

It is because of the thorough lack of education on social lines in our medical schools, while there is after all some medical training in our social schools, that the medical profession in this country, 150,000 of them, find themselves in a very serious situation, confronting a process of social evolution which they are utterly unable to understand and therefore bound to resist. It is perhaps in meetings such as these, where physicians and social workers and practical students of social problems can get together, that we may get some light, so that in the future we shall have some system of medical aid that will take social conditions into consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 P. M.

MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

JUNE 3, 1929

The meeting convened at 3:30 P. M., at the Breakers Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., Miss Dorothy C. Kahn of Philadelphia, presiding.

Dr. S. C. KOHS: When the Program Committee originally planned the round table discussions, we thought in terms of having separate round tables for each division. One for the group interested in family case work problems, another for those interested in delinquency problems, a third for those interested in child care problems and another again for those interested in health or medical problems.

We realized that this was a rather artificial and arbitrary division, but for purposes of convenience we were thinking in terms of this kind of planning. When we actually came to work out the program we realized that it was far more beneficial to combine the Family Welfare and Health groups into one round table and the Child Care and Delinquency groups in another, and in accordance with those arrangements, proceeded to develop our program. In the printed program you will find one round table on Child Welfare and Delinquency with Mr. Jacob Kepecs and Miss Mary Palevsky as co-Chairmen, and another round table on Family Welfare and Health, with Miss Dorothy Kahn as chairman.

As a result of changes in the program, we had to combine both of those round tables into one.

Mr. Kepecs and Miss Palevsky have ceded to Miss Kahn the Chairmanship of this meeting.

With regard to the program for the balance of the afternoon, the following is the arrangement. Mrs. Liveright and Mrs. Davis will present their material to the group and that will be followed up by a discussion. Subsequently, we will have a discussion of the papers presented by Mr. Astrofsky, Miss Frank, Dr. Goldrich and Mr. Simmonds.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Miss Dorothy Kahn, who will preside for the balance of the afternoon.

CHAIRMAN KAHN: A certain presiding officer of my acquaintance was recently given this tribute by one of the speakers. He was told that whenever people came to a meeting at which he presided and at which there were four speeches scheduled, they invariably heard eight. That is not going to be the case this afternoon.

As Dr. Kohs explained to you, we are going to devote the first part of the afternoon to the discussion that was scheduled for this hour. There are a number of members of the volunteer and board member group who are interested in getting away to the meeting of the National Appeals Information Service a little later, so without any delay or without any introductory remarks, which I trust can be fully taken care of by the next speakers, I am going to introduce them.

There are a number of board members in this room, many of them from Philadelphia, and now my home. I haven't been there very long, but I have been there long enough to know that Mrs. Liveright has the repu-

tation of being the professional board member and the professional volunteer. It gives me great pleasure to present her to this group.

THE VOLUNTEER IN CHILD WELFARE WORK

MRS. I. ALBERT LIVERIGHT

I thought that this would be a small group, and therefore I have merely prepared a few very informal topics for discussion. However, I will attempt to give the proper sequence to them and leave the rest to you.

The question of the volunteer in child welfare work is, I think, not so very different from the question of the volunteer in any other field. Let us approach it, at least for the time being, from that angle, and believe that the person who comes into the volunteer field is coming because he or she wants to give a part of his free time to, or convert some time that would be used in some other field into, this particular type of service.

One of the questions in the list of that was sent to me was, "What price volunteers?" In view of the fact that we think of the volunteer offering his or her service, we might evaluate the price at this time, and I should say that it is very high. It certainly is very high for the person who is offering to serve in this capacity. It means a sacrifice of time. It means a great sense of humility. In other words, if that volunteer is to be the kind of volunteer we wish, let me say, her to be, she has so much to learn that her sense of humility is very rapidly developed and that in itself is a very hard price for some of us to pay. The sacrifice may vary, depending upon the time one is already accustomed to giving to community service.

But I think that the price the agency pays is far higher, or let me say, should be far higher, because it means that the agency must give literally, in terms of dollars and cents, of the time of an executive, of a supervisor, of a specialized worker to the training of the volunteer. It may often mean time wasted because you are not always sure that your volunteer, any more than your staff worker, is going to turn out to be just the type you want, but it is worth while, I say, if you get results. So that you have to face that possible loss.

You have to pay for the mistakes of your volunteer, whether it is merely a typewriter tape, whether it is paper or pencil or whether it is a much more serious price, in the terms of some failure on a case contact where you certainly would regret the undersirable situation and yet have to expect something of that kind to happen occasionally, while breaking in a volunteer.

In the terms of misinterpretation, the volunteer is, I think, our greatest loss, because until the volunteer really has become so much a part of the work that she understands what it is all about and not just what a part of it is about, she is likely at the next lunch party or dinner party she attends describe a slice of the work that is very near and dear to you as executives, in such a way that it becomes entirely distorted and subject to misunderstanding. I grant you that this is almost too much to tolerate, yet even such a situation need not spell the doom of the volunteer, if properly handled.

I can go on indefinitely telling you the prices you have to pay, but you probably know them as well as I do. I only emphasize them as a contrast to the advantages that, I think, you gain in the end.

I want to stress the question of the differences between the child welfare worker and the worker in the family field. Mrs. Davis will give you her idea of what the worker in the family field should be, so I will just come

quickly down to my subject. I should say that there are differences and that there are no differences.

There is no difference in the desired approach, in the fact that you want a "volunteer" to come to you voluntarily, not to be pushed into the work, because a mother, or an aunt, or a friend says, "Go ahead and do it," but because the person herself or the man himself really sees in social service something that is of personal value. Then there comes the question of fitness, and that applies, as I see it, to all volunteer workers.

Are our applicants really temperamentally fitted to do this type of work? Certainly many of the people we know are much better in libraries doing research work. They would be very much better with a definite job as a teacher. We must appraise them, and I believe that it is only through volunteer clearing bureaus that these evaluations may be made. I believe that a volunteer clearing bureau can tell you that after it has established itself with a very keen volunteer as chairman. She must be a person who has come through the mill, who knows her community, who knows where to pick and choose, who knows the training that people need for the jobs that are available. She should, I believe, take plenty of time to interview the volunteer, to appraise her experience and her abilities and then send her either to the children's agency or the family agency or any other agency in the community for which she is equipped.

But I think when the volunteer goes direct to the child welfare agency, as happened in the past, we find that it was often simply a prejudice, let us say, or a tradition that brought that person there and not really the thing itself that lured her or the thing to which she really was best able to give her abilities.

So I urge upon you, if you do not come from places where you have volunteer clearing bureaus, to establish them as the very best way of saving this high cost, this waste of an applicant's time and of an executive's time in an effort to work together. Maybe some of these people shouldn't do volunteer social work at all.

The question of recruiting was also presented. There too you have a similar problem, whether it be in family work or children's work. I think the best recruiting is the recruiting done by persons already within an organization. That person knows who is wanted, the type that is wanted. Of course it can be done through groups such as the Junior Councils, through large agencies, and so on, but the difficulty in culling out the people you do not want is so much greater in that way that it means a waste of effort on the part of the volunteer executive as well as many heartaches to persons coming all ready to work only to be rejected.

Some agencies seeking volunteers have large luncheons, and some of the people who fostered such luncheons in Philadelphia are in the room. They will be better able to tell you the value of them. I, myself, am not in favor of that type of recruiting. I think you go to a lot of trouble with small results and face the problem, as stated above, of having too many unselected people apply.

Then the question of the function of the volunteer is, I believe, similar in all phases of work; the matters of interpretation, leadership, community stability and cooperation certainly are distinctly volunteer jobs. The interpretation from the inside to the community at large and from the community into the agency itself certainly are things that a volunteer as a liaison person is well able to do. The stability of the volunteer, in terms of residence in a community as against the changing staff, is something to be considered, and the question of cooperation certainly is one that is almost too obvious to mention.