

CHAPTER XIV

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

An administrative mechanism, even assuming its conformity to the best principles of organization and procedure, can be no better than the staff which operates it. It is necessary that agencies of government be staffed with persons whose capacities and equipment for the job to be done are adequate for the responsibilities asked of them. In the field of public aid these responsibilities are extensive. The new measures which have been introduced in recent years present technical and policy problems of a considerable degree of complexity and call for staffs with judgment and understanding of the broader social implications of their respective duties. At the same time the changed attitude regarding the character and causes of economic insecurity and the responsibilities of government toward the economically insecure has placed increased emphasis upon the relations between the administrator and the applicant. It is now seen that whether the receipt of public aid is demoralizing and destructive of initiative or constructive and preventive will in large measure depend upon the attitude of administrators themselves toward the performance of their tasks, especially in their dealings with applicants.¹ As it has been pointed out,

Decisions * * * which affect the lives of persons who are living on the margin of subsistence require capacity to observe, evaluate, and, to the greatest possible extent, to harmonize the often tangled and apparently conflicting interests of public policy and personal relationships. They underscore the need for permanent, experienced personnel in the staffs of State and local public-assistance agencies and for a level of education and training which will ensure that these staffs have both a mastery of the necessary professional skills and a broad and unbiased understanding of the purpose of the program and of the individuals with whom they are dealing.²

However, the exercise of discretion by administrators who are aware of the broad objectives and social implications of the programs for which they are responsible is not confined to public assistance and general relief. All other public-aid programs call for staffs which are capable of performing much more than merely routine

or clerical functions. Unemployment compensation and employment service programs bring administrators in close touch with employers and workers. Their staffs must be familiar with local employment practices and conditions, and they must possess some understanding of broad trends in the national labor market. In the application of the various disqualification clauses, such as those involving refusal of suitable work, they are called upon to make decisions whose economic and social implications are of far-reaching importance. The administration and development of experience-rating programs and the formulation of policy regarding changes in benefit formulas and the treatment of special groups, such as seasonal workers, demand a high degree of economic and technical competence.

Even the old-age insurance programs, which at first sight appear to be largely mechanical in operation, call on the financial side for highly trained personnel, and in contacts with applicants many problems arise which cannot appropriately be handled by routine clerical workers. In the same way, it will have been evident from the account of the work and youth programs given in Chapter IX that their operation calls at many points for skilled and trained administrative personnel.

It was perhaps inevitable that recognition of the new demands upon administrative staffs created by the development and expansion of public-aid programs should have come slowly. In many communities in America the sentiment of a previous era, which exalted the ability of the common man to perform each and every governmental task in a democracy, carried over and remained embedded in local culture. This appeared to be especially true of some of the older types of public aid, where the tradition of administration by the layman had been particularly strong in spite of the progress witnessed with the advance of social-work and public-aid administration as professions.

It is therefore not surprising that the various agencies attempting to deal with the far-reaching problems created by the depression were confronted at the outset with inadequate resources in trained personnel and possessed limited information on the kinds of abilities required to operate the huge programs. The solution of the problem of servicing the administrative machinery depended upon the ability of public agencies to recruit and train professional personnel whose background and understanding would ensure competent and disinterested effectuation of important social policy.

¹ Although relatively little attention has been given to job analysis and the equipment of personnel with specialized qualifications in other than the public-assistance, general-relief, and child-welfare programs, a certain amount of material is available from agency reports and from "A Study of Education for the Public Social Services" made in 1938-39 by the American Association of Schools of Social Work (University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.). An earlier study of personnel in public-assistance and child-welfare services made by the American Public Welfare Association contains additional material regarding these programs. (American Public Welfare Association, *A Public Welfare Job Study; An Analysis of Selected Positions in Social Work*, Chicago, 1938.)

² *Third Annual Report of the Social Security Board, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1938*, Washington, 1938, pp. 105-106.

A major contribution toward the development of more adequate public-aid staffs was made by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which recognized from the first the need for trained and qualified administrators and promoted higher standards of selection and staff development policies throughout the country.³ As the newer Federal agencies developed, especial emphasis was placed upon the recruitment and development of trained professional personnel. Progress at the State and local level has, however, been slower; nor can it be said that all the requirements for developing a high grade of administrative personnel, who will regard public-aid administration as a career service, have been fulfilled at the Federal level.

In the following discussion of the status of administrative personnel in 1940, attention will be directed to the major elements necessary to attract and retain high-grade staffs. These elements include methods of selecting employees on the basis of competence and merit, programs for staff development, conditions of employment (including salaries, tenure and prospects of advancement), and finally the adequacy of the numbers of staff to perform the volume of work to be done.

The Personnel of Federal Agencies

Of the Federal agencies now performing important public-aid and closely related functions, the Social Security Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Children's Bureau, and the Public Health Service were operating under civil-service regulations by June 1940. On the other hand the WPA, the Farm Security Administration and the NYA, the CCC, and the Surplus Marketing Administration were not under civil service. As will be described below, however, several of these agencies had machinery for classifying and determining the fitness of their employees by objective merit standards, which frequently were identical with or similar to those of the Classification Act of 1923 as amended.⁴

³ The FERA had sufficient funds to employ the necessary number of personnel but was unable to find an adequate number of qualified and experienced persons. While no formal merit system was adopted, employees were selected to a marked extent on the basis of special qualifications for the jobs they were to perform. An attempt was made to strengthen the personnel system by requiring Federal approval for State and local appointments. For a summary of personnel qualifications and State training programs of the Social Service Division of FERA, see Ocker, Marjorie M., *Social Service Division Staffs of the State Emergency Relief Administrations, 1935 and 1936*, Research Bulletin, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1937.

The FERA also granted funds to 39 States for the specific purpose of providing educational leave with financial assistance to nearly 1,000 persons in order that they might study for 1 semester or 2 quarters at schools of social work. For further information on this FERA training program and discussion of later educational policies of Federal agencies in this field, see Brown, Josephine C., *Public Relief, 1929-1939*, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1940, pp. 273-90.

⁴ The compensation schedules set up in the Classification Act of 1923 were amended by joint resolution of June 7, 1924. The Welch Act of

Civil Service Agencies

All employees of the Social Security Board, with the exception of experts, lawyers, and the higher ranks of the administrative hierarchy (all of which are usually excluded in civil-service agencies) were from the first brought under civil-service rules. Subsequently the Board took steps to discontinue the exemptions, and all staffs are now selected through civil-service machinery. However, the Board was initially faced by a serious problem because of the lack of available personnel trained in some of the relatively new fields. Training and staff-development problems have therefore been given prominence. A training program is operated under the direction of the Training Division of the Office of the Executive Director.⁵ In addition, each of the three operating bureaus carries on training programs which concentrate upon the operating procedures, regulations, and problems peculiar to each bureau and conducts an advisory service for training and staff development of employees of the cooperating State agencies.⁶

The Railroad Retirement Board selects its regular personnel at all levels through civil-service rules, and the control of personnel is maintained pretty closely under the central administration. The regional offices advise the central offices regarding the types and numbers of personnel needed; the Washington office reviews these requests and selects personnel from civil-service lists. An interesting aspect of the Board's administrative system lies in the use for unemployment insurance of regular railroad employees as claims and countersigning agents.⁷ While these agents are, of course, not government employees, the restricted range of their duties and the obvious convenience of utilizing them for these purposes appears to justify the somewhat unusual arrangement.

All of the employees of the Children's Bureau are subject to civil-service rules and regulations. Among these are the Washington employees and the regional

May 28, 1928, and the Brookhart Act of July 3, 1930, also amended provisions of the act of 1923.

⁵ The program of the training division includes courses in basic training for all administrative, supervisory and professional personnel entering the Board's service and a program of training in the various functions which employees perform. In addition, there are a number of special training courses. While these training programs have been considered necessary in view of the complexities of the programs administered by the Board, they have also been very valuable as a contribution to creating a personnel which, in addition to understanding the procedural and technical aspects of their work, are also provided with a conception of the major economic and social objectives which the programs are intended to further.

⁶ For an account of these advisory services, see below under "Federally Aided Programs."

⁷ For this service, the Board compensates the assisting railroad at the rate of 50 cents for each registration and claim form. The railroad, in turn, pays its own employees who perform this work. The Railroad Retirement Board estimated for the fiscal year 1940 that employment of personnel directly by the Board would cost at least four times as much as the present arrangement.

and special consultants performing advisory services for the States. Since the Bureau is a part of the Department of Labor, the central personnel office of that Department clears appointments and provides services with respect to classification and other personnel matters for the Bureau.

The employees of the Public Health Service include physicians who are members of the Commissioned Corps and nurses, professional and scientific personnel, and clerical workers. The regulations governing the Commissioned Corps are military, but all other employees are under the Federal civil-service regulations.⁸

Non-Civil-Service Agencies

When the Works Progress Administration was set up in 1935, the Washington office and regional field offices composed what may be termed the central administration. Since the Congress had insisted in its Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts that any administrator having general supervision or any State or regional administrator securing a salary over \$5,000 be approved by the Senate,⁹ the personnel system had to be built under these conditions. The Federal Administrator was, however, usually able to insist upon the appointment of persons whom he considered qualified at the Federal level. *Despite the requests made by the Administration, Congress has never conferred civil-service status upon the WPA.*¹⁰ In the Ramspeck Act, which gives the President power to extend the provisions of the civil-service law to executive agencies, the agency is specifically exempted.¹¹

Immediately following the incorporation of the WPA in the Federal Works Agency in 1939, steps

⁸ Because of the fact that a variety of consulting professional and field personnel are needed by the Service, it customarily appoints large numbers of its employees under the exceptions permitted in Schedule A of the Civil Service Rules.

⁹ Section 3, Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (Public Resolution No. 11, 74th Cong., approved April 8, 1935); Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936 (Public No. 739, 74th Cong., approved June 22, 1936, Title II, not sectioned); section 4, Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 (Public Resolution No. 47, 75th Cong., approved June 20, 1937, Title I); section 38, Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 (Public Resolution No. 24, 76th Cong., approved June 30, 1939); section 37, Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941 (Public Resolution No. 88, 76th Cong., approved June 26, 1940). This act was designated by the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made, rather than the calendar year in which it was passed, as in previous acts). The Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1938 (Public Resolution No. 122, 75th Cong., approved June 21, 1938) did not include this provision. The 1935 Act exempted those persons already serving in the Administration.

¹⁰ The late Work Projects Commissioner, Colonel Harrington, told a congressional committee in 1940 that he knew of "no single step which would do more to increase the efficiency and morale of our administrative organization" than conferring civil-service status upon its staff. (*Work Relief and Relief for Fiscal Year 1941*, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 76th Cong., 3d sess., Washington, 1940, p. 457. Publication referred to subsequently by title only.)

¹¹ Public No. 880, 76th Cong., approved November 26, 1940.

were taken formally to apply the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923 to the great majority of the positions at all levels of the administration.¹² This arrangement became effective at the Federal level on January 1, 1940, and in the State offices on August 1, 1940. Although positions are classified in accordance with the principles set forth in the Classification Act, actual salary scales for specific grades are lower than those established by the Act.

At the State level the WPA has been handicapped in attempting to control appointments of its personnel. In addition to the requirement of Senate confirmation of certain employees earning above \$5,000 per year,¹³ the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts have required that State and even district employees of the agency be selected from the area concerned, insofar as such a requirement is compatible with "good administration." While the latter phrase permits some degree of flexibility in interpretation, other requirements add to the difficulty in obtaining employees under a personnel system based solely upon merit. The WPA headquarters office has also made real attempts to lift the standards of State and district administrative personnel by stressing the desirability of training and staff-development programs.¹⁴

The Farm Security Administration, while not a civil-service agency, has adopted a policy in making appointments of following as nearly as possible the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Personnel appointments are made by the Office of Personnel of the Department of Agriculture upon recommendation by the Farm Security Administration.

¹² In 1938, positions in the central office were informally classified under the Classification Act of 1923, with the assistance of representatives of the Civil Service Commission. WPA now recommends classification and appointments to the personnel office of the Federal Works Agency, which in turn submits them to the Civil Service Commission for approval. Thus both the Federal Works Agency and the Civil Service Commission have the opportunity to approve classifications and salaries proposed for new appointments and civil-service regulations are used as a guide for promotions. At the State and local level, classification for all employees save the State administrator is required, and the Washington office makes the classification after the State office has forwarded the job analysis for approval.

¹³ For an account of the difficulties caused by this requirement, see Macmahon, Arthur W., Millett, John D., and Ogden, Grace, *The Administration of Federal Work Relief*, Chicago, Public Administration Service, 1941, pp. 269-80.

¹⁴ The Washington office prepares instructions regarding the organization and conduct of such programs and sends out advisers to assist local officials in setting up courses. (*ibid.*, p. 277.) The committee which studied the administration of the WPA program in New York City in 1939 stated that "Perhaps the greatest positive efforts which have been made to improve the quality and effectiveness of the supervision of the WPA are those connected with the training program which has been in operation for about a year. * * * The beneficial effects of the training program, which covers about 20,000 persons, are already apparent in a better understanding of the purposes of the organization and of their duties and responsibilities on the part of those participating in the conferences." (*Works Progress Administration for the City of New York*, Advisory Council, *Reports on Public Assistance*, New York, 1939, p. 169.)

Personnel are recruited both by the Washington office and by the 12 regional offices of the Farm Security Administration, but *the fact that no guarantee of tenure beyond 1 year can be given is to some extent a handicap.* Although, under the terms of the Ram-speck Act, employees of the agency appeared to have been eligible to qualify for civil service, they were specifically excluded by a last-minute amendment to the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act in June 1941.

For its field service a classification plan has been designed and applied by the FSA which is similar in some respects to the classification plan applied by the Civil Service Commission under the Classification Act of 1923, although the salary levels are considerably under those prescribed by the act. The classification of departmental positions has been placed within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission by administrative action.

Appropriate standards of training and experience have been maintained in the selection of personnel for both Washington and field offices. Civil Service Commission type examinations are given to all applicants for stenographic, typist, clerical, and accounting positions. Thus, while a high proportion of the clerical positions have been obtained with political endorsement, standards of competence have been maintained. The qualifications of applicants for professional and specialist positions are determined by interview and by investigation of prior training and experience.

In addition to the careful recruitment of its personnel, the FSA conducts a training program which includes a comprehensive induction training course for newly appointed personnel in certain important positions and carefully planned conferences of the personnel each year for explanation of and training for the year's program.

It has in general been the intent of the various appropriation acts to limit the selection of field personnel to residents of the States and localities concerned. The appointments of a large majority of FSA field employees to positions where the salary is \$2,000 and less have been made by field officials for periods up to 6 months. This permits the expeditious employment of persons in permanent or seasonal and other temporary work. Various local county committees which assist the agency in an advisory capacity have also been appointed in the field, thus speeding up the appointive process and reducing to a minimum the number of personnel papers handled.

The FSA has gained a reputation for attracting able personnel. It has taken the initiative in setting up a comprehensive program of personnel administration. It has, however, suffered a hampering turnover in staff,

particularly among its field employees, because of the comparatively low level of its salaries.¹⁵

The employees of the National Youth Administration have also hitherto been denied the benefits of civil-service appointment and status. During the fall of 1940 and the early months of 1941, the NYA, with the assistance of the Division of Personnel Supervision and Management of the Federal Security Agency, established a personnel classification system to cover its project and supervisory employees. It is planned to extend this system to cover all employees at all levels of the Administration. While pay scales are set in accordance with the Executive Order grades,¹⁶ the agency is following as closely as possible Federal standards based upon the standards of the classified service.

The Civilian Conservation Corps has only about 90 employees of its own, since its field personnel is composed of individuals attached to the regular staffs of the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Office of Education. Most of the field service of CCC therefore operates under the personnel systems of these agencies. The Civil Service Commission classified CCC jobs during the fiscal year 1938. The Federal Security Agency reviewed the classifications of jobs in the Office of the Director in 1940 to discover whether recommendations should be made to the Civil Service Commission for reclassification.

Finally, the Surplus Marketing Administration has adopted some of the standards of the 1923 Act. It classifies its positions in accordance with these standards.

Personnel of State and Local Agencies

In 1935 only nine States had State civil-service agencies.¹⁷ By 1937, five additional States had enacted civil-service legislation.¹⁸ By the same year, only 169 of the 3,053 counties in the country were under some civil-service plan, although many county welfare employees were being appointed in accordance with departmental merit plans.¹⁹ In 1937, also, the public-welfare departments of 439 cities had their own civil-

¹⁵ For testimony of Administrator Baldwin on salary scales, see *Work Relief and Relief for Fiscal Year 1941*, pp. 218-219.

¹⁶ The NYA was exempted from the Classification Act by Executive Order No. 7086 of June 26, 1935, under the act of April 8, 1935 (Public Resolution No. 11, 74th Cong.).

¹⁷ Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, *Civil Service Agencies in the United States, A 1940 Census*, Pamphlet No. 16, 1940, p. 34. These States, in order of establishment of their agencies were New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Illinois, Colorado, New Jersey, Ohio, California, Maryland.

¹⁸ Arkansas, Tennessee, Connecticut, Maine, and Michigan. (Lansdale, Robert T., "Merit Systems in Public Welfare," in *Social Work Yearbook, 1939*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1939, p. 260.)

¹⁹ See Lansdale, *op. cit.*, for a discussion of the situation respecting public-welfare merit plans.

service systems, and 235 cities and villages had systems operated by some other unit of government. What proportion of these systems included city welfare workers had not been determined. A few States were operating departmental merit plans for public assistance or welfare employees.

By July 1940, a total of 17 States had enacted civil-service legislation and either had or were preparing to set up merit-system machinery. At the same time 173 counties and 869 cities were operating under some type of merit system covering one or more agencies.²⁰ Because the increasing use of merit systems has been directly related to the participation of the Federal Government in certain public-aid programs, a discussion of the quality of State and local administrative personnel must distinguish between those programs which involve Federal participation, and general relief, which does not.

Federally Aided Programs

Certain provisions of the Social Security Act have had a profound effect upon the personnel policies of State agencies which submit plans for public-aid programs to be approved for Federal grants-in-aid. Sections of the act as amended in 1939 which apply to State plans for old-age assistance, unemployment compensation, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, maternal-and-child-health services, and services for crippled children make it a condition of approval of the State plan that State agencies provide "such methods of administration (including after January 1, 1940, methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Board shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Board to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan."²¹ The language of the titles of the original Act which relate to public-health services and child-welfare services has been interpreted as authorizing regulations requiring a merit system as a condition of the receipt of a Federal grant-in-aid to a State.

Special public-assistance programs.—In its first annual report the Social Security Board drew attention to "the very real problem of obtaining personnel adequately trained and equipped to administer the public-assistance programs in the States." While in some

States the experience gained during the life of the FERA program had made it easier to find adequate personnel and to set up an adequate organization, in others there was "still little recognition of the professional character of such work."²² As the programs expanded, both the States and the Federal Government became increasingly aware of the necessity of working for an improvement of personnel.

From the first the Social Security Board endeavored to encourage and assist the States in raising personnel standards. Although prior to the 1939 amendments it had no direct legal controls over personnel standards, it was responsible for seeing that State plans were efficiently administered and took the position that efficient administration depended upon the quality of personnel employed. It therefore refused to approve State plans that did not contain provisions which established objective minimum standards for the selection of both State and local staffs.²³

At the same time the Board provided to the States technical and advisory services in connection with personnel management and staff development. In 1937 the Board established the State Technical Advisory Service to collaborate with the program bureaus in advice and assistance to States in formulating merit-system rules and regulations and in installing and maintaining systems of personnel administration.

By June 1938 of the 50 jurisdictions which then had one or more approved public-assistance plans, there were 14 in which the State staff was selected through civil-service examinations; in 8 of these both State and local positions were under State-wide civil service.²⁴ By June 1939 three other States and Hawaii enacted civil-service laws, seven States strengthened the statutory basis for departmental merit systems, and a number of others improved existing departmental merit systems or extended and strengthened personnel standards. Against this progress however there was definite retrogression in some States. The Social Security Board reported that in certain States the minimum standards of education and experience "are so low as to be ineffective; furthermore, even in States which

²² *First Annual Report of the Social Security Board, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1936*, Washington, 1937, p. 34. Cf. also *Second Annual Report of the Social Security Board, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1937*, Washington, 1938, p. 35.

²³ *Second Annual Report of the Social Security Board * * * 1937*, p. 34. In its *Standards for Personnel Administration in State Unemployment Compensation and State Public Assistance Agencies*, issued on December 23, 1938, the following statement appears, "Because the administration of the State public assistance program is so largely dependent upon competence of staff, the Board holds that the personnel procedures, and rules and regulations established by the State public assistance agency are an essential part of a State plan, and that the adequacy of the provision * * * is to be considered in approving such a plan."

²⁴ *Third Annual Report of the Social Security Board * * * 1938*, p. 92.

²⁰ Information in this paragraph from Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 19, and 23. City data as of May 1, 1940.

²¹ Secs. 2, 303, 402, and 1002. Secs. 503 and 513, relating to maternal-and-child-health services and services for crippled children, contain similar provisions with slight variations in wording, since the Chief of the Children's Bureau is responsible for their administration.

have more than nominal standards, political considerations have sometimes governed appointments and tenure and have led to substantial turnover of staff, with detriment to the programs".²⁵ In addition, difficulties were experienced because of the low level of salaries²⁶ and in regard to the appointment of personnel at the county level.

The powers of the Board were greatly increased by the 1939 amending act which required the States after January 1, 1940, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis as a condition of eligibility for Federal grants administered by the Board. Standards were promulgated, but a certain amount of elasticity was necessary in view of the differing situations in the individual States.²⁷ Nevertheless, by June 30, 1940 there were 18 jurisdictions in which general civil-service systems were applicable to the State social-security agencies. Rules for joint merit systems covering unemployment compensation as well as public-assistance personnel had been adopted in 19 jurisdictions,²⁸ while in 13 States a separate merit system had been established for the public-assistance agencies.²⁹ In

²⁵ *Fourth Annual Report of the Social Security Board, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1939*, Washington, 1940, p. 108. "One State repealed its civil-service law, others weakened their merit systems through legislation and a number of States did little or nothing to remedy" existing methods of personnel selection. Cf. also "State Welfare Services and the Spoilsman," *Social Service Review*, XIII (March 1939), 116.

²⁶ In 1937 the Board complained that many States had established salary levels which had prevented them from obtaining well qualified personnel, and drew attention to the fact that the salary scales for responsible positions in State public-assistance agencies were in many cases less adequate than those prevailing in other agencies of the State government. Salaries of local officers at the county level were especially low, "in some instances the salaries paid are less than the prevailing wages in the community for routine clerical positions." (*Second Annual Report of the Social Security Board* * * * 1937, pp. 34-35.)

²⁷ The Board's standards were set forth in a document entitled *Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration in State Employment Security and State Public Assistance Agencies*, Washington, November 1939. For an account of the main provisions of these standards, see *Fifth Annual Report of the Social Security Board, 1940*, Washington, 1941, p. 131.

The Board recognized that it was impossible to install fully functioning merit systems by January 1, 1940, but considered it necessary to obtain from each State either the rules and regulations under which the State would administer its personnel program or an acceptance of the Board's standards together with a statement of the steps which would be taken to put them in operation. It permitted State agencies to pay identifiable costs to State civil-service agencies for assistance in setting up merit systems and provided grants for the costs of initial examinations and other aids to the States. It permitted the standards of State civil-service systems which were substantially equivalent to its own standards to be applied to social-security agencies.

For States lacking State civil-service systems, the Board recommended the establishment of Joint Merit System Councils to administer the personnel systems for public assistance and employment security programs. The Board has assisted the States in carrying through these changes, by consultative services on personnel rules and regulations and assistance in the development and installation of classification and compensation plans and in problems of construction and administration of examinations. Courses were held for merit-system supervisors.

²⁸ *Ibid.* In 10 of these States the joint system covered also the health department.

²⁹ *Ibid.* In four of these States the health department and the public-assistance agency were served by the same system.

the remaining States interim plans were formulated for a joint system pending the inauguration of a State civil-service system.

*Considerable as is this progress, much remains still to be done. In particular in States where the tradition of local autonomy is very strong or where the appointing and discharge power residing in the political subdivisions is more extensive than that reposing in State officials, the appointment of trained personnel with assurance of tenure is not as yet general below the State level.*³⁰ Furthermore, difficulties have been experienced in the process of adjustment to civil-service standards especially in regard to incumbent personnel.³¹ Finally, residence requirements still present a barrier to the development of an effective career service. The Board has encouraged the use of State-wide lists in selecting local personnel; but, while some States have made limited attempts in this direction, most States have clung to practices which require appointment of personnel with local residence. The merit systems of many State agencies provide for certification from county registers and permit certification from district and State-wide registers only when county registers are exhausted.³² Local officials have generally been responsible for effective opposition to the introduction of State-wide personnel.

*Continuing attention has been given by the States and by the Board to staff development. From the first the Board had aided and encouraged the States to expand their provision for staff development through on-the-job and in-service training and through the grant of educational leave. The Division of Technical Training of the Bureau of Public Assistance developed standards and suggested methods and materials for use by State agencies. Nevertheless, by 1940 it was reported that progress, although real, was slow.*³³

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³¹ Social Security Board regulations permit the merit-system councils to qualify incumbent personnel as of a given date by open competitive or qualifying examination even if they do not possess the minimum qualifications set up for their positions. Some States have insisted that incumbents take the competitive examinations and qualify in the same way as new applicants; others have seized the opportunity to solidify the position of incumbents by easy attainment of civil-service status.

³² State residence requirements, imposed either by statutory provision or as a matter of administrative practice, to some extent delimit the field from which expert personnel may be drawn. The 1939 survey of the American Public Welfare Association revealed that 26 States, plus Alaska and Hawaii, imposed statutory residence requirements for public-assistance personnel, the period varying from 1 to 5 years. Eleven of these States permitted a waiver of residence requirements for technical positions. The numbers above do not indicate the extent to which State residence has been required in administrative practice.

³³ van Driel, Agnes, "Staff Development in the Public Assistance Agencies," *Social Service Review* XIV, (June 1940), 224-236. In 1939, only 3 States had provision for educational leave in their State plans. In March 1941, the Advisory Committee on Training and Personnel to the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board and the U. S. Children's Bureau reported that 217 full-time students, then

Unemployment compensation and the public employment service.—The development of proper personnel standards in State employment security agencies has presented fewer difficulties. The payment of all unemployment compensation administrative costs by the Federal Government and the fact that the State political subdivisions play no part in administration have obviated some of the problems experienced at the county level in public-assistance programs. Furthermore, staffs of the United States Employment Service, which at the State level were closely integrated with those administering unemployment compensation programs, had been subject to civil-service requirements since the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933. By 1937 the employment services in all except two States had been brought under civil service.³⁴

Prior to 1939, however, the Social Security Board had no power to require merit systems in the States. As in the public-assistance programs, the Board had bent every effort to secure the adoption by the States of merit principles. It embodied in its draft bills sections providing for the examination and appointment of personnel "on the basis of efficiency and fitness as determined in such examinations."³⁵ The then Bureau of Unemployment Compensation issued a manual outlining a plan of personnel procedure for use in the States and made available advisory and technical services on request.³⁶ The Board also used persuasive powers through conferences and the relaxation of detailed controls in the case of States with approved merit systems.³⁷ Nevertheless, the effectiveness of all

attending schools of social work, were on leave from public welfare agencies in 44 States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. 197, or 90 percent of these students were from State or local public-assistance and child-welfare agencies. (Wisner, Elizabeth, "Welfare Staff on Leave," *Public Welfare News*, IX (July 1941), 6.)

³⁴ If a State had a civil-service system, the U. S. Employment Service permitted it to apply its own standards if they were considered adequate. Otherwise, it required that selection of State personnel be made from lists of eligibles who had taken examinations conducted within the State by the Service itself. For the positions in more than three-fourths of the States, the Employment Service prepared and graded examinations in Washington. After appointments were made from these lists, the Employment Service reviewed them to determine whether there had been compliance with its personnel regulations. The Employment Service set forth its personnel regulations in several documents, the latest, which includes previous amendments, being entitled "Personnel Standards of the United States Employment Service, July 1, 1938."

³⁵ Social Security Board, *Draft Bills for State Unemployment Compensation of Pooled Fund and Employer Reserve Account Types*, revised edition, January 1937, Washington, 1937, pp. 54, 133.

³⁶ Thus in 1938 the Board at the request of State agencies assisted in examination programs by directing the training in Washington and in the field of supervisors, proctors, and oral examiners; by developing suggested examination material; and by giving technical assistance in methods of administering and scoring examinations, setting up registers, and certifying eligibles. The Board also financed State examination programs under approved merit-system regulations and assisted 31 States in developing classification plans and schedules for compensating employees.

³⁷ Thus, in 1939, the Board adopted the policy of discontinuing itemization of grants for salaries and wages in those State Unemployment

these influences was necessarily limited. Although the majority of the States with unemployment compensation laws made some attempt to comply with these personnel provisions voluntarily, many took no active steps until 1939, despite the cooperative interest of the Interstate Conference of Unemployment Compensation Agencies.³⁸

Greater progress was possible after the 1939 amendments gave the Board power to require the adoption of a merit system as a prerequisite to the certification of State laws. As stated above, the Board formulated standards applicable to both public-assistance and employment security agencies; by June 30, 1940, all States had signified their willingness to accept these standards, and most of them had adopted conforming rules and regulations.³⁹

Staff-development programs have also been inaugurated in many of the States. By 1940 a training supervisor had been made responsible in 43 States for in-service training functions in both unemployment compensation and employment service. The Board has attempted to foster such activities by preparing and distributing of training material, disseminating the results of State experience, and organizing institutes for employment security personnel and conferences of training supervisors.⁴⁰

Health and welfare services.—Improvement of personnel administering certain health and welfare services has been promoted by the Children's Bureau and the Public Health Service in the administration of Federal grants-in-aid. The 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act gave the Children's Bureau the responsibility for requiring, as a condition of approval, that each State plan for maternal-and-child-health services and for services to crippled children shall include as one essential of efficient operation, provisions

Compensation agencies with well established merit or civil service systems.

³⁸ A personnel technical committee of the conference in 1937 recommended standards and procedures for personnel administration. (*Draft of Regulations for Merit System of Personnel Administration in State Unemployment Compensation Agencies*, September 1937.) By June 30, 1938, "11 State unemployment compensation agencies were subject to State civil-service laws in the appointment of personnel; 24 other State agencies had adopted regulations designed to establish a personnel program based on the merit principles; and 3 additional agencies were drafting regulations as a basis for the establishment of a merit system." In the remaining States plans were in varying stages of development. (*Third Annual Report of the Social Security Board * * * 1938*, p. 58.)

³⁹ *Fifth Annual Report of the Social Security Board, 1940*, p. 132. As a result of the consolidation of functions of the U. S. Employment Service and unemployment compensation agencies, the personnel functions of the former agency were merged with the State Technical Advisory Service. By June 30, 1940, therefore administrative and technical personnel of State employment service agencies were covered by State-administered merit systems serving unemployment compensation agencies.

⁴⁰ For an account of the institutes and conferences held in the fiscal year 1940, see *ibid.*, p. 133.

for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis.⁴¹ The broad language already included in the Social Security Act of 1935 with reference to the Public Health Service and the child-welfare services administered by the Children's Bureau made it possible for the Surgeon General in the one case and the Secretary of Labor in the other to adopt rules and regulations with reference to merit systems. Hence, the merit-system amendment to the Social Security Act in 1939 did not specifically apply to these services.⁴²

Both agencies have paid particular attention to the improvement of personnel. The Public Health Service has worked out standards for personnel through the medium of joint planning procedures developed in the series of meetings of the conference of State and Territorial Health Officers,⁴³ and through constant informal contact with the State public-health services. Under amended regulations issued in December 1939 the States are required to submit as part of a State plan a "plan for a merit system of personnel administration as is now in effect or may hereafter be adopted applicable to any State or local health personnel."⁴⁴ In developing merit systems within the States, the Public Health Service has worked closely with the Children's Bureau, and where a State health department has elected to enter a joint merit system with other State agencies administering special-assistance grants,⁴⁵ the Public Health Service collaborates also with the Social Security Board.

Provision of technical training is an important part of the program in view of the outstanding need for

trained personnel. In the fiscal year 1940, 737 persons, financed in whole or in part by funds made available by the Public Health Service, began an organized period of training.⁴⁶

The Children's Bureau, as already stated, has cooperated closely with the Social Security Board in consideration of basic principles and detailed provisions of the merit standards to be required of the States participating in grants under the Social Security Act. Before the passage of the amending act, the Children's Bureau had transmitted to State agencies the standards recommended in 1938 by its Advisory Committee on Maternal and Child Health Services.⁴⁷ Standards developed in conference with State and Territorial health officers were issued to the States in November 1939. By July 1, 1940, of 52 jurisdictions administering maternal-and-child-health services, 50 had submitted rules and regulations for merit-system administration. Of these, 15 were found to be substantially in conformity with the recommended standards. Of 51 jurisdictions administering services for crippled children, 49 had submitted rules and regulations and 16 had been accepted. Of 52 jurisdictions administering child-welfare services, 47 had submitted rules and regulations and 18 had been accepted.⁴⁸

Special stress has been laid by the Children's Bureau upon programs for staff development, including the grant of educational leave, through the use of Federal funds for these purposes and assistance in the preparation of plans for staff development.⁴⁹

General Relief

The personnel administering general relief ranges from nonprofessional overseers of the poor, elected by popular vote or appointed by local officials, to highly trained professional workers recruited through civil-service or other types of personnel systems. While so high a degree of diversity precludes the giving of any clear picture of the situation throughout the coun-

⁴¹ The Bureau has required that plans for a merit system, including provision for classification and examination of personnel, be incorporated as a part of each State plan submitted annually. All States have submitted such rules and regulations governing the operation of the personnel system. The Bureau assists States in the construction of their classification plans and examinations through approving the use of Federal funds for this purpose and through advisory services.

⁴² In November 1939 the Secretary of Labor issued amended regulations for the administration of child-welfare services to bring their methods of administration into conformity with the amendments to the Social Security Act relating to merit systems.

⁴³ The Social Security Act requires the Public Health Service to consult with a conference of State and Territorial health authorities before issuing regulations affecting the States. In 1935, prior to the adoption of the Social Security Act, the conference adopted a set of recommendations setting forth the qualifications of four major classes of employees, which, while not promulgated, were presumably carried out in the several jurisdictions. The minimum requirements in respect to education and experience were, in this instance, specified for medical officers, public-health nurses, public-health engineers, and sanitation personnel, on the basis of the studies of professional associations who had knowledge of the types of training and experience needed. (*Transactions of the Thirty-Third Annual Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers with the United States Public Health Service*, June 17, 18, 19, 1935.)

⁴⁴ *Annual Report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the United States for the fiscal year 1940*, Washington, 1941, p. 28.

⁴⁵ See above.

⁴⁶ *Annual Report of the Surgeon General* * * * 1940, p. 28.

⁴⁷ The Committee had made recommendations concerning the selection, training, and compensation of State and local personnel engaged in maternal-and-child-health services, including local practicing physicians paid for their services under the program, and the use by State health agencies of expert advice from professional groups or from individuals. The State and Territorial health officers in conference with the Children's Bureau in 1939 adopted similar recommendations on personnel qualifications and recommended that State and local personnel newly employed under the program after June 30, 1939, should meet certain minimum qualifications.

⁴⁸ *Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor, Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1940*, Washington, 1940, p. 184.

⁴⁹ By 1939, 14 State welfare agencies were utilizing child-welfare-service funds for employing a supervisor or director of training. For an account of the character of the training provided and the number of persons given postgraduate education, see *Ibid.*, pp. 163-164, 174, 179, and 181-182.

try, it may be said that, in general, personnel standards are higher in those States where the administration of general relief has been integrated with that of the special public assistances, or where the State exercises supervision over local administration. As a rule, the use of trained personnel is more prevalent in the larger cities than in the smaller administrative units. However, it is not too much to say that in many parts of the country the quality of the general-relief personnel leaves much to be desired.

Where general relief is integrated with the administration of the special public assistances, either the same staff administers both programs or there is a tendency for the principles governing the selection of the personnel for the latter to be applied also to the former. Hence in such States, what was said above regarding the quality of the personnel administering the special assistances will apply also to the general-relief staff. There are, however, some exceptions to this general rule. Moreover, in some States integration has been carried through only in some of the counties or areas.

In consequence there is still considerable diversity of practice even in those States which report such integration, and the diversity is still greater in those where there is none, even though general relief is subject to some degree of State supervision. It is not uncommon in such States to find that the use of trained workers is prevalent in the larger cities, which in many cases have municipal civil-service systems that are utilized by the general-relief agency; but the other administrative units in charge of general relief may either have no personnel at all other than one elected or legally appointed official or may recruit their staffs by a standard in which merit plays no part.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Thus in Illinois the personnel of the Chicago Relief Administration must meet minimum qualifications established for all positions by the Administration and approved by the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission. But although reasonable standards of competence, according to rules and regulations of the State Commission are nominally required for the personnel employed by boards of county commissioners and township trustees in other parts of the State, a recent survey found that "uniform high qualifications and adequate standards were not regularly adhered to in recruiting personnel." (Illinois Legislative Council, Research Department, *The Administration of Relief in Illinois*, Publication No. 21, Springfield, 1940, p. 13.)

In Michigan, while the Detroit Department of Public Welfare operates under the city civil-service commission, no minimum qualifications are formally specified for 79 of the 83 county departments of social welfare operating in other parts of the State. In Wisconsin, the Milwaukee County personnel is selected through the county civil-service Commission but objective standards do not govern the appointment of the general-relief personnel employed in the remainder of the State. In Massachusetts, while 28 of the 39 cities administering general relief recruited personnel on a civil-service basis, only 2 of the 312 towns administering relief specified minimum qualifications for the staff. Nine cities and 4 towns, however, selected one or a few of the staff through civil service.

In Minneapolis, the staff of the Minneapolis Department of Public Relief is selected through civil service. In 57 of the 87 counties in

TABLE 91.—General-relief personnel of local units in selected States

State and local unit	Total units administering general relief	Number of units using only appointed or elected officials
Florida:		
Board of county commissioners.....	65	1 31
Georgia:		
Board of county commissioners.....	147	59
County ordinaries.....		14
Kentucky:		
County judges and/or magistrates.....	110	1 89
County commissions ²		
Maine:		
Overseer of the poor.....	511	1 511
Minnesota:		
Town board ³	1,006	3 700
Village council.....		206
Mississippi:		
County board of supervisors.....	(⁶)	(⁶)
City relief agency.....		1
Nebraska:		
Board of county commissioners.....	93	19
New Hampshire:		
Board of county commissioners.....	245	(⁷)
Overseer of the poor.....		235
Rhode Island:		
Towns and cities (unemployables).....	71	7 39
Oklahoma:		
Board of county commissioners.....	77	3 61
South Dakota:		
Board of county commissioners.....	69	60
Tennessee:		
County court.....	65	62
Vermont:		
Overseer of the poor.....	246	3 246

¹ Most units employ no personnel.

² No personnel for sole purpose of administering relief.

³ Employing personnel to assist town board is unlawful expenditure of township funds. Townships in Hennepin County (Minneapolis) may, by special arrangement, group together and employ personnel.

⁴ There is integration with special public assistances in 57 counties, but the town boards and village councils are not included in such counties.

⁵ Estimated.

⁶ There are 82 counties in the State; it is not known how many provide general relief.

⁷ In most units, the director of public aid is the only person employed.

⁸ Except in few large units. In addition to the county commissioners, the local offices of the State Board of Public Welfare administer relief in 76 counties.

⁹ In most units, the overseer is the only person employed.

Source: Information made available by the Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board. Information not available for all States.

In many local units, no personnel other than the local official or officials designated by law is employed for the administration of general relief. (See Table 91.) In these circumstances, it is likely to be merely accidental if the persons appointed or elected for relief administration possess special qualifications. Furthermore, the amount of time to be devoted to administration is influenced by the pressure of other local business.⁵¹

the State, the general-relief program is integrated with the special assistances and administered by county welfare boards, but in the remaining counties, operating under a township system, no minimum qualifications for personnel are formally specified.

In Iowa, in the 37 local units which have integrated the special assistances with general relief, personnel must meet minimum standards specified in the merit plan of the State Board of Social Welfare, but in the 62 counties where there is no integration, no minimum qualifications are specified except for those activities dealing with the certification and referral of applicants to Federal agencies. The State Board of Social Welfare, however, is usually requested to refer qualified personnel to the county boards of supervisors.

⁵¹ In Massachusetts, it was found that prior to the reorganization in 1939, "the bulk of * * * the administration is performed by part-time persons who, as farmers or merchants, have their attention more

In those States where the personnel of the local general-relief program is selected by local officials without reference to standards set up by the State agency, such selection is made according to the standards—or lack of standards—which apply to other persons employed by the town, city, or county.⁵² There is also some evidence to suggest that, even where personnel are selected by locally prescribed standards, these standards are uneven or are often not very rigorously applied.⁵³

The personnel standards prevailing today in the administration of general relief reflect the historical background of our public-aid programs. When public aid was of insignificant proportions and when a narrow view prevailed as to the responsibilities of government in regard to the economically insecure, administration was lodged in the hands of small local units and was performed by persons who frequently carried out other civic functions. It was to be expected that, when these positions carried pecuniary or political perquisites, opposition would develop to the introduction of professional standards. This has indeed happened. In a

closely on their own business. * * * Administration must almost inevitably be carried on by elected officials on a part-time basis with all the political pressures and obstruction which that involves." (Haber, William, and Somers, Herman M., "The Administration of Public Assistance in Massachusetts," *Social Service Review*, XII (September 1938), 410.)

Even where a staff is employed, the entrusting of responsibility to a township supervisor who has other functions to perform has serious disadvantages. In Illinois, in 1940, the Legislative Council reported that in some local units "the supervisor, because of the pressure of other local business, was far too busy to give adequate supervision to the local staff. * * *" (Illinois Legislative Council, Research Department, *op. cit.*, p. 13.)

⁵² For example, in New Jersey it was found in 1940 that "no personnel standards are at present set for relief employees or even for welfare directors * * *" (Joint Legislative Emergency Relief Committee, *Report of Investigation of Relief Administration in New Jersey*, February 1940, p. 10.)

In Indiana, a survey conducted in certain townships of Lake County in 1938 found that the administration of poor relief was "inefficient and abounding in abuses." This was in part attributable to a "failure to restrict employment to properly trained or qualified personnel." (Governor's Commission on Unemployment Relief, *Report on Poor Relief Administrative Policies and Procedures in Calumet, Hobart, and North Townships in Lake County, Indiana*, 1938, p. 3.)

In Kentucky, county judges or magistrates, county or city welfare agencies, city commissions, or private agencies have responsibility for general relief in the various counties. The majority of counties and the city commissions employ no personnel. In the 6 county relief or welfare departments no minimum qualifications are specified. Only in Louisville is the personnel selected under civil-service regulations.

In Texas, where administration is entrusted to county commissioners, courts, town relief agencies, county-city and county-town public-welfare agencies, no minimum qualifications are formally specified for any of the agencies except for one of the two city public-welfare agencies, where case workers must pass an examination.

⁵³ A study made by the American Public Welfare Association in Minneapolis in 1938 reported that "the civil service examinations for the social service personnel have been of unequal quality." Discussions revealed an "absence of professional qualifications as to formal training and proven successful experience as a requirement for application to take the examinations for case work supervisors. This has meant that only recently a number of employees have been promoted to the posts of case work supervision who, upon examination as to background, reveal serious lack in qualifications." (American Public Welfare Association, *Public Welfare Survey of Minneapolis, Minnesota*, Chicago, 1938, p. 26.)

few States, organizations of local poor officials have successfully fought off proposed legislative changes, and continuation of the separation of general relief from the special assistances has been the result of a compromise to satisfy those persons having a special interest in perpetuating the *status quo*.⁵⁴ In other cases the entrenched local administrators have challenged attempts to reorganize with less success.⁵⁵

*The poor calibre of the personnel administering relief in certain parts of the country may also in part be explained by the low level of remuneration offered.*⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Thus in Michigan, the public-assistance law of 1937 was rendered ineffective by a referendum vote instigated by the township trustees. Under the Reorganization Act passed in 1939, the special public assistances are under civil service, but the relief organization is under the spoils system. (See *Public Welfare News*, VII (January 1939) 1, and (November 1939) 4.)

Again, in Illinois it has been pointed out that "The poor law relief officials, the overseers of the poor, strongly resist any proposal which would curtail, let alone eliminate, their authority in the administration of State and local funds for general relief. * * * There have been individual exceptions among both the poor law officials and the county judges but they have been in minority." (Glick, Frank Z., *The Illinois Emergency Relief Commission: A Study of Administrative and Financial Aspects of Emergency Relief*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940, p. 237.)

Similarly, in Oklahoma, in 1937, when it was found that a constitutional amendment had given the State welfare commission power to control local personnel, the legislature created a second State body, the Board of Public Welfare, and entrusted it with the administration of State funds for general relief. Thus in every county there is a commission office and a board office, one nonpolitical, the other political. (Colcord, Joanna, "The West is Still Different," *Survey Monthly*, LXXIII (August 1937), 244.)

In Ohio, in 1935, an observer stated that the movement "to confer legal status upon the *de facto* county welfare units has been resisted by the township authorities, most of whom are very eager to retain the exclusive status so long enjoyed and to regain the actual administrative control, of which force of circumstances has temporarily deprived them." (McMillan, Wayne, "Unemployment Relief in Ohio," *Social Service Review*, IX (September 1935), 467.)

In Indiana, when the Welfare Act of 1936 created a State Department of Social Welfare, outdoor relief and poor asylums were omitted from its scope (despite inclusion in the original draft) because of "a mixture of political fears and conscientious doubts on the part of the legislators." * * * (White, R. Clyde, "Recent Public Welfare and Social Security Legislation in Indiana," *Social Service Review*, X (June 1936), 209.)

⁵⁵ In Pennsylvania the constitutionality of the 1937 Public Assistance Act, which abolished over 400 local poor districts, was attacked in 8 separate actions filed by different poor districts. The State Supreme Court held that the Act was valid and constitutional.

⁵⁶ The town welfare department of Stamford, Connecticut, reported as follows in 1939: "A thoughtful comparison of the responsibility borne by members of this staff with the amount paid them reveals the necessity for an immediate adjustment of salaries if efficiency is to be maintained. It is difficult to develop or maintain high standards of work with so great a turnover of personnel as this Department experiences each year." (Stamford, Conn., Town Welfare Department, "Report * * * for the Year 1938-39," in *Manual of Statutes and Policies*, Stamford, 1940, p. 3.)

The Fulton County (Ga.) Department of Public Welfare commented as follows: "It is amazing that so many competent and trained people have remained on the staff under handicaps of inadequate relief funds with which to help people and low salaries for staff members. No one who has not experienced the depressing feeling of turning away hundreds of worthy, destitute families because of lack of funds can adequately estimate the nervous drain on Case Workers under such pressure." (Fulton County Department of Public Welfare, *Report for Year 1939*, Atlanta, p. 2.)

In regard to North Carolina it was pointed out that "training, insofar as it increases a sense of personal responsibility for what is done to

Furthermore, because the funds available for general relief are limited, the nature of the work that can be performed under such conditions does not attract people with high professional standards.

Still another factor contributing to the inferior calibre of general-relief personnel in many areas is the prevalence of residence requirements, which are especially common in those States where general relief is a responsibility of small local units. Many of these local residence requirements have their basis in local spoils systems; only residents of long standing are eligible for jobs which are payment for political loyalty. Exceptions are occasionally made in the case of positions requiring specialized training, and in some States individual positions are exempt from the requirement. There is, however, no consistent pattern in the making of these exceptions.⁵⁷

Information on residence requirements for local general-relief personnel is available for nineteen of the States where general relief is not wholly or mainly integrated with the special public assistances. In five⁵⁸ of these, no professional personnel is employed in the majority of the local units. It may be assumed, therefore, that the elected officials (in the case of Maine, either appointed or elected) administering general relief must necessarily be county and State residents.

In 4 States (Iowa, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Ohio) residence in the State is a requirement either by law or regulation.⁵⁹ In addition, State residence is required in practice for employees of the Chicago Relief Administration, and in North Carolina State and county residence is a consideration. Local residence requirements are more frequently found than are those for State residence. In 12 of these 19 States personnel is recruited locally because of law, regulation, or practice.⁶⁰ In 10 of these 12 States (with the exception of Oklahoma, where county residence is required by law), local practice and custom are responsible for the establishment of these residence barriers.

clients, tends to cause case workers to leave an agency when its standards start falling." (Peele, Catherine G., "We Who Must Say No," *Survey Midmonthly*, LXXVI (April 1940), 127.)

⁵⁷ For example, in 1 State (Michigan) only the county director must have county residence while in another (Missouri) all county positions except that of director must be filled by a county resident.

⁵⁸ Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, South Dakota, and Tennessee.

⁵⁹ In New Jersey and Ohio the requirement applies only to those persons recruited through civil service, while in Iowa it applies only to the county boards of social welfare which administer general relief in 37 of the 99 counties of the State.

⁶⁰ Michigan, Oklahoma, Vermont, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, and Wisconsin. In Michigan and Vermont, only the administrative head must have local residence. However, in Vermont, many local units employ no other personnel, and it has been observed that, where other personnel is employed, it is unlikely that persons without local residence would be employed.

Inadquency of Administrative Staffs

Effective administration cannot be expected when staff members are overworked or charged with unduly heavy responsibilities. The belief is common among legislators that, when financial resources are limited, the first line of retrenchment should be in the area of administrative expenses. Furthermore, lack of appreciation both of the constructive potentialities of administration by professionally trained personnel and of the complexities of the problems raised by contemporary public-aid programs has fostered the practice at all levels of government of placing arbitrary limitations, often on a percentage basis, on administrative appropriations.⁶¹ In consequence, staffs have been overworked, and the full effectiveness of programs has not been realized.

The effect of these restrictions on administrative costs has been particularly evident in the special-assistance and general-relief programs and has resulted in unduly high caseloads carried by the respective staffs. As the caseload for which a worker is responsible increases, it is obvious that less time can be devoted to the needs of each case. While the size of the caseload which results in maximum efficiency and economy cannot be stated with precision, the American Public Welfare Association has concluded that "an active caseload of between 75 and 100 cases is the maximum that can be efficiently carried by individual social workers and at the same time assure both a sound, humane administration of public assistance and the minimum of necessary social services."⁶² This conclusion is consistent with the findings of other studies, all of which have shown that caseloads which are small enough to permit a good quality of service are also most economical from the standpoint of costs.⁶³

⁶¹ That there is little consistency in such limitations is evidenced by a range from a 5 percent limitation on administration in Oklahoma made by the 1937 Legislature to a 15 percent limitation in California placed on the State Emergency Relief Administration by the 1940 Legislature. In Illinois, the Emergency Relief Commission operates with a 10 percent limitation on the "aggregate expense of administering poor relief by a local relief area" but excludes costs of providing certification and referral services in connection with Federal agencies. In Nebraska the county assistance committees, which administer the special assistances in all counties and general relief in 70 counties, are allowed 4 percent of State monies allocated to the county, plus any available county funds, for administrative purposes; in counties having a population of 200,000 or more, the State limit is placed at 5 percent.

⁶² American Public Welfare Association, *A Public Welfare Job Study*, p. 73.

⁶³ See, for example, the important study of the California State Relief Administration which concluded that "the improved performance which accompanied the lowest loads tested (50 applications per week and 60 active cases, respectively) was sufficient to justify the increased operating cost . . . by relatively small increases in the agency's operating expenses, substantially greater accuracy in eligibility could have been attained, resulting in decreases in total SRA expenditures." For a table summarizing the results of the study see Simon, Herbert A., and others, *Determining Work Loads for Professional Staff in a Public*

In a very large proportion of agencies, however, the loads carried by case workers are very much higher than these figures. *It is not unusual to find staffs so small, in relation to the total caseloads of their agencies, that each worker carries responsibility for from 100 to 130 cases; indeed, instances of caseloads as high as 350 have been reported. These excessively high caseloads have resulted in less efficient service, inadequate investigation, and delay in handling cases.*⁶⁴ The inefficiencies of this kind of economy have been commented on not only by those responsible for ad-

ministration but also by authorities who have made impartial investigations⁶⁵ and by taxpayers' associations and other groups interested in economy.⁶⁶

Welfare Agency, University of California, Bureau of Public Administration, Berkeley, 1941, pp. 4-5. See also p. 53, table 13, which gives estimated expenditures under various caseloads. For other analyses of the effect of differing caseloads upon efficiency of administration and administrative costs, see Staman, Rebecca, "What is the Most Economical Case Load in Public Relief Administration?" *Social Work Technique*, III (May-June 1938), 117-121; Reed, Ellery F., *An Experiment in Reducing the Cost of Relief*, Chicago, American Public Welfare Association, 1937; American Public Welfare Association, *Adequate Staff Brings Economy*, Chicago, 1939; Hastings, Constance and Schwartz, S. S., *Size of Visitor's Caseloads as a Factor in Efficient Administration of Assistance*, Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance, Philadelphia County Board, Philadelphia, 1939.

⁶⁴American Public Welfare Association, *A Public Welfare Job Study*, p. 29.

A study of the caseloads in the administration of aid to dependent children in 13 selected counties in 6 States, showed that in 9 counties where caseloads were undifferentiated the average load ranged from 150 to 304 cases per worker. (Information supplied by the Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Board.)

The Oklahoma Department of Public Welfare, stated in 1939 that "in order to conduct the public assistance program efficiently during the next fiscal year, it would be necessary to have at least 635 visitors instead of the 325 which the Department of Public Welfare has at this time." (Oklahoma Public Welfare Commission, Department of Public Welfare, *Third Annual Report * * * for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1938-June 30, 1939*, p. 16.)

"Case units are divided on a geographical basis, each unit assuming responsibility for a section of the territory containing 500 to 600 cases. Within the unit the territory is further divided into caseloads. Each should contain an average of 65 cases (a range of from 50 to 75) assigned to one field worker for efficient operation. Our visitors have had to carry well over 100 cases. The Town loses money whenever an individual caseload exceeds 75. It is well to remember that each visitor authorizes several thousands of dollars of public monies each month in addition to other responsibilities." (Stamford, Conn., Town Welfare Department, *op. cit.*, p. 11.)

In Waltham, Mass., in 1939 the general-relief case worker carried an average load of 315 cases although it was recognized that efficiency called for a load of not more than 100 or 150. (City of Waltham, Mass., *Annual Reports of the Public Welfare, Park and Recreation Departments, 1939*, p. 6.)

In July 1941 the average caseload per worker in Tennessee was 350. (Elmore, Edith B., "Field Administration in Public Welfare," *The Tennessee Planner* [Tennessee State Planning Commission], II (September-October 1941), 257.)

Cf. also, City of Louisville, Kentucky, Department of Public Welfare, *Annual Report * * * Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 1939*, p. 21.

⁶⁵The Missouri Association for Social Welfare concluded as a result of its study of relief conditions in the State in the summer of 1940 that all programs would be greatly improved by the provision of more adequate funds for administration. (Missouri Association for Social Welfare, *Stones for Bread*, St. Louis, 1940, pp. 81 and 86.)

Cf. also American Public Welfare Association, *A Public Welfare Job Study*, p. 73.

An editorial in *Public Management*, XX (March 1938), 65, drew attention to the inadequacy of appropriations for administration. "Impartial studies of relief and welfare administration prove how false economy in administrative costs increases the cost of relief. For example, a committee which recently investigated relief administration in a large city reported that: 'Successful operation is dependent upon the allocation of sufficient funds for administrative purposes. The maximum of 8 percent now allocated by law for administrative expense is inadequate. * * * Insufficient administrative funds have resulted in a reduction in the number of caseworkers to a point where it is physically impossible for them to perform their duties. The survey shows that a majority of the relief clients had not been visited by caseworkers for over 4 months. Adequate supervision of relief cases would reduce fraud and uncover resources which would remove many people from the relief rolls. This is impossible with the present reduced staff. Each caseworker is now required to carry a load of approximately 300 cases.'"

For an account of the adverse effect of inadequate appropriations for the administration of workmen's compensation, see Dawson, Marshall, *Problems of Workmen's Compensation Administration*, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 672, Washington, 1940, pp. 154-165.

⁶⁶A study of relief in Center Township, Indiana, by the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce drew attention to the fact that faulty relief practices could be traced primarily to the fact that the township did not employ a sufficient number of competent investigators. (Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Bureau of Governmental Research, *A Review of Poor Relief Administrative Procedures in Center Township, and Suggested Changes for Improvement*, Report No. 15, Indianapolis, 1940, p. 4.)

A report by the Pittsfield (Mass.) Taxpayers' Association was even more emphatic. After stressing the wastefulness of a relief program which neglected the rehabilitation and restorative phases of public aid, the report concluded that a narrow view of the functions of a relief agency "has meant a deleterious limitation of Welfare activity and, as a consequence, the continuance of high taxes for relief purposes, and a damaging disservice to recipients. * * *

"The public must realize that Welfare work demands a trained personnel to cope with its duties and responsibility. The blunt fact of the matter is that the present case work staff in the Welfare Department was not hired to do the type of work which must now be done. Their job has been one of determining the need of material assistance, with only small emphasis upon attendant social case work problems. While these workers have undoubtedly more than earned their salaries, the salaries in themselves would not attract trained personnel. To cope with this situation the community must be prepared to set up high professional personnel standards and to pay salaries commensurate with such training." (Pittsfield Taxpayers' Association, *Public Welfare Survey*, 1940, pt. II.)

The Governor's Commission on Unemployment Relief in Indiana attributed the inefficiency of administration in certain districts in part to a failure to maintain adequate investigating staffs and to the unduly high case loads (700 cases in one district) carried by investigators. (Governor's Commission on Unemployment Relief, *op. cit.*, p. 4.)