nor is it possible to design a training program within the confines of any ivory tower. In these circumstances, UPO proposes to design a program to "train out" operating problems facing its staff.

The UPO training director and his assistants will attend staff meetings, discuss problems with administrators, analyze staff performance and review information provided through the central information system. Problems arising will be reviewed by the top staff of the project. Out of review of problems and action needed for their solution, a step by step training program will be implemented.

### APPROXIMATE BUDGET

	<u>18 months</u>	<u>2 years</u>
1 Staff Training Director	\$21,000	\$28,000

(Two assistants, one at \$12,000 annually and one at \$10,000 should be included for thorough performance of the training task.)

BUDGETS FOR OMAT CONTRACTS

<u>Position or Title</u>	<u>Percent of Time</u>	<u>Salary 12 Months</u>	<u>Salary 6 Months</u>	<u>Salary 18 Months</u>
1 Project Director	100	\$ 16,500	\$ 8,250	\$ 24,750
1 Staff Training Director	100	14,000	7,000	21,000
1 Accounting & Control Statistician	100	12,000	6,000	18,000
1 Job & Employee Clearance Unit Ch.	100	10,000	5,000	15,000
2 Job Clearance Workers @ \$7,000	100	21,000	10,500	31,500
1 Director of Occupational Orientation	100	10,000	5,000	15,000
1 Testing Technician	100	7,000	3,500	10,500
1 Director of Job Development	100	17,000	8,500	25,500
1 Coordination of Civil Service Occupations	100	15,000	7,500	22,500
3 Job Development Specialist III @ \$14,000	100	42,000	21,000	63,000
1 Job Development Specialist II @ \$11,000	100	33,000	16,500	49,500
1 Job Development Specialist I @ \$8,000	100	48,000	24,000	72,000
1 Supervisor Handyman Center	100	8,000	4,000	12,000
1 Supervisor Pre-vocational Training	100	8,000	4,000	12,000
3 Technicians @ \$6,000	100	36,000	18,000	54,000
1 Director of Special Offenders	100	16,500	8,250	24,750
1 Senior Counselors or Psychologists @ \$12,000	100	24,000	12,000	36,000
3 Counselors @ \$6,222	100	56,000	28,000	84,000
1 Chief of Case Evaluation	100	12,500	6,250	18,750
1 Evaluation Assistant	100	10,000	5,000	15,000
1 Secretary of Neighborhood Employment Services	100	16,000	8,000	24,000
1 Technician	100	7,000	3,500	10,500
20 Neighborhood Workers @ \$4,000	100	80,000	40,000	120,000
2 Area Employment Coordinators @ \$12,000	100	24,000	12,000	36,000
12 Counselors @ \$8,000	100	96,000	48,000	144,000
1 Area Employment Coordinator	100	12,000		
2 Counselors @ \$8,500	100	51,000		
2 Staff Workers @ \$8,000	100	24,000		
1 Community Organization Specialist	100	9,000		
1 Area Employment Coordinator	100	12,000		
2 Counselors @ \$8,500	100	51,000		
2 Technicians @ \$6,500	100	78,000	39,000	117,000
18 Clerk Typists @ \$5,500	100	99,000	49,500	148,500
		\$975,500	\$408,250	\$1,224,750

Direct Costs other than salaries

204,300

306,450

Administrative Costs E/A

106,324

159,476

1,286,124

1,690,676

OMAT REVISED

<u>Position or Title</u>	<u>Percent of Time</u>	<u>Salary 12 Months</u>	<u>Salary 6 Months</u>	<u>Salary 18 Months</u>
Associate Director Employment and Training @ \$18,000	30	\$ 5,400	\$2,700	\$ 8,100
Program Assistant @ \$12,000	30	3,600	1,800	5,400
Administrative Assistant @ \$9,000	30	2,700	1,350	4,050
Secretary @ \$6,800	30	2,040	1,020	3,060
Clerk-Typist @ \$5,000	30	1,500	750	2,250
Executive Director @ \$25,000	15	3,750	1,875	5,625
Deputy Executive Director @ \$23,000	15	3,450	1,725	5,175
Secretary @ \$7,330	15	1,095	548	1,643
Secretary @ \$6,800	15	1,020	510	1,530
Assistant to Executive Director @ \$13,500	15	2,025	1,013	3,038
Staff Assistant @ \$6,500	15	975	488	1,463
Secretary @ \$5,970	15	895	448	1,343
Assistant Director of Finance and Administration @ \$18,000	15	2,700	1,350	4,050
Supervisor, Accounting and Budgeting	15	2,100	1,050	3,150
Personnel Director, \$12,000	15	1,800	900	2,700
Contract Specialist @ \$8,000	15	1,200	600	1,800
Secretary @ \$6,700	15	1,005	502	1,507
Clerk-Typist @ \$5,200	15	780	390	1,170
Accountant @ \$6,800	15	1,020	510	1,530
Accounting clerk @ \$4,800	15	720	360	1,080
Budget Analyst @ \$8,500	15	1,275	637	1,912
Bookkeeper @ \$8,000	15	1,200	600	1,800
Payroll Clerk @ \$4,800	15	720	360	1,080
Accountant @ \$8,000	15	1,200	600	1,800
Administrative Assistant @ \$10,000	15	1,500	750	2,250
Storekeeper @ \$5,500	15	825	412	1,237
Messenger @ \$4,160	15	624	312	936
Clerk-Typist @ \$4,900	15	735	368	1,103
Steno-Typist @ \$4,800	15	720	360	1,080
Clerk-Typists - 3 @ \$4,800	15	2,160	1,080	3,240
Auditors -1 @ \$8,500 - 1 @ \$7,200	15	2,355	1,178	3,533
File Clerk @ \$4,800	15	720	360	1,080
Accountant @ \$10,000	100	10,000	5,000	15,000
Accounting Clerk - 2 @ \$4,800	100	9,600	4,800	14,400

Administrative Costs Personnel	62,240
Plus: Fringe Benefits @15%	9,336
10% Salary Increases	6,224
Sub Totals	77,800
Administrative Costs other than Personnel	28,524
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	<b>106,324</b>

SCHEDULE "C"

OMAT

PROJECT COSTS

Office Equipment

Typewriters	\$ 23,800	
Desks, Chairs, Etc.	35,000	
File Cabinets	15,000	
Dictaphone & Transcribers (GSA, Rent or Purchase)	13,500	
Telephone	5,000	
Consumable Supplies	7,500	
Travel:		
Local and Out-of-Town, Recruiting	20,000	
Insurance 300 @ 5%	1,500	
Postage	500	
Rent	41,500	
Equipment for Work Crews & Work Centers	12,000	
Materials for Work Center (Fabrics, Etc.)	12,000	
Medical Expenses	2,000	
Testing Material	5,000	
Automobiles		
1 Bus		
1 Pick-up Truck		
9 Station Wagons - 5 for 7 months	<u>10,000</u>	
		\$ 204,300
50 percent of total cost conversion of annual cost to 18 months		<u>102,150</u>
TOTAL		\$ 306,450



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)