

## NOTICE

This material may be protected by  
 copyright law (Title 17, U.S. Code)  
 STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA

OC 31 '89

## A BRIEF SURVEY OF CHILD WELFARE IN IOWA

A paper given by Dr. Mae Habenicht, before  
 the Iowa Conference on Child Development and  
 Parent Education, in May of 1937.

For many years Iowa has been definitely interested in the welfare of its unfortunate people. This has taken the form of not only providing for them, but of developing a welfare program. Many studies and surveys of various welfare fields have furnished a great amount of material, and Social Welfare as a function of the Government, has been of increasing interest to many groups in the State. Of the many aspects of Iowa's Social Welfare needs that have been studied during the last fourteen years, a short resume is given, which makes for a better understanding of the present situation.

Special mention should be made of the work of the Iowa Child Welfare Commission appointed by the Governor in November, 1923, since this was the first serious thought given to these needs. Probably the most extensive study ever made of the various phases of child welfare was made by this Commission. When the Commission's report was submitted, it recommended that the ten interlocking bills which had been carefully compiled as the result of its study and research, should be adopted without change because each one related to all the others. Only four of these bills were adopted by the 1925 Legislature. These were, -- First, a bill creating a Department of Child Welfare in the Board of Control, with power to assign its duties, regulate its procedure and establish its policies. Three other bills were passed; bills to license Child Placing Agencies, Boarding Homes and Maternity Hospitals.

The present Bureau of Child Welfare began its functions under these Acts July 1, 1925.

Two years later a new adoption bill was passed, and thus five of the ten bills recommended by the Commission became Laws, however, in a much modified form.

Many of the recommendations of the Commission are as pertinent today as the day they were made. The entire program for child care has been crippled and greatly handicapped, not only because of inadequate legislation, but also because of changes made in the bills. These changes prevented the development of a program which would fulfill the intent and purpose of the Commission in formulating the ten interlocking bills.

Second, A study was made in 1930 by the National Probation Association of Juvenile Courts and Probation, at the request of the Bureau of Child Welfare, which was supported by the Board of Control of State Institutions. The results of this study were published, and a bill proposed, that would correct some of the most outstanding inadequacies in our present laws. The principal recommendations were:

1. Appoint a specialist as State Supervisor of Probation.
2. Authorize the appointment in any county or combination of counties, of a salaried probation officer, their number and compensations to be determined by the judges and county boards.
3. Continue the development of county welfare organizations and appoint their workers as probation officers.
4. Authorize the designation by district judges, of County Attorneys or salaried probation officers, as referees to hear children's cases in counties where there is no resident judge.
5. Revise the juvenile court law generally to clarify definitions, improve procedure, broaden jurisdiction and end jail detention of children.

The bill which embodied these recommendations, failed to pass the legislature and we are today suffering because the needs indicated by this study have not been met. The recommendations made by the National Probation Association are as much needed today as they were in 1930.

Third, The "Iowa Plan" for organizing County Welfare Work as sponsored by the Extension Division of the State University of Iowa, has attracted much interest outside of the State, and was the basis upon which the Emergency Relief Program was built. For a number of years this was the only attempt made in the State toward education or organization in the Social Welfare field.

When the Emergency Relief program was organized, there were twenty counties operating under this plan. Because of the development of this County Unit Plan, Iowa, together with several other states, was selected for field study by the sub-committee on the Administration of "Local Public Units of Child Care", of the White House Conference on Child Care and Protection. The report of this committee may be found in the proceedings of this Conference.

Fourth, In 1931 at the request of the Bureau of Child Welfare, the United States Children's Bureau sent a child welfare worker from their staff to study the organization of Child Welfare work in the state and to make recommendations which would assist Iowa to establish better standards of work and also to develop facilities already existing in the state.

The recommendation made as a result of this study included both legislative and administrative provisions. For the most part they were limited to public Social Welfare problems.

An unofficial body representative of the groups throughout the State interested in Social Legislation, was brought together to consider the recommendations of the report and to formulate an adequate Social Welfare Program for the State. It was urged that the public be informed of the needs so that the measures advocated would receive popular support when the Legislature convened in 1933.

It was pointed out that Iowa with a Budget of \$5,000 was attempting to carry a program comparable to its neighboring states, which are provided with a much larger budget. It is of interest to compare these budgets. Wisconsin had appropriated \$45,000, Minnesota \$60,000 and Iowa \$5,000 to carry out their provisions for Child Welfare.

These states can quite fairly be compared in density of population, pursuits, general interests and needs.

This report indicated Iowa's interest in its children compared to its interest in agriculture, and other departments of State government, by the appropriations allowed each of these departments. Little interest was aroused in the lack of facilities to meet the children's needs and no program of development, extension or education was undertaken by the groups who met to receive this report.

No legislation was contemplated to present to the 1933 legislature.

Fifth, Following the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, called by President Hoover in the fall of 1931, a similar State Conference was held in Iowa in April, 1932. It was hoped by the Planning Commission appointed to make arrangements for this conference that the facts brought forth as the result of these studies, would make for a better understanding of the needs of the State in the care of its children.

Every phase of child welfare was studied, and much valuable material was made available for future use. The Planning Commission recommended to the Governor that a permanent Social Welfare Commission be appointed to develop and direct the State's program of Social Welfare, and to establish the minimum requirements as set up by the serious and scientific committee-people who had outlined the reports of the Conference.

This proposal was not followed and again no action was taken to further the State's program in the care of its children

Sixth, In 1933 the Legislature provided funds for a survey of Administration in Iowa. The Committee on Reduction of Government Expenditure invited the Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution at Washington, D. C., to make a study of the State's Governmental Departments.

The State's Public Welfare Activities, including State Agencies and Institutions, as well as local welfare activities and organizations, were made a part of its studies.

The Brookings study found "a centralized system of institutional management and control, but a glaring lack of co-ordination of related welfare services; a reasonably adequate state system of institutions, but very little provision for pre-institutional care and prevention; an excellent hospital and clinic service for children at the University, but a poorly staffed, entirely inadequate children's bureau for general child-caring work; and an elaborate system for paroling prisoners with entirely inadequate provision for either investigation or supervision."

The Brookings Survey recommendations included a Public Welfare Department under which all welfare functions should be integrated. The Public Welfare Department activities suggested, were to be distributed among seven divisions.

1. A Bureau of County Welfare and Relief which should have charge of the development and supervision of County Welfare units, the direct administration of all state relief funds, and the supervision of all local institutions and agencies of a penal or eleemosynary nature.
2. A Bureau of Child Welfare which should license and supervise all Child Caring Agencies or Institutions, Boarding Homes for children, Maternity Homes, and supervise the four state children's institutions, develop foster and boarding homes, administer widows' pensions and in general be charged with all the child welfare duties of the State Government.
3. A Bureau of Mental Hygiene which should supervise the State Hospitals for the Insane and Epileptic, the Training Schools for Feeble-minded and develop a State Mental Hygiene program in connection with the State Hospitals and in cooperation with the Psychopathic Hospital at the University.
4. A Bureau of Correction which should supervise the three penal institutions and be responsible for the parole of all prisoners.
5. A Bureau of Handicapped which should have charge of the care, supervision and training of the blind, deaf, crippled, and should concern itself with preventive plans in this field.
6. A Bureau of Industries and Equipment which should supervise the construction and maintenance of all institutions under the department.

7. A Bureau of Research and Statistics which should be the fact finding branch of the Department charged with the assembling, classification and interpretation of all information in developing and operating the State's Welfare Program.

In 1935 a Public Welfare bill was written covering the main points in the Brookings recommendations. Little support was secured because of a general lack of understanding of the proposed law, both by the people of the state, and the Legislature. No organized effort was made to inform the state of this proposed legislation and no action was taken by the Legislature.

Close on the heels of this extensive study, the Federal Social Security Bill was passed in the spring of 1935, which stimulated interest in all the provisions and requirements of the laws covering the various fields with which it had to do. A renewed interest in the many studies and surveys previously made was awakened to meet the challenge of this opportunity offered by Uncle Sam.

Up until this time, which the Code of Iowa laid seven mandatory requirements upon the Bureau of Child Welfare, only three of these had been partially met. Of the seven outlined in the code, only in the first half of one and the second half of another, had any attempt been made to meet the requirements. These have to do with the disposition of children committed to the care of the State. The major interest of the Bureau has been home finding, child placement and supervision of State wards.

In 1954 a Department of Psychology was established by the Board of Control to arrange for tests, measurements, examinations and disposition of children in state institutions as provided for in Section 3661-a1, Paragraph 1. This, however, only partially fulfilled the requirements since the law included children outside of state institutions for whose care in institutions application is made.

All the remaining mandatory requirements which have to do with meeting the child's needs in his community and preventing, if possible, the ultimate disaster of a permanent separation from his family have not been met. These are in the nature of "preventive" measures which was clearly the intent and purpose of those who formulated these laws.

Until we can begin to stem the tide of the ever increasing number of children knocking each year at the doors of our state institutions for admission, we will have failed to meet the requirements of our laws and also failed in our service to children.

In 1935, when the report of the National Committee on economic security revealed that there are over 7,400,000 children under sixteen years of age depending on the public for their future security, we began to think seriously in terms of prevention.

If, from the beginning, we had complied with the requirements of our Children's Code as it was passed in 1925, we would now be well on our way in developing a prevention program and would have carried out all of the provisions now provided for in Services to Children under the Social Security Act.

In the beginning of 1936 we had not made any appreciable progress in assuming our duties with respect to a general child welfare program.

Children continued to be committed to State Institutions in large numbers and without adequate investigation. Such investigations should be made by either local social agencies or by a representative of the Bureau of Child Welfare. Local communities did not provide temporary care for children which would permit time for adequate study of the child and its needs, so that only those children would be accepted for care by the State who must be permanently separated from their own people, or who are in need of special care only the state is equipped to give.

Local resources had not been developed for the rehabilitation of the families of the children who were considered for commitment to institutions.

Little of permanent value to a child can be accomplished in separating a family and removing children from their natural habitat without giving serious thought to their relation to the rest of the family. Careful study and planning for such families should be given over a long period of time, in an effort to make possible re-uniting the family at some future time. Permanent placement plans, either in an institution or a foster home, should never be made until there seems no possibility of re-establishing the family unit.

At the present time, the State program provides for the care of children in only two ways. They may be cared for in a State institution or placed in a free home.

We are all agreed that institutional life is not suitable to the normal development of a child and should only be resorted to where no other plan is possible, and should then only be considered as a part of a treatment plan for a child. It is also true that many children are not suitable subjects for free home placement, and these children are, therefore, deprived of a normal "home life" under our present facilities.

If, instead of overcrowding children's institutions until only the most rudimentary care can be given, Iowa would provide funds for boarding home care, which like institutional expense, would be shared by the State and the County, it would give opportunities for normal home life for children who would otherwise never know this natural right of every child. In the long view it would also reduce the cost of care materially.

Such a program would permit the State Institutions to give the children coming to them for care, the individual attention they need in training and specialized care for the particular group of children they are intended to serve.

No state plan to protect and assist the unmarried mother and her child has been provided, although about nine hundred unmarried mothers come to the knowledge of the Bureau of Child Welfare each year. A comparatively uniform procedure of standards and policies should be formulated. A uniform illegitimacy act provides an excellent means of securing adequate support from a man found to be the father of a child born out of wedlock. The effectiveness of this law, however, depends entirely upon the attitude of the judge and the County Attorney concerned with the case.

Since the Bureau only receives reports from licensed Maternity Homes on illegitimate births, and these comprise only a small number of these cases, obviously little information is available concerning this large and serious problem.

Illegitimate children born in other hospitals and private homes only come to the knowledge of the Bureau through the Department of Vital Statistics. A recent report showed of the 898 cases reported by the Vital Statistics Department, the bureau had learned of only 225. What is happening to these unmarried mothers and their children is shrouded in mystery, and occasionally when tragic cases are later brought to our attention, it is then too late to give any assistance.

In the rural counties particularly, the County Welfare Agency should be in a position to accept the responsibility for these cases. In urban centers, where there are large numbers, some agency should be made responsible for the care of these cases.

The most that is done at the present time is in giving assistance in planning for the child. What happens to the mother, relative to her future that would enable her to become a useful member of society, has not yet come within the scope of our planning.

While we have a much improved adoption law over the one in effect in 1927, the present law is much inferior to the one recommended by the Child Welfare Commission. The original bill provided that upon the filing of a petition, "the Court should notify a welfare agency, either county or state, to verify the allegations of the petition, to investigate the condition and antecedents of the child for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was a proper subject for adoption, and to make appropriate inquiry to determine whether the proposed home was a suitable one for the child." The report of this investigation was to be submitted in writing to the Court with a recommendation as to the granting of the petition. The law as passed requires the Court to make its own investigation and to file a copy of the "complete" court record with the Board of Control. A six months' residence period is provided but both the investigation and the residence period may be waived by the Court "upon good cause shown."

The serious difficulty in our present methods of adoption procedure is the lack of resources for making investigations. Only a few counties have salaried probation officers to give assistance in these cases. In a few counties the judge refers such adoption cases to the local welfare organization for investigation. This is, however, entirely dependent on the attitude of the judge toward thorough investigation before issuing a decree of adoption.

In practice we find that the resources available for investigation are not always used. Certainly every safeguard should be set up to assure careful consideration of adoption, since by an action requiring only a few minutes in court, the whole future of a child's life is determined.

The statute provides that the findings of the Court shall be made a "complete record" and a copy filed with the Board of Control. However, in practice, only the most meager information is given in the adoption decrees. Frequently only the child's "first name" appears, or the "new adoptive name" is the only one appearing in the decree. No report showing any attempt has been made to investigate the facts is ever recorded.

It is readily seen that the copies of adoption decrees now furnished the Bureau of Child Welfare do not have sufficient information to make them of any value. A plan should be devised to give the needed protection to the child about to be adopted, and also to follow more closely the work done by the State Agency, Child Placing Agencies and Juvenile Courts, as well as their standards of work and procedure in adoptive cases.

While the Board of Control has initiated an excellent program for the diagnosis and care of feebleminded children in State institutions, there is a great need that facilities be established throughout the state for the proper diagnosis of children for whose care outside their own homes plans must be made.

During the last two years through the courtesy of the Board of Control, and Dr. H. M. Skeels of the Department of Psychology, some service in this field has been given counties on a basis of demonstrating this need. It was soon evident that this service was most valuable to the counties and the demands for such service taxed our Department of Psychology so heavily it was necessary to discontinue the service except in the most urgent cases.

The early recognition of feeblemindedness in a child is essential if later difficulties are to be avoided. There is no doubt but that assistance should be given to the courts, the schools and social agencies in understanding the mental problems of children who come to their attention and also assist them in making suitable plans for each child. This most baffling problem is far from being understood and in many ways is the most menacing of all our future problems.

Commitment to a state institution avails little since they are already too overcrowded to permit admitting a child without a long waiting period. It is likely that many who should be committed are not, because of the limited provision made for their care by the State.

Community resources must be developed to assist in making additional provision for some of these children, through special instruction in the public schools and proper supervision of those who are cared for in the community.

There is need for a careful study of both public and private agencies in order to understand the overlapping and gaps in our present organization. The needs of the state as a whole must be considered in relation to the services offered by the existing agencies. The Federal Children's Bureau recommended that "An attempt should be made to reorganize the field of child care so that instead of a number of agencies doing mediocre child placing work, a few first-class child-placing and child-caring agencies would remain and others would provide specialized services of various types -- diagnostic services for problem children, convalescent care, care for children having venereal disease, etc." Providing vocational guidance and facilities would be another excellent field to develop.

The standards established for child care should be equally applicable to state institutions as well as private institutions.

The state program for children should be unified one in which the state, counties and private agencies "pull together", each one fitting into the general program to the greatest advantage of the whole program and the child's individual needs.

The Boarding Home program has not been developed because of lack of staff and money to properly investigate and supervise these homes, but an attempt has been made to eliminate some of the most unsatisfactory ones and to prevent others from being opened.

The supervision and administration of Mothers' Pensions in the State should be assigned to a State Agency to insure uniform and adequate services. This phase of the field of child welfare will be discussed by Mr. McCauley, Superintendent of the I.S.H. in his paper on "Aid to Dependent Children."

The Social Security Bill provided that \$1,500,000 should be allowed to states on an unmatched basis to develop a program in services to children especially in rural communities and in areas of special need. It was felt that while urban centers had developed some services for children, although inadequate, rural communities were almost entirely lacking in these services.

Iowa receives \$37,325.57 of this money which was allowed on a basis of its rural population. It was further dependent on the requirement that Iowa submit a plan to the Federal Children's Bureau which it could approve as one which would carry out the provisions of the Social Security Act. Such a plan was made and approved as of July 1, 1936. It was felt that since the amount of money available would not be sufficient to actually do all the work indicated in the children's field, a plan must be devised which would be the most far-reaching in stimulating interest in the general field of child welfare through a program of demonstration, education and training.

Our plan first eliminated the sixteen urban counties in the state and divided the remaining counties into four districts on a basis of the judicial districts and also provided for the establishment of a unit of demonstration in each of the four districts. These units are to be made up of two or more rural counties.

It was planned that a resident Child Welfare Worker would be in charge of each unit of demonstration and would assist in developing a well rounded program in service to children. Obviously one worker could not do all the work in two or more counties, but through making a selection of cases, showing the greatest need, and covering all types of care, it would be possible to demonstrate to the community the need for thorough investigation and study of each child's individual needs before making permanent plans for him.

Each county in such a unit would bear part of the cost of operating the unit to insure an interest in the program and also to conserve funds in order to extend the service to other areas.

It was also planned that a district Child Welfare Worker would be established at a strategic point in each of the four districts who would be available as consultant on children's cases to anyone in the district. She would also give direct case work service to schools, judges and County Welfare Agencies in certain cases.

A State Supervisor of Child Welfare (Services) is provided for in the plan, who is responsible for carrying out the services provided for in the plan.

Provision is also made for a Mental Hygiene Unit, that would be available to the workers in the field in completing their studies of children's cases. It would also provide tests, measurements, and diagnosis as well as render assistance in making individual plans for children.

A Training Unit is also provided to give further training in Child Welfare Techniques to those who have had a basic training in the Social Welfare Field, as well as offering an opportunity for field training to students in the school of Social Administration at the State University.

Our Services to Children must meet the State's particular needs and the kinds of assistance provided will differ in the counties, depending upon the extent to which social welfare activities have been developed in the local units and the service already available.

It was found that the interpretation of the program to the State generally, as well as to schools, County Boards of Supervisors, Welfare Agencies and Courts was of primary importance.

Since some case work service for children was available in a few urban centers and was practically non-existent in rural areas, to provide this service became our first consideration. If we are to meet this need for "service" it is highly essential that qualified personnel be secured or there will be no program of "service."

There have been many difficulties in securing an adequate staff, due to the great demand in all the states for children's workers. The demand so far exceeds the supply, that this has become one of our major problems and there seems little hope of any change in this situation until students now in training have completed their training and secured experience.

In defining the functions of the Staff, it was important that their field of operation be clearly defined so that the work of the State Agents of the Board of Control and that of private agencies would not conflict with the new program. We have, therefore, entered the fields that have not previously been covered and are attempting to carry out the remaining mandatory requirements set forth in our laws that have not already been met.

For the first time we have been able to comply with the provisions made to reach children's problems at the beginning rather than after the difficulties have become unsurmountable, and commitment to an institution with permanent separation of family ties is the only possible solution.

The service offered under this plan includes a broad educational program to reach not only the people in the community, but also the Agencies working with children such as the Schools, Welfare Organizations, Courts and County Boards of Supervisors. This service covers all types of problems found in any locality which require investigation and case work by qualified workers such as:

Arranging for foster home or institutional care for children who need care away from their own home during a temporary emergency, and also protecting neglected and mistreated children.

Locating and securing attention for the physically handicapped as well as the mentally defective.

Safe-guarding children of illegitimate birth.

Giving service to courts in investigations and doing case work as well as probation service where none is provided.

Assisting schools in attendance and conduct problems.

Giving assistance to State Institutions for children with reference to admissions and after care, and assisting in organizing community activities for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Since there is an urgent need in all counties of facilities for the temporary care of children, our major emphasis is being placed on developing boarding homes where children may be kept while their individual needs are being studied before a permanent plan is made.

All this work for children is being tied very closely into the community interests by establishing advisory committees in counties. These committees are vitally concerned in what is happening to their children, and are proving most valuable in establishing facilities for child care where there are none, and stimulating the community to a realization of its own responsibilities to its children.

Unless the community wants this service for its children sufficiently to interest itself in developing the community's resources, it would be of little value to take this service to it.

During the past year counties registered their interest, their need, and their support.

Ninety-two counties have asked for and received assistance and about 1,300 cases have been given some type of service.

We are, therefore, bringing to the New Child Welfare Division which has been established under the Public Social Welfare Department by act of the 47th General Assembly, at least the beginning of a state-wide unified child welfare program.

It is again clearly the intention of those who formulated these new laws to so coordinate, correlate and integrate all the public welfare functions that the most far-reaching service would be possible to those for whom these laws were made.

We must not forget that the enactment of these laws is only the beginning. Unless they are properly interpreted and administered there will be no benefit derived from them. There is also great need that those citizens of the State who have fostered child welfare legislation continue their active interest. By watching the unfolding of plans in the administration of these laws they will be in a position to render further valuable service by advising when weak spots are discovered or further legislation is needed to correct or add to the present laws.

We know that no social legislation can be static and that from time to time changes must be made to meet the changing needs.

Our opportunity to immeasurably extend our service to Iowa's unfortunate children is a challenge we must meet.

CHILD WELFARE IN IOWA - RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

NOTICE

This material may be protected by  
law (Title 17 U.S. Code)  
STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA

A paper given by Dr. Emma McCloy Layman before the Iowa Conference on Child Development and Parent Education on May 5th, 1940.

Three years ago, at the meeting of this conference, Dr. Mae Habenicht ably summarized the developments in the field of Child Welfare in Iowa, up to that date. Because of the comprehensive nature of Dr. Habenicht's report, we shall content ourselves with only a brief review of some of the points made at that time, and devote most of this paper to a report of more recent happenings.

The welfare of underprivileged children in Iowa has long been a matter of concern to various groups and private individuals, but it was not until the conclusion of the first World War that sentiment became crystallized into a wide-spread conviction that the protection and care of children should be the responsibility of the State. The first organized attempt to promote legislation to make possible a more effective safeguarding of the welfare of children was the appointment of the Iowa Child Welfare Commission by Governor Kendall in 1923. This commission made a thorough and comprehensive study of child welfare needs in Iowa, and recommended to the legislature that ten interlocking bills be passed. Only four of the bills were adopted by the 1925 legislature, and these in much modified form. These included a bill creating a Department of Child Welfare in the Board of Control, with power to assign its duties, regulate its procedure, and establish its policies, and bills to license Child Placing Agencies, Boarding Homes, and Maternity Hospitals. Two years later a new adoption bill was passed.

As a result of the action of the 1925 legislature, a Bureau of Child Welfare was established on July 1, 1925. Although this Bureau was empowered to assign its own duties and establish its policies, the lack of adequate supporting legislation and an inadequate annual appropriation (\$5,000) made it impossible for the Bureau to perform those functions which the Governor's Commission had intended for it. The result was that the activities of the Bureau were confined chiefly to making plans for children committed to the care of the State.

In the decade following the establishment of the Bureau of Child Welfare, a number of studies were made in Iowa, to determine child welfare needs, and recommendations were repeatedly made to the legislature, but were completely disregarded, so that the situation in 1935 differed very little from that found by Governor Kendall's Commission in 1924.

PLEASE RETURN TO  
IOWA STATE TRAVELING LIBRARY

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN  
SERVICES - LIBRARY  
Hoover Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

The passage of the Social Security Act in 1935 gave new impetus to interest in the welfare of children in Iowa. Part 3, Title V of this act "authorizes an annual appropriation of \$1,500,000 for Federal grants to the States to enable the United States, through the Children's Bureau, to cooperate with the State public welfare agencies in establishing, and strengthening, especially in predominantly rural areas, child welfare services for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent. The funds are to be used for payment of part of the cost of district, county, or other local child welfare services and for developing State services for the encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community child welfare organization in areas predominantly rural and in areas of special need." The federal funds allotted each State submitting an acceptable plan consisted of an annual grant of \$10,000, plus an additional amount dependent on the ratio between the rural population of the State, and the rural population of the United States.

A State Plan for Child Welfare Services in Iowa was submitted to the United State Children's Bureau in 1936, and was approved, making available to Iowa a Federal allocation of \$37, 325 a year. However, in 1937, when a new plan was submitted, the United States Children's Bureau stated that Iowa's annual state appropriation of \$5,000 for child welfare was not large enough to indicate the existence of a Child Welfare Program in Iowa. Consequently, the Committee on Retrenchment and Reform granted an additional appropriation of \$10,000 per year for both years of the biennium ending June 30, 1939. The 1939 legislature increased the State appropriation to a total of \$75,000 for each year of the biennium ending June 30, 1941, thus making possible considerable expansion in the child welfare program.

In Iowa, the Child Welfare Services program was administered by the Bureau of Child Welfare under the Board of Control from July, 1936 to July, 1937. When the 47th General Assembly established a State Department of Social Welfare, in the spring of 1937, a Division of Child Welfare was created within that Department, to take over a large share of the child welfare functions formerly carried on by the Board of Control. At that time, the Division of Child Welfare assumed responsibility for two phases of the child welfare program - that of services to children, and the licensing and inspection of children's agencies and institutions. Subsequent legislation has made some changes in the administrative set-up of the State Department of Social Welfare, but changes in the child welfare program have been in the nature of extending and strengthening the program in existence, rather than uprooting or supplanting it.

At the present time, the State Department of Social Welfare is administered by a full-time Board consisting of three members. Within the Department are two major service divisions - A Division of Public Assistance and a Division of Child Welfare, each with a Director whose duties and responsibilities are defined by the State Board.

Under the plan now in operation, the program of the Division of Child Welfare is carried out by five Sections in the Division. However, this sectioning within the Division is chiefly for the purpose of simplifying the problem of administration and supervision, and does not imply any clear-cut and mutually exclusive separation in function. Actually, the program is an integrated one, having as its keynote that of "service" to children, with the five Sections working closely together, each serving to make the functioning of the others more effective.

In the Plan for Child Welfare Services covering the present fiscal year, the objectives of the program were stated as follows:

"(1) To establish a Bureau of Child Welfare Services within the Division of Child Welfare which will be a permanent state service.

(2) To extend and strengthen this service and to develop other indicated necessary services with supplementary funds supplied through the Social Security Act, Title V, Part 3.

(3) To coordinate and integrate the normal statutory functions of the Division of Child Welfare with the established services in order that a sound, well organized and efficient state program may be realized for the protection of the children of Iowa 'who are homeless, dependent and neglected, or in danger of becoming delinquent'

(4) To increase the state's interest in and awareness of the problems of its children who are homeless, dependent and neglected, and in danger of becoming delinquent, and to provide the best methods of handling these problems.

(5) To insure services which will meet the needs of every child who comes under the definition of a homeless, dependent and neglected, or delinquent child.

(6) To coordinate all existing facilities and resources available for the care of dependent children in the State of Iowa.

(7) To raise the standards of care of children by utilizing on the state staff a corps of well qualified persons equipped by education and experience to deal with the problems of children, and to encourage the progressive value of that staff by granting periods of educational leave for workers who have demonstrated their ability to profit by further training."

The carrying out of these objectives involves the coordinated activity of each of the five Sections of the Division.

The largest Section of the Division is the Section of Child Welfare Services. It consists of a Supervisor, and 13 Children's Workers who are giving service on children's problems in 18 Iowa counties. These workers are paid by the State, with funds secured chiefly through the Social Security Act, while office space, supplies, mileage, and stenographic service are supplied by the counties. These workers devote the largest share of their time to doing direct case-work with children and their parents, but perform additional functions which include (1) consultation with agencies doing work with children; (2) general community interpretation concerning child welfare needs; (3) investigation of prospective foster homes; (4) supervision of children in boarding homes. This Section works in close cooperation with the Section of Agencies and Institutions, the Foster Home and Consultant Service, and the Section of Psychological Services.

Those counties not included in demonstration units are given service by the Section of Foster Home and Consultant Service. This Section is staffed by a Supervisor and four consultants, each consultant having as her territory one quadrant of the state (giving service in those counties not served by Children's Workers). This Section is charged with the responsibility for setting up standards for boarding homes, and recommending for licensing those boarding homes which meet the standards set up. In performing this function, the Section of Foster Home and Consultant Service works closely with the Director of the Division and other state office staff members. The Consultants, in their county contacts, are engaged in the following activities: (1) consultation service given to agencies dealing with children's problems; (2) community interpretation designed to stimulate interest in child welfare; (3) direct case-work service on a few selected cases, on a demonstration basis; (4) investigation of foster homes; (5) interpretation to agencies and individuals concerning desirable and undesirable practices with reference to the use of foster homes. The Consultants do not hesitate to call on the Section of Child Welfare Services, and the Section of Agencies and Institutions, and the Section of Psychological Services for assistance in making plans for children.

The Section of Agencies and Institutions is staffed by two Consultants and an Acting Supervisor (Director of the Division of Child Welfare). In addition to the function of licensing and inspecting all private child placing agencies, children's institutions, and maternity homes, this Section assumes responsibility for setting up standards for these institutions and agencies, and giving consultation service to executives and board members of institutions concerning general and specific conduct of the institutions or agencies, and any children's problems which exist. This Section also works with the other Sections of the Division.

When the Child Welfare Services program was first put into operation in Iowa, a psychologist was included on the Child Welfare Services staff. In March, 1939, a second psychologist was added. In July, 1939, the Section of Psychological Services was made a permanent service in the State, financed chiefly by State funds, supplemented by federal funds. Since December, 1939, there have been three clinical psychologists on the staff. The Section of Psychological Services provides a means for studying the child in his own community, and interpreting his behavior, personality, and capacities in the light of his social background and physical condition, this interpretation to serve as a guide to those concerned in planning for the child's future. It is in no sense a child guidance clinic of a treatment nature, except in so far as treatment is possible through community interpretation and short-time contacts with the child. This unit was organized principally to make more effective the work of the Child Welfare Services program in the diagnosis of children's cases. At present it works in cooperation also with the Foster Home and Consultant Service, and the Section of Agencies and Institutions. The activities of the Section of Psychological Services are of three types: (1) diagnostic tests and interviews; (2) consultation service; (3) general community interpretation.

An outstanding need in Iowa for many years has been that of adequate provision for training and supervised field-work experience for students and workers interested in the field of case-work with children. A step toward meeting this need has been made this year by establishing an in-service training unit in Johnson County, cooperating with the Division of Social Administration in the State University of Iowa. It is the primary purpose of this Section to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate their aptitude for child welfare work, as a basis for selection of individuals to be given further training, and to furnish field work experience under expert supervision to workers returning from school. This Section is at present staffed by a Supervisor who teaches courses in case work with children in connection with the Division of Social Administration at the State University, and supervises field work on children's cases in Johnson County, in addition to performing such functions as are assumed by County Children's Workers in other counties.

During the four years which have elapsed since Child Welfare Services were first made available to the children of Iowa, various forces have operated in such a way as to make progress difficult, at times. However, in spite of these, very considerable gains have been made in a number of areas. As evidence of progress, we may cite the following.

(1) There has been increased financial support for the Child Welfare program, from the State and Counties.

(2) Each year has brought an increase in the number of counties desiring and using the services of a County Children's Worker.

(3) There has been an increasing use of consultants' and psychological services.

(4) There is a better understanding of children's problems in the counties.

(5) Boarding homes are coming to be used more intelligently.

(6) Standards for boarding homes, child placing agencies, institutions, and maternity homes have been set up.

(7) Agencies and institutions are becoming more interested in studying and planning for children as individuals.

(8) An in-training unit has been started.

(9) Schools have become more interested in making provisions for the exceptional child.

(10) Interest in vocational planning for the adolescent boy and girl is beginning to develop.

Child Welfare in Iowa is on the march, but it can continue only so long as there is the interest and support of the lay public of the State.

Source: Iowa  
Social Welfare  
Department,  
1940

This material is loaned to you by the  
STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA

Aid to Dependent Children is a program of the Social Security Board whereby the Federal government cooperates with the state in setting up a plan and participating financially up to 50% of the cost of developing that plan of caring for dependent children in their own or relatives' homes, providing the state does not pay more than \$18 for the first child and \$12 for each additional child in the home. If the state pays more than this amount the difference is born entirely by the state. Funeral and medical costs are borne by the state in all cases. (The state means either the state government alone or the state in cooperation with other political subdivisions contribute the other 50% of the cost.) Such payments must be in cash to parents or relatives of the dependent child.

In keeping with our population of 696,000 under 16 years of age and other states' experiences it is estimated at least 16,000 children will come under the provisions of this act.

At present, it is costing Iowa \$834,516 (1939) for widows' pensions. In addition, supplementary aid on which we have no figures is likely costing a fairly large sum. Under present arrangement not more than \$2.50 a week can be paid for any child and often this is not sufficient. Also in granting supplementary aid by the relief office other members of the family may be and likely are taken into consideration besides the dependent child.

Many children with relatives are not now eligible and some are in other homes where the county pays for their keep. Some of these children might be eligible under ADC and some families who may be on relief would be eligible under ADC.

With the Federal Government paying one-half the cost it would cost Iowa at least \$1,200,000 for ADC and perhaps \$1,500,000.

As to how much better it would serve the children of the state would depend on the type of law and method of administration.

Source: (Iowa. Social Welfare Dept). 1940

For the calendar year 1939, 8,735 children received \$834,518 in widows' pensions or an average of \$95.54 per child. All counties but Monroe gave pensions and were included in these figures. The number of children, amount of money by county and average amount per child appear below.

County	Number of Children	Amount Paid	Aver. Per Child
Total	8,735	\$834,518	\$ 95.54
Adair	37	3,414	\$ 92.27
Adams	26	2,184	84.00
Allamakee	60	4,447	74.12
Appanoose	101	10,072	99.72
Audubon	41	4,354	106.20
Benton	98	7,904	80.63
Black Hawk	172	20,332	118.21
Boone	74	8,750	118.24
Bremer	74	7,300	98.65
Buchanan	65	6,015	92.54
Buena Vista	55	6,361	115.65
Butler	49	5,818	118.73
Calhoun*	95	6,140	64.63
Carroll*	82	8,291	101.11
Cass*	50	4,922	98.44
Cedar	47	5,465	116.28
Cerro Gordo	144	17,693	122.87
Cherokee	86	7,909	91.97
Chickasaw*	45	4,079	90.64
Clarke	60	4,419	73.65
Clay	66	6,863	103.98
Clayton	72	4,603	63.93
Clinton	261	24,900	95.40
Crawford	41	2,534	61.80
Dallas*	102	7,406	72.61
Davis	43	3,436	79.91
Decatur	138	11,244	81.48
Delaware*	53	5,722	107.96
Des Moines	30	3,328	110.93
Dickinson	41	4,287	104.56
Dubuque*	400	42,811	107.03
Emmet	38	4,135	108.82
Fayette	18	1,848	102.67
Floyd*	89	6,604	74.20
Franklin*	65	4,066	62.55

PLEASE RETURN TO  
 IOWA STATE TRAVELING LIBRARY

County	Number of Children	Amount Paid	Aver. Per Child
Fremont*	1	\$ 96	\$ 96.00
Greene	63	6,974	110.69
Grundy*	21*	2,132	101.52
Guthrie	7	832	118.86
Hamilton	54	6,471	119.83
Hancock	98	9,756	99.55
Hardin*	70	7,409	105.84
Harrison*	110	11,565	105.14
Henry	32	2,072	64.75
Howard	38	3,745	98.55
Humboldt*	73	8,064	110.47
Ida	45	5,492	122.04
Iowa	32	3,895	121.72
Jackson	71	4,206	59.24
Jasper*	99	10,882	109.92
Jefferson	54	4,207	77.91
Johnson	97	11,405	117.58
Jones*	79	7,972	100.91
Keokuk	35	4,592	131.20
Kossuth*	100	10,536	105.86
Lee	154	13,084	84.96
Linn*	260	26,000	100.00
Louisa	9	708	78.67
Lucas*	90	6,908	76.76
Lyon	68	5,237	77.01
Madison	54	3,969	73.50
Mahaska	51	5,370	105.29
Marion	9	368	40.89
Marshall	109	8,717	79.97
Mills	51	3,033	59.47
Mitchell	39	3,321	85.15
Monona*	63	4,637	73.60
Monroe	0	0	0
Montgomery	43	2,671	62.12
Muscatine	86	8,504	98.88
O'Brien	23	2,315	100.65
Osceola	46	4,303	93.54
Page	33	3,234	98.00
Palo Alto	104	7,618	73.25
Plymouth	139	9,791	70.44

County	Number of Children	Amount Paid	Aver. Per Child
Pocahontas*	64	\$ 6,205	\$ 96.95
Polk*	508	46,340	91.22
Potta.	493	53,716	108.96
Poweshiek	46	4,431	96.33
Ringgold	60	3,528	58.80
Sac	84	7,589	90.35
Scott*	350	37,416	106.90
Shelby*	85	8,269	97.52
Sioux	132	9,497	71.95
Story	44	3,563	80.98
Tama*	65	6,773	104.20
Taylor	82	5,797	70.70
Union	77	6,531	84.82
Van Buren	10	448	44.80
Wapello*	85	8,268	97.27
Warren*	81	8,600	106.17
Washington	57	6,124	107.44
Wayne*	38	3,155	83.03
Webster*	88	10,097	114.74
Winnebago	55	5,334	96.98
Winneshiek*	169	8,406	49.74
Woodbury*	438	53,182	121.42
Worth	42	3,795	90.36
Wright	54	5,637	104.39

\*indicates counties where the figures are estimated. It seems likely that the figure shown is not an unduplicated count of children for the year. However, the total amount of money is likely correct.

Our information on number of families receiving widows' pensions is not reliable and the extent of supplementary aid is not available at this time.

During the last calendar year, 106 children either delinquent or dependent were committed by the court to private agencies or institutions, and the court provided homes for 11 children either directly or through the facilities of private agencies. We do not have information on the number of dependent and neglected and number of delinquent children.