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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose:

This thesis is intended to present a study of various changes in the program of field services within the Illinois Department of Public Welfare. Specifically, the changes within the administrative organization of these services will be examined with the purpose of identifying the reasons for the changes. It is recognized that a good, clear administrative structure is essential for the effective operation of any program. This is as true in the field of public welfare as it is in any other business. Important changes have been made in administration within public agencies in recent years and this study examines those changes which have occurred in one of those agencies.

The term "field services" as used here refers to those extra-mural services necessary to extend welfare programs throughout a given geographical area. This is a term commonly used in welfare agencies and includes both the people who actually perform these services and the offices they use as headquarters. In this study most of the personnel referred to as "field staff" have had specific training in child welfare, or have demonstrated aptitudes in working with children. The child welfare workers making home visits and community contacts are aided by clerical personnel who help with secretarial services, bookkeeping, and by performing related office duties.
Scope:

The Department of Public Welfare is one of the largest sections of the governmental structure of the State of Illinois. Slightly over one-fourth of the approximately 40,000 state employees are assigned to the Department of Public Welfare. Although the public assistance programs are not now the responsibility of this Department, it does administer twenty-nine institutions, cares for about 50,000 patients of various types, and has numerous offices and clinics throughout the state. Almost one-fourth of the state finances are budgeted to the Department of Public Welfare. The Director of the Department of Public Welfare is appointed by the Governor and is directly accountable to him. There is also a citizens board, members of which are appointed by the Governor, which has an advisory but not policy determining function.

In general, the Department of Public Welfare is responsible for child welfare, including juvenile correctional programs and psychiatric services for children; the care, treatment, and training of certain physically handicapped groups; the hospitals for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. Because of the wide span of activities of this department, it was felt advisable to limit the scope of this thesis to the field of child welfare.

A study of available source material indicated that major organizational changes occurred during a ten year period which had its start in 1942. Closer examination of this material revealed several important steps in the administrative functioning of the field services program. These will be presented and elaborated upon and will form the basis of the conclusions drawn at the end of the thesis.
Sources:

Official orders issued by the Department of Public Welfare have served as an important source of information regarding the subject matter of this thesis. The annual report of this Department for the years 1945, 1949, and 1950, and its magazine, the Welfare Bulletin, for December, 1943; June, 1944; and August, 1944 have also provided helpful data. The report of the American Public Welfare Association dealing with the suggested reorganization of the Department of Public Welfare in 1942, has given much background information for Chapter I.

Method:

At the start of this study the author personally collected all the available material in the files of the Department of Public Welfare which related to the subject being studied. This material fell into the four main sources of information mentioned above. The next step was to read this material and to sort it chronologically. Following that, the author selected the relevant information and studied it for the purpose of identifying the administrative changes and of seeking the reasons for them. This procedure pointed out the three main steps involved and gave the key to the conclusions that have been drawn.

Plan of Presentation:

The presentation of the assembled material proceeds primarily on a chronological basis. An analysis of the changes in administrative structure is given at appropriate intervals in the text. Chapters II, III, and IV embody a description of these major changes, while Chapter V contains the
conclusions. These conclusions, in a sense, serve as a summarization of the main points made in preceding chapters.
CHAPTER II

ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT IN 1942

When one looks at the organization of a field service program in children's work within the Department of Public Welfare in the year 1942, he sees a multiplicity of divisions. He sees various types of services being offered through the following divisions:

1. The Division of Child Welfare
2. The Division for the Rehabilitation of Women and Girls
3. The Division for Delinquency Prevention
4. The Metropolitan Division for Delinquency Prevention
5. The Institute for Juvenile Research
6. The Division for Juvenile Field Supervision
7. The St. Charles Training School for Boys
8. The Geneva Training School for Girls
9. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Children's School at Normal

In one way or another some type of program extramural in nature is operated by each of the above mentioned divisions. Figures 1 and 2 chart these services. Figure 2 presents only those services with which this study is concerned and is adapted from Figure 1.1

In the introductory remarks of a report of the American Public Welfare Association, the following statements are made:

With the exception of fiscal control and management services, similar functions and activities remain uncoordinated at any level below that of the director. Services are scattered throughout the Department and many closely related functions operate quite independently of one another. An outstanding example of this lack of coordination

1 Figures 1 and 2, Pages 6 and 7
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can be found in the field of children's services. . . . The present setup permits approximately ten different types of local community contacts which can be coordinated at no point below that of the Director of Public Welfare. The disadvantages of this arrangement are obvious.2

A closer look at this administrative structure shows that the main offices of the Divisions of Child Welfare and Delinquency Prevention were located in Springfield; the offices of the Division of Rehabilitation of Women and Girls, Metropolitan Delinquency Prevention, and the Division for Juvenile Field Supervision were located in Chicago; the Institute for Juvenile Research had headquarters in Chicago, as did the Division for the Blind. The superintendent in charge of each of these Divisions of the Department was responsible immediately to the Director of the Department of Public Welfare. The field staffs for each Division were headquartered in their own homes and did their own office work there. The field staffs were responsible immediately to the superintendents of the Divisions and their immediate assistants at headquarters.

There apparently was little opportunity for discussion between divisional superintendents and, consequently, group thinking and planning was difficult to secure. In fact this same report points out:

At present serious conflicts exist between the Division of Child Welfare and the Division of Delinquency Prevention. Both divisions operate on a county level and are actually in competition with each other. There is also conflict between the Division of Delinquency Prevention and the Institute for Juvenile Research with the former seeking to build up a duplicate competing service in the child guidance field. This example from the child welfare area merely illustrates the necessity for coordinating related services.3


3 Ibid.
Fortunately, the Director of Public Welfare in 1942, and the Board of Public Welfare Commissioners were aware of the lack of coordination and consequent inefficiency in operation that existed within the Department's field services. The State Department of Finance was also interested in seeing a more efficient and better coordinated program. That department is responsible for the approval of expenditures of state monies and is considered to be the "watch dog" on the state budget. With the approval of the Governor of Illinois, the Department of Public Welfare in early 1942 asked the American Public Welfare Association to make a study of the administrative structure of the Department. This organization provides technical and consultant services and acts as a clearing house for the exchange of information and experience in the field of public welfare.

This study was made by the Director of the American Public Welfare Association, the Chief of the Administrative Service Unit of the Minnesota Division of Social Welfare (study supervisor), and the Executive Assistant of the American Public Welfare Association. The report of the American Public Welfare Association study committee was transmitted to the Director of Public Welfare on April 25, 1942. In his letter of transmittal, the Director of the Association pointed out that the survey staff would not be expected to evaluate the quality of service but would concentrate on organization and administrative management.¹

In its proposal for a reorganization of administrative services, the report recommended that there be instituted the positions of three deputy

¹ Ibid., 1
directors of public welfare, each responsible in turn to the director, one for social services, one for fiscal control and administrative management, and one for mental hygiene. In describing its recommendation and the reasons therefor, the report says that under its plan similar services would be grouped together on a functional basis and fall into the three main services. It felt that this grouping would enable the Department to render much more effective service than in the past. Also, arrangements were made in the social service section to provide for four division chiefs responsible respectively for Public Assistance Child Welfare Services, Services for the Physically Handicapped, and Field Operations. These would constitute a sub-cabinet group which would be responsible, together with the deputy in charge of social service, for developing policies, plans, and procedures for the operation of the field service programs. In connection with its suggestions for a coordinated field service program, the report recommended:

The division chief in charge of field operations will have direct line authority over the district office supervisors who in turn have administrative responsibility for the direction of field activities within their districts.

It is interesting to note that in relation to child welfare reorganization the report recommended:

1. Reorganizing completely the child welfare program.

5 Ibid., 5
6 Ibid.
2. Placing the responsibility for all child welfare work in the hands of one division chief under the social service deputy.

3. Having the parole services operate directly out of the institutions, since the institutional managing office was legally responsible for a child until parole was terminated and because this highly specialised activity should be considered an extension of the institutions' treatment program.7

Figures 3 and 4 chart these recommended changes with Figure 4 representing only the pertinent parts in the social service section.8

Some little time elapsed until it became clear as to how the suggestions of the American Public Welfare Association might be put into effect. As might be expected, these recommendations could not be undertaken without large scale preparations. On September 29, 1943, approximately eighteen months after the report of the American Public Welfare Association, General Order #286 was issued by the Director of Public Welfare. This general order followed closely the recommendations of the study and made the reorganization of the Department of Public Welfare effective as of October 1, 1943. The positions of the three deputy directors were established as recommended and of particular concern to us is the section entitled, "Social Service." It is interesting to note that, in addition to the divisions already referred to, there was included in the responsibilities of the deputy director for social service the supervision of the Division of Trachoma Control and the Division of Visitation supervision of the Division of Trachoma Control and the Division of Visitation

7 Ibid., 6
8 Figures 3 and 4, pages 12 and 13
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RECOMMENDED ORGANIZATION PLAN FOR THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE (SOCIAL SERVICE SECTION)
of Adult: Blind. Included in the institutional part of his responsibilities were:

1. Illinois School for the Blind
2. Illinois School for the Deaf
3. Soldiers' and Sailors' Children's School
4. Illinois State Training School for Boys
5. Illinois State Training School for Girls
6. Soldiers' Widow's Home
7. Soldiers' and Sailors' Home
8. Industrial Home for the Blind
9. State Reformatory for Women
10. Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary

There was included in this same order a statement which is of interest to us: "There shall be established a coordinated field service program by which community contacts will be maintained and services offered." This statement we shall see led to the establishment of regional offices throughout the state and a highly organized degree of coordination of field services.

Summary:

We have seen here a movement from a service which was lacking in coordination—but knew it—to self inspection, with the result that a start was made in the direction of coordination and clear lines of responsibility.

Prior to the reorganization study, these points were noticeable about the services of the Department.

1. A lack of coordination existed below the level of the Director.
2. Headquarters offices of the various divisions were widely separated geographically.

---

9 General Order #286, Department of Public Welfare, State of Illinois, 1943, 1
3. Field personnel did not have offices from which to work.
4. Competition between services interfered with constructive program planning.
5. Inefficiency in financing an uncoordinated program was apparent.

Recognition of these facts suggested the urgency of making administrative changes and the need of having this service performed with the help of an outside agency.
CHAPTER III

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL OFFICES

OCTOBER, 1944

Following the promulgation of General Order #286, the Director's staff made plans to implement the statements contained therein. The Welfare Bulletin, an official publication of the Department of Public Welfare, in referring to this General Order, points out that this regrouping of services on a functional basis is really only the first step in providing the best preventive and rehabilitative service to the citizens of Illinois.1

This report goes on further to outline some of the objectives to be accomplished through this order:

1. The establishment of the clearest possible lines of authority for the purpose of achieving effective direction of all work. Describing definite lines of authority will facilitate the issuance of directives and will eliminate confusion in the execution of plans. A definite line of administrative authority may be established and those services which are consultative and technical rather than administrative will be considered as staff functions. The duties and responsibilities of each employee must be clearly defined and be understood by the employee if he is to function in the most efficient manner.

2. Better coordination of functions and services. Within the Social Service there are many functions and services which have operated independently of one another. There is a definite need for coordination

---

of activities on all levels. One of the major problems is the need for integration of field staff. Many of the divisions have their own field staff which work independently, and some of the institutions have personnel which work in the field. This has resulted in the use of several groups of field workers covering the entire state for channeling the services of the Department to local communities. In order to obtain efficient and economical administration, it seems apparent that the field activities of the various divisions must be integrated and coordinated to the greatest possible degree in order to eliminate duplication of effort and travel.

3. More effective program planning and analysis. Careful attention must be given to directing the planning of programs on the part of the divisions and institutions, and these programs will be analyzed and reevaluated from time to time in the light of experience. Programs must be planned with an understanding of ultimate objectives. They also must be planned with reference to programs developed by other divisions and institutions and other state and local welfare agencies, if duplicate services are to be eliminated and conflicts between agencies are to be resolved. The need for frequent analysis and evaluation of programs is apparent. A program plan which was adequate two years ago may not be a sound one at this point because of a change in the nature or extent of the need of persons who are being served by the program. It has been said that it is more difficult to discard a useless concept or to revise a faulty program than it is to develop a new concept or to establish a new program. Difficult as it may be, however, to revise plans in effect at any given time, the task must be undertaken and followed through, if the best possible services are to be made available to our fellow citizens who need help.

4. Improvement of personnel administration. Personnel administration is a major factor in the success with which any program is operated. Programs may be carefully planned, directed, and coordinated but in the last analysis, it is the caliber of the staff, including each and every employee, who determines the quality of service.2

During the intervening months, the Director's staff was hard at work planning for the effective implementation of these suggestions. On May 12, 1946, while speaking at the thirteenth annual delinquency prevention conference, the Governor of Illinois announced the plan to set up regional offices.

---

2 Ibid., 4
He said, in part:

There has been a tendency in recent years for each of the different aspects of the total life situation of a child to generate a separate and specialized agency to watch over it. Many advantages accrue from specialization, as we all well know, but the point at which each agency fails to coordinate its work with every other agency touching the life of the child represents the point of diminishing returns in specialization in this field. We are contemplating, therefore, the setting up of regional offices whose function it shall be to integrate and coordinate in each region the work of the several agencies of the State Department of Public Welfare, concerned with the problems of children. Workers from these agencies will be stationed permanently in each of the regions so that they will be available at all times to local social work agencies, schools, institutions, and citizens.

By this means we hope to avoid unnecessary duplication of our services, and effect a more inclusive approach to the meeting of the needs of children.

Following this announcement of the Governor, additional work was undertaken in connection with the opening of offices and the Welfare Bulletin announced the establishment of seven regional offices. It mentioned that the offices were to be located in Rockford, Chicago, Peoria, Springfield, Champaign, East St. Louis, and Carbondale. A regional representative would be administratively responsible for the operation of the Department's program. It further indicated that the divisions would be responsible for providing technical supervision to workers in the regional offices.

This article goes on to report that an employee of the Department had been selected to supervise this new field service program.

3 "Governor Green's Address Highlights Delinquency Prevention Conference." Welfare Bulletin, June, 1944, 5

The regional offices were opened in October, 1944, and wherever available, staff members from the following divisions were assigned to these offices:

1. Division for Delinquency Prevention
2. Division of Child Welfare
3. Institute for Juvenile Research
4. Division for Adult Blind

Stenographic help was hired for the offices at the same time. The only divisions which did not immediately assign staff were Rehabilitation of Women and Girls and Juvenile Field Supervision. However, three of the regional representatives had been members of the Division of Juvenile Field Supervision and where convenient some members of that division did make use of regional office facilities.

In order to have some general understanding of the responsibilities of divisional superintendents and of the regional representatives at the start of this new plan and so that the individual staff members participating therein would be able to understand their responsibilities, a statement was drawn up and was issued to all concerned:

Under the direction of the Assistant Deputy Director, Field Services, the Regional Representative will have the following responsibilities:

1. Plan organization and supervise operation of Regional Office.
   a. Arrange for and allocate space, equipment, supplies and stenographic service to members of the Regional Office staff
   b. Develop and maintain office routines
   c. Review itineraries, work schedules, time roll, leaves of absence, and vouchers

2. Supervise administratively, activities of regional office staff members
   a. Advise and assist in the development of good public relations, coordination of effort, cooperation with other staff members and organization of work
b. Interpret administrative policies and procedures

c. Approve working agreements and arrangements made with other agencies and organizations in the region (at the regional level)
d. Review reports made to agencies, organizations and individuals
e. Receive from staff members, written reports concerning work done, progress made, and problems encountered

f. Assist in the planning and operation of staff development programs
g. Participate in the evaluation of the performance of staff members, particularly in the areas of public relations, cooperation with other employees in the office, interpretation of programs, organisation of work, and acceptance of responsibility for decisions

3. Direct public relations program in the region

a. Arrange for the interpretation of the Department’s program to public officials, public and private agencies, groups of interested persons, and individuals

b. Advise with public officials, agencies, and local groups relative to local welfare program needs, planning and administration

c. Plan and participate in educational programs and conferences for the purpose of enlarging understanding of welfare problems and methods of dealing with them

d. Develop cooperative relationships with public and private agencies, organizations and public officials

4. Prepare and submit reports on the adequacy of departmental program policies and procedures as reflected in their application to current problems within the region, make periodic progress reports and special reports as requested

5. Serve on departmental committees which may be organized to assist in planning programs, policies, and procedures.

Under the administrative direction of the Deputy Director, the divisions in the Social Service will have the following responsibilities:

1. Plan program for administering functions assigned to it either by law or executive order

2. Formulate policies and procedures for effectuating the program plan

3. Provide technical supervision for members of regional office staff

4. Participate in the planning and operation of staff development programs, with major responsibility for the technical aspects of this function
5. Participate in the evaluation of regional office staff with major responsibility in the area of professional work
6. Participate in the development of personnel standards
7. Cooperate with divisions and institutions within the Department and with other public and private agencies in the development and execution of plans for promoting welfare services throughout the state
8. Interpret program.5

Close attention should be paid to some of the terms used to describe these two types of responsibilities. The divisional superintendents were made responsible for "Technical supervision" while the regional representatives were made responsible for "Administrative supervision." It is difficult to determine exactly what was meant by these terms, but apparently it was felt that the regional representatives would attempt to provide administrative coordination, at least at the start, and the actual professional, specialized supervision would be provided by the headquarters staff of the divisions. For example, in the Division of Child Welfare it apparently was expected that the casework supervision would be provided by staff members of the headquarters office and a similar arrangement was expected for the headquarters office staff for the Division for Delinquency Prevention, Institute for Juvenile Research, and the Division for the Blind. Although there is a description of the administration supervision to be provided by the regional director, the terms used are somewhat nebulous and do leave room for differences of opinion.

5 Deputy Director, Social Service, Department of Public Welfare Illinois, Letter, July 1, 1944.
On March 15, 1945, the deputy director for Social Service issued a directive to the superintendents of the divisions involved in the regional office plan. He mentioned in this directive that some additional minimum procedures had to be established in order to operate the various services in a coordinated manner through the regional offices. At that time he was concerned primarily in seeing that regional representatives were given copies of itineraries and conference schedules; that a master index system was set up; that case records were all filed in regional offices; that copies of correspondence were given to regional directors; that stenographic service was assigned properly; and that reports and expense vouchers were seen by regional directors. This directive, however, seemed not to place any responsibility on the individual staff members to accept the regional representative's direction in connection with any of these points.

On January 1, 1946, General Order #292 was issued by the Director of Public Welfare. This was essentially the same information contained in General Order #286, with the exception that the title of the Social Service Section was changed to Educational and Correctional Service, and one new institution (the Illinois Hospital School for Physically Handicapped Children) was added to the list of institutions for which the Deputy Director of the Educational and Correctional Service was responsible. No changes were made in the responsibilities of any of the line or staff personnel.

On September 17, 1946, approximately two years after the start of the regional offices, the Deputy Director for the Educational and Correctional
Service issued a memorandum to superintendents in the various divisions of that service, regarding the responsibilities of the divisional superintendents and the regional representatives in the administration of field services. He started out by saying:

Recently some questions have been raised by divisional superintendents and regional representatives relative to relationships between them.

Attached is an outline statement which sets forth the responsibilities of divisional superintendents and regional representatives in the Educational and Correctional Service. According to our records, this statement was prepared in July, 1944, and had not been revised since then.

If you have not already done so, please acquaint the members of your staff with this policy statement so that they will be governed accordingly.6

Then follows the very same statement previously mentioned, relating to the respective responsibilities of these two positions. The inference in the last sentence just quoted seems to be that the personnel assigned to the regional offices were still considered accountable in a large part to the divisional superintendent. On August 13, 1948, just short of four years after the inception of regional offices, the Deputy Director for Educational and Correctional Service issued a memorandum to divisional superintendents in which he refers again to relationships with regional offices and points out that, in order to effect a more efficient operation of the Department's program in regional offices, all assignments of staff members to any regional office should be cleared through the assistant deputy director who is in charge of

regional offices. He also points out that:

In order to protect the gains the Department has made in coordination of programs and public relations at the regional level, it is necessary for state office personnel to notify the regional representative when they plan to visit the region, to fill speaking engagements, or to carry out other duties within the region.7

On March 14, 1949, General Order #292-F was issued by the Director of Public Welfare. This order dealt with the assignment of Parole Agents for boys and girls to the regional offices. The order stated that this was being done, "in order to promote a higher degree of coordination with the rehabilitative services in the Department and to provide for greater efficiency in the treatment of delinquents."8 Previously, we noted that the two divisions responsible for juvenile parole supervision had not assigned personnel to the regional offices when they opened in October, 1944. The intent of this order was to combine the responsibilities of supervision of parolees with the other services conducted through the regional offices. It made the parole agents assigned to the various regional offices responsible and accountable to the regional representative for the proper supervision of the parolees in that region. It gave direction for the housing of all parole records in the regional office, along with records of other divisions, and made the parole service an integral part of regional office services. A further attempt at outlining the responsibilities within the regional office plan was made on April 21, 1949,


in a memorandum from the Deputy Director for Educational and Correctional Service to the superintendents and regional representatives. It dealt with correspondence to and from the regional office and started out with the statement:

Now that the regional offices are headquarters for all field staff and regional representatives are responsible for all the Department's activities in their territory, it becomes more important than ever that the regional representatives be kept fully informed of all situations, policies, and programs.⁹

The purpose of this order was to have all mail going to other sections of the Department go over the signature of the regional representative and all correspondence from the various divisions to the regional office be addressed to the regional representative over the name of the superintendent of the division or institution.

The information contained in this directive stated that all incoming mail from divisional headquarters, from other regional offices, and from institutions was to be addressed to the regional representative and that all outgoing mail to these same offices was to go out over his signature. We notice here for the first time the strengthening of the role of the regional office in the administrative structure of field services.

The next major development in the historical evolution of the field service program was the establishment on July 1, 1949, of the Division of Field Services. This was done by General Order #292-H issued by the Director of Public Welfare. It was a very brief and introductory order and in effect

---

established this division to assume the functions formerly carried by the two parole divisions and the seven regional offices. Approximately two months later, on September 8, 1949, the Director of Public Welfare issued General Order #292-I, relating to the Division of Field Services. At the start of that order, he stated:

During the time the regional offices have been in operation, it has become increasingly apparent that what was needed was a clear cut line of command from the office of the Director to the staff in the field, and a clear cut line of responsibility and accountability from the field staff to the office of the Director. To bring this about requires some clarification and redefinition of functions for the regional offices and divisions.10

The main provisions of this order included the following:

1. The assistant deputy director of the Educational and Correctional Service was appointed superintendent of Field Services.

2. All field services for children, youth, and the physically handicapped provided by the Educational and Correctional Services were to be administered through the regional offices.

3. Division superintendents and their state office staff were to function as staff officers. The regional representatives were to function as line officers under the immediate direction of the superintendent of Field Services, who in turn would be responsible to the Deputy Director.

4. All employees assigned to the regional offices were considered to be members of the regional office staff. These employees were to be responsible and accountable to the regional representatives.

5. The division superintendent would not send any policy or procedural instructions directly to regional office staff. These were to be submitted through the superintendent of field services.

6. The line of contact concerning operations in the regions would be through the superintendent of field services and field staff was expected to report to the state office through that same channel.\(^{11}\)

We see here a fairly clear-cut line of responsibility for superintendents and regional representatives. Thus, the line of command was straightened out and, in keeping with what is generally understood as "line and staff responsibility," the headquarters office personnel were to assist in planning and policy making but would not have the responsibility for seeing that these would be carried out by field personnel. This responsibility was vested in the superintendent of field services and in regional representatives.

We see, also, that the regional office plan was now raised to a status of a division with equal rank of other divisions. It was considered the operating arm of the Educational and Correctional Service out in the field and its personnel all were to have "line" responsibility.

Summary:

We have seen in this chapter the implementing of the recommendations reorganizing one section of public welfare service in Illinois. During this five year period, we see a clarification of the roles of the superintendents

\(^{11}\) Ibid., 1
of a division and of the regional representative. The latter's duties changed from being responsible mainly for general administrative details to being responsible for program direction and personnel performance. The superintendent became a staff officer with advisory responsibilities, as well as policy determining functions. These changes were made gradually as it became necessary to look at the type of service each of these positions could be expected to perform.
CHAPTER IV

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

AS OF JULY 1, 1952

For three years the field services program operated under the direction of General Order #292-W. No additional orders were issued in regard to administrative responsibilities until June, 1952. The 67th Illinois General Assembly in 1951, passed legislation which required each department to prepare and publish a set of rules and regulations governing its operation. General Order #298 of June 10, 1952, announced the issuance of these regulations for the Department of Public Welfare.

Administrative regulation #1 dealt with the organization of the entire Department of Public Welfare and superseded all orders previously issued. It is interesting to note that this regulation also adhered in its general format to the main recommendations of the American Public Welfare Association study of 1942, in that it also maintained the positions of the three deputy directors, although there were slight changes in their titles. The three major divisions of the Department were now termed "Services" and were designated: the Mental Health Service, the Educational and Correctional Service, and the Administrative Service, and each was immediately responsible to a deputy director, who in turn was responsible to the Director of Public Welfare. Figures 5 and 6 are administrative charts which depict the new lines
of responsibility. Figure 5 shows the organization of the entire department and Figure 6 shows the organization of the Educational and Correctional Service. In the introductory portions of this regulation, there was the following statement:

The two operating branches of the Department are the Mental Health Service and the Educational and Correctional Service, which will cooperate fully in any overlapping or common area. Mental Health Service and the Educational and Correctional Service shall administer for the Director, the institutions and non-institutional, and field services engaged in the departmental programs of mental health, education, and correction. The Administrative Service shall serve the two operating services of the Department. The operating services shall have responsibility for all activity connected with providing welfare services to the public, except for certain staff services hereinafter described, and primarily relating to fiscal, statistical, personnel, engineering, home economics and nutrition, and other functions which in the interest of efficiency and economy are centralized and made the responsibility of Administrative Service; provided that matters of significance are cleared with respective operating deputy directors.

This order again confirmed the line of responsibility from the institutional superintendents to the deputy director of the Educational and Correctional Service. It spelled out the name of the institution and the fact that the superintendents "shall have the authority for the program and operation of their respective institutions, shall be responsible to the deputy director for such operation." For the first time, also, we see a major change in the responsibility of the superintendent of a division within the Educational and Correctional Service.

1 Figures 5 and 6, pages 31 and 32.

2 Department of Public Welfare, Illinois, Departmental Rules, Administrative Regulation #1, June 10, 1952, 1.

3 Ibid., 8
FIGURE 6

DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION AS OUTLINED ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION NO. 1, JUNE 10, 1952
(EDUCATIONAL & CORRECTIONAL SERVICE DIVISION)
Correctional Service. There was established the position of an assistant deputy director for field services who was made immediately responsible to the deputy director of the Educational and Correctional Service. The field service program "through which community contacts shall be maintained and services rendered," was to be administered by the assistant deputy director for field services. He became a line officer with line authority and the superintendents of divisions were made consultants with staff responsibility.

The assistant deputy director for field services was expected to:

1. Be responsible for the direct supervision of the regional offices, under the general direction of the deputy director.
2. Review policies and procedures recommended by consultants.
3. Be responsible for the administration by regional directors of the programs operating through the regional offices.
5. Be the liaison between the deputy director and field personnel.
6. Act as the liaison between the field offices and the Mental Health Service and the Administrative Service.

This same regulation changed the title of regional representative to regional director. In describing his duties, these points were mentioned:

1. He was to function as a line officer, immediately responsible to the assistant deputy director for field services.
2. All field services for children, youth, and the physically handicapped were to be administered through the regional offices.
3. All employees assigned to regional offices were considered to be members of the regional office staff and to be responsible and accountable to the regional director.

---

4 Ibid., 8
5 Ibid., 8
6 Ibid., 9
A good description of line and staff activities is:

Line activities are those which are carried on by the operating bureaus to discharge the agency's responsibilities for program operation.

Staff activities constitute the auxiliary services of planning, research, statistics and others which are essential to the operation of all of the agency's programs. Most of the staff activities are carried on by service bureaus, although strict exclusion of these activities from operating units would militate against efficiency of operation. 7

As was previously mentioned, the role of the superintendent was changed from partly line and partly staff responsibility definitely to that of staff responsibility alone. His responsibilities were intended to include:

1. Providing professional and technical guidance in the programs administered by the Educational and Correctional Service.
2. Rendering consultative service in his specialty to the deputy director of the Mental Health Service. 8

The consultants were made administratively responsible to the deputy director for Educational and Correctional Service. It should be noted that this regulation makes an exception in one part of the responsibilities of the consultant on child welfare. For the purpose of licensing of children's agencies and institutions and for the administration of plans authorizing the use of federal child welfare funds, he was considered to be a superintendent of child welfare services and in that capacity was made immediately responsible to the Director of Public Welfare. Provisions were made, however, for him to

7 Marietta Stevenson, Public Welfare Administration, New York, 1938, 168
8 Administrative Regulation #1, 9.
carry out these duties by delegating, with the approval of the deputy director for Educational and Correctional Service, specified duties and responsibilities to the regional directors of field services.

Summary:

In reviewing the intent of this administrative regulation, we see rather sharp lines drawn between the responsibilities of the line officer and the staff officers. We see that policies were to be decided by the deputy director with the help of the consultants and when agreed upon would be passed down the line through the assistant deputy director to the regional director.

This order left little doubt as to the type of responsibility assigned to the consultant and to the regional director. It repeated a statement contained in General Order #292-I to the effect that all personnel in the regional office were to be considered members of that office and were accountable to the regional director. This order went beyond that General Order in scope, since it definitely and clearly changed the divisional superintendent's role to that of a staff person.

We might at this time look more closely at the duties of some of the consultants. The consultant on child welfare was given the responsibility for preparing staff development programs in his specialty, of assisting in the recruitment and preparation of training programs for child welfare personnel, of assisting in the location and development of public and private resources for the care of dependent and neglected children, was responsible for the development of standards for child care and was expected to offer consultation
services in the field of child welfare to judges, courts, and organizations concerned with the welfare of children. He was also expected to serve as a consultant in the field of child welfare to the deputy director of Mental Health Service, insofar as there were children's services in the field of Mental Health.

The consultant on parole was also expected to assist in the preparation of staff development programs, in making recommendations concerning policies and procedures in the field of parole and was expected to initiate and develop research projects in the field of juvenile parole, and to assist in the preparation of training programs for technical parole personnel.

The consultant on youth and community services was expected to plan and outline policies and procedures relating to community programs for juvenile delinquency prevention. He was to submit plans on conferences aimed at the prevention and reduction of delinquency. He was to assist in the location of public and private resources in the field of delinquency prevention and make information available to the operating staff, and to assist in developing resources when they were lacking.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters we have seen the main steps in the evolu-
tion of a field service program. One general conclusion we can draw is that
making major administrative changes takes a long time—in this instance it
took ten years. Some of the other salient features which this study points
out are listed below, not necessarily in the order of their importance:

1. We see here another evidence of decentralization of government.
At the beginning of this period it was necessary for people seeking services
from the Department of Public Welfare to "shop around" from one office to
another until they finally found what they wanted. This was eliminated by
bringing these services together under one roof in a centrally located town
of a major section of the state. A further geographical breakdown has act-
tually taken place by the setting up of sub-regional offices in some regions,
thus, bringing these services into more intimate contact with local communi-
ities. These steps were good public relations moves, since they enabled the
personnel of the Department of Public Welfare to bring their story much closer
to the citizens who support these programs, as well as the citizens who bene-
fit from them.

2. During this period there has been quite a change from the organ-
izational structure characterized by the American Public Welfare Association
report as "lacking in coordination" to a reasonably tight administrative line of command. Contrast Figure 1 with Figure 5, and Figure 2 with Figure 6. One can easily see in Figure 6 very clear lines of responsibility and accountability.

3. The responsibilities of the superintendent of a division have been clarified and he and his headquarters office staff have been freed for what they can probably best do—act as consultants in their specialties and as aides in determining top level policy. Research and writing, two parts of the welfare job that are often necessarily neglected, can best be performed by the consultant staff in this plan.

4. With the responsibility for personnel performance and program interpretation placed in the hands of the regional director, that function is also probably where it can best be performed. With a clarification of his responsibilities, he can avoid confusion and delay in following out his line of command.

5. As a result of these changes, personnel in the regional office had an opportunity to know clearly what their responsibilities were and to whom they were responsible. Moreover, these same people were able to learn more about all the services of the Department and could thus interpret them better to their clients. With the tightening up of administrative lines, there was more opportunity for all employees to be treated equally. The same rules applied for all personnel issued through the same line officers for all

---

1 American Public Welfare Association, Report, 1942, 3
personnel. The same benefits accrued to all personnel through these same lines. Personnel administration became more nearly uniform.

Ground work has been laid for regional offices truly to become the headquarters for all Department of Public Welfare services. As has been pointed out, regional offices serve primarily the Educational and Correctional Services of the Department of Public Welfare. However, some other programs of the Department of Public Welfare have begun to use the regional offices as centers for their activities. Personnel of the new Division of Reimbursements, which is responsible for the collection of payments for the hospital care of the mentally ill, have been assigned to regional offices. Some of the outpatient clinics operated by the State Hospitals use the regional offices when they are in these towns.
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