UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Harold L. Ickes, *Secretary*

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
J. W. Studebaker, *Commissioner*

COORDINATION OF EFFORT FOR THE EDUCATION OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

REPORT OF A CONFERENCE CALLED BY THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Compiled by

ELISE H. MARTENS

Senior Specialist in the Education of Exceptional Children

BULLETIN, 1935, No. 7

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1935

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - Price 10 cents

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

There are some 20 or more voluntary organizations of national scope devoted primarily to the education and welfare of various types of exceptional children. The members of some of these organizations scarcely know of the existence of other agencies in allied fields. The policy of actively coordinating the work done for the respective groups has in past years been practically nonexistent, although all exceptional children have certain common needs that can best be met through mutual understanding and cooperation on the part of leaders in the various fields.

The White House Conference of 1930, recognizing the importance of greater coordination of forces related to the education of exceptional children, urged that the United States Office of Education perform the services of a coordinating agency in this respect. The Office of Education, while ready to accept the responsibility, has been hampered by lack of adequate financial provisions with which to carry on a suitable program. However, in the year 1934–35 special funds were made available through which an exploratory conference on the problem could be realized. Fifteen educational, psychological, and medical leaders, representing the eight groups of exceptional children, met in Washington on November 1 and 2, 1934, at the call of the Commissioner of Education to consider the possibilities of furthering a cooperative program for all groups concerned. A general summary of the conference and the contribution made by each member to its deliberations are the content of this report. These augur well for the continued development of a coordinated program if the sentiments expressed by members of the conference are indicative of general opinion on the subject. The Office of Education offers its services toward the realization of a more nearly integrated program of work for excep-

tional children and hopes that leaders in the field may use their efforts in the same direction.

To all who participated in the conference and contributed so generously toward its success, the Office of Education expresses its grateful appreciation.

BESS GOODYKOONTZ,
Assistant Commissioner.

COORDINATION OF EFFORT FOR THE EDUCATION OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

PART I

Origin, Purpose, and Summary of the Conference

IN NOVEMBER 1930 the Committee of the White House Conference on Special Classes for the Handicapped and the Gifted included in its report a recommendation that the United States Office of Education look toward the appointment of a national advisory council "to advise in the formulation of and assist in sponsoring a comprehensive educational program" in the interests of exceptional children. The groups whose needs were considered by this committee were (1) the deaf and hard of hearing; (2) the blind and partially seeing; (3) the crippled; (4) the speech defective; (5) children of lowered vitality; (6) the gifted; (7) the mentally retarded; and (8) the emotionally or socially maladjusted. The committee pointed out that such a national council acting under the leadership of the Office of Education "could perform a great constructive service by bringing about a better understanding of the educational needs" of all these groups of children and a greater coordination of effort on the part of national organizations and State agencies interested in their educational welfare.

Due to financial reasons it was 4 years later before the Office of Education saw its first opportunity to take the initial step in carrying out this recommendation. On November 1 and 2, 1934, fifteen representatives of the various groups gathered in Washington at the call of the Commissioner of Education to consider the possibilities of promoting greater coordination of effort in the interests of all exceptional children. Since available funds were limited, and also since the conference was largely of an exploratory nature and was to constitute primarily a working group, it was limited to this small number of persons, representing

the types of activities being carried on by voluntary organizations of national scope. Many other persons and other organizations might have been included with profit to the conference had it seemed feasible to make of it a comprehensive gathering of all leaders in the education of exceptional children.

The conference was convened by Assistant Commissioner of Education Bess Goodykoontz, who expressed the gratification and appreciation of the Office of Education that the meeting had become a reality. She said in part:

> Since the Office of Education does not have a laboratory school nor classes of any kind under its administration, we depend to a large extent upon the assistance that you can give us in permitting us to visit your fields of work or in bringing desired information in to us. Any day that one of you could come in to see us and confer about the problems in your respective fields would be a very helpful one indeed to us, but to have all of you in at one time makes this a red letter day in the program of the Office of Education, and we are grateful to all of you for coming to give us your views and counsel on our common problems.
>
> As you will see by the announcement that has been handed to you, we are calling this a Conference on Coordination of Effort. There are, of course, a great many problems in the education of exceptional children. First of all there is the problem of locating them and diagnosing their difficulties. Then there are problems of providing special educational provisions for them, of securing adequately trained teachers, and of developing curricula that are suited to the needs and capacities of the respective groups.
>
> But it has seemed to us that there is still another important problem, namely, that of laying out a plan of the whole field of education for all kinds of exceptional children, and of seeing something of the extent of the problem, of its seriousness, of the agencies that are working in various fields, of the areas that are not adequately covered or served, and of the common needs of all groups. That is what we mean by a conference on coordination of effort in the education of all groups of exceptional children.
>
> Possibly we might say a little about what we do *not* expect the conference to be. We did not have in mind that it should in any way be an attempt to define the work of various agencies or to restrict the activities of different groups, for all of us recognize that there is far too little instead of too much being done. The purpose of the conference is to enhance the work of all organizations rather than in any sense to limit or define.
>
> We have been rather slow in carrying out the recommendation of the White House Conference that the Office of Education serve as a

coordinating agency of this type. But now at the very first opportunity offered we have invited you to come in to think over the problems that we have in common, to give us your very helpful advice, and to get a bit better acquainted with one another.

Assistant Commissioner Goodykoontz then introduced Commissioner of Education John W. Studebaker, who gave the official greetings of the Office and expressed his interest in the education of exceptional children as well as his purpose to work toward greater coordination of effort in their behalf. He said:

> Through my experience as a school administrator, I know what a difficult matter it is to bring such coordination about. I am convinced that we should state as many of the principles as we can envisage dealing with coordination of effort, and then proceed to set up such administrative machinery as will enable us to put into actual effect and give practical reality to those principles that we can clearly endorse.
>
> One of the great troubles is that the care and education of exceptional children have developed as Topsy did, and all over the country we still find maladjusted children tucked away in dingy basement rooms. What we need is a program, the expense of which is shared by the Federal Government, States, and local communities, looking toward the provision of adequate building facilities and adequate instructional facilities for all handicapped children.

Of deep significance was the contribution made by Mrs. Roosevelt, who had graciously accepted an invitation to speak briefly at the first session. She expressed herself as feeling that past conceptions of what we should do for children through education have been wrong. "Our aim", she said, "ought to be not to give every child the same type of education, but to find out as early as possible to what each child responds and what lines he should follow. We should then probably achieve much better results than we are today." She also emphasized the fact that the cost of education is less than the cost of *laissez faire*, since handicapped adults cost a great deal more to the community if proper adjustment has not been made than do special educational facilities for handicapped children which will help them to help themselves. Legislators, citizens, administrators, teachers, and parents must all be willing to face reality and to provide the type of education which each child needs.

Four major questions had been proposed by the Office of Education for consideration at the conference, namely:

1. What are the major problems in which the Office of Education can be of assistance to representatives of the various groups of exceptional children?
2. In what ways can representatives of the various groups of exceptional children be of assistance to the Office of Education?
3. In what ways can representatives of the various groups of exceptional children be of assistance to one another?
4. How can the Office of Education and representatives in the field work together toward a better coordinated program for all groups of exceptional children?

Each conferee made a special contribution in answer to one of these questions and entered freely into the discussion of all questions. The problems overlapped one another sufficiently to make possible a repetition of and emphasis upon certain suggestions in successive sessions of the conference. There proved to be such marked agreement on the fundamental points considered that a brief summary may be given which is quite representative of the group thinking of the entire conference.

ATTITUDES AND ATMOSPHERE

It was emphasized again and again, for example, that through the United States Office of Education should be developed that "coordinating atmosphere" through which individuals working with various types of exceptional children will come to know one another better. It was urged that both the Office of Education and workers in the field should by all possible means encourage the attitude of "each for all and all for each", with isolation of no group and discrimination against none; that representatives of various groups should show a greater willingness not only to look upon one another without distrust but to appreciate common problems as well as one another's problems, without necessarily knowing one another's techniques. Finally, attention was called to the fact that "special education is only a spe-

cial case of education in general", and that all agencies must therefore stress the points of contact between regular and special groups and enter into active cooperation with general education.

DESIRABLE SERVICES

The possibilities of services to be rendered by both the Office of Education and workers in the field were considered at length. Among those of major importance for which it was hoped that the Office of Education might be able to develop increasing facilities were (1) the conduct of surveys and of legislative and other studies that would be of special value to those concerned with the education of exceptional children; (2) the formulation of suggestive standards for teacher training and selection, for curriculum, methods, organization, admission to special schools and classes, State plans of supervision, and for the solution of other pertinent problems; (3) the development of a more extensive "on call service" for informational, advisory, and technical assistance; (4) the promotion of progressive movements involving legislation for and enumeration of exceptional children, better provision for rural communities, coordination between day schools and residential schools, administrative set-ups that will bring the education of all types of exceptional children under the same general direction, inauguration of pre-service training in the essentials of special education for all teachers, and continued in-service training that will help them to recognize and to take steps toward the correction of serious maladjustments in children.

Representatives of specific groups can in turn cooperate with the Office of Education (1) by keeping before their respective organizations the needs of *all* types of exceptional children; (2) by interpreting the problems of the respective groups to the Office of Education; (3) by suggesting investigations that should be carried on; (4) by giving and encouraging prompt and complete replies to all requests for information; (5) by encouraging local organization for the education of exceptional children as a unit, with all groups under the same administrative direction; (6) by using locally the resources of all existing organizations in the interests of a coordinated program.

Working together, the Office of Education and representatives in the field can do much to establish a philosophy of special education and a definition of its purposes and objectives, with an understanding of the whole child, of the needs common to all children, and of the relative values contained in segregation or congregation of exceptional children. By their combined efforts they can arouse the community to a social consciousness of the importance of making adequate provision for the education of exceptional children, put into circulation printed material that will be helpful to administrators, teachers, and parents, and promote an efficient organization that will reach *all* children who need special educational services.

CULMINATION OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference culminated in a luncheon meeting, at which Commissioner Studebaker presided and at which both representatives coming to Washington and members of the Office of Education expressed their gratification at the values accruing to them from this opportunity of coming together. Mutual appreciation and information, a better understanding of the work of the rest of the "family", stimulation to put into practice in a local area or field the ideals for which the conference stood were some of the intangible values one heard talked about at that meeting. Commissioner Studebaker injected a very concrete element into the discussion when he told of his hope to effect better building facilities for the education of exceptional children through Federal emergency aid.[1] With an expression of sincere appreciation of his efforts in this direction, the conferees voted endorsement of a program that might mean for all types of exceptional children improved conditions in housing, voicing at the same time, however, the need for an increase in qualified personnel and general facilities for the organization of special classes.

Repeatedly throughout the conference came the request for more meetings of the same type, even at the financial expense of organizations or individuals, or in connection with other conventions. Regional conferences, too, sponsored by

[1] At time of printing, no developments had taken place in this direction.

the Office of Education, were urged as a valuable means of drawing people together. If the Office of Education sees its way clear to follow these recommendations, there will be problems of personnel to consider, as well as problems of organization and arrangement. On all of these it wishes to act cooperatively and will welcome suggestions from those who are vitally interested in the cause. If the conference held in 1934 was a demonstration of the fact that we need only to be brought together in friendly, thoughtful deliberation to appreciate one another and the significance of the common program in which we are all engaged, it augurs well for the results of future conferences that may carry on the work that has been begun.

PART II

Contributions Made by Members of the Conference

Because of the significance of the conference and of the contributions made by its various members, the papers which were presented constitute an important part of any report of its proceedings. They therefore appear in somewhat abbreviated form in the following pages. It should be noted that, while each person spoke from the standpoint of his own particular field of work, each one gave clear evidence of an appreciation of the needs of exceptional children other than his own special charges.

The papers should be read with a realization of the goal of the conference—to increase mutual understanding and coordinated service. They are presented in the order in which they were given, each one being grouped with others that were offered under the respective questions placed before the conferees for consideration. Much informal discussion took place during the conference which was stimulating and enlightening but which because of lack of space is not reproduced here. This report of proceedings is limited to a record of the prepared papers.

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR PROBLEMS IN WHICH THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION CAN BE OF ASSISTANCE TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN?

1. May E. Bryne, *Director of Special Education, Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minn.*

The problems which I shall cite are those major ones which seem to me to be common to all types of exceptional children—the gifted, the handicapped, and the emotionally unstable—with, of course, necessarily different applications to different groups.

The first problem is that of *attitude* toward the exceptional child—the attitude of the parent, of the educator, and of the general public. I think it is not necessary for me to enlarge or elaborate upon this topic, since I am sure you all know the typical reactions one finds toward the handicapped child. We are very familiar with them because we encounter them many times.

The second problem is that of *early discovery and diagnosis*. Every worker could cite instances of having found a child early enough to make it possible to give the type of training needed. But we also come in contact with large numbers of children who have not been discovered at an early enough age, and we see the unfortunate results.

The third problem that I should like to raise is that of *adequate provision* within the school organization. To date, with the exception of a few cities, there is no special provision for gifted children. Comparatively few cities provide for the blind or partially seeing, and even in those cities which have long boasted of their care of exceptional children there are many things to be desired. The preference is always given to the larger group, and exceptional children have often been relegated to basement rooms and been otherwise neglected in the organization of the school program.

The fourth problem which presents itself is that of *training*. Who knows or cares to say what is the best type of training for the gifted child? Have the objectives even been outlined definitely? For the handicapped group we have gone so far as to outline such objectives as minimizing the handicap, development of special aptitudes, and preparation for living within a normal group. But do we know the most desirable requisites for obtaining those objectives?

The training of all types of exceptional children is still largely by the trial and error method. To make it otherwise we need a well-defined program of research. That brings me to the next problem, that of *research* to evaluate results. This, I believe, is one of the weakest points in our program for exceptional children. Too little has been done in the evaluation of teaching methods, types of organizations, or follow-up work to enable us to know whether or not the type of training that is being given has fitted these children to find and to maintain a place in the community.

The sixth problem is that of *guidance*. For several years we in Minneapolis schools have formed the practice of making individual case studies of physically handicapped children when they are leaving the eighth grade. We have collected such data as scholastic knowledge, special aptitudes, social status, and personal desires. When all these data are collected we have held conferences and have hoped that through group thinking we could give the necessary guidance. To these conferences we have invited teachers and principals, medical experts, counselors, rehabilitation agents, and other interested persons. We have been confronted by two difficulties. In the first place, there is a dearth of knowledge of the occupations which these people can successfully carry on, and, in the second place, there is generally a lack of cooperation on the part of the employers even in giving the handicapped persons a trial.

These, then, are the major problems as I see them. To outline the problems has been a very simple matter, because problems always stand out in any line of endeavor. One has no trouble in finding out what the problems are, but to suggest to a Federal office what it can do to help us meet the problems is more difficult.

I am going to make my suggestions in relation to the problems as I raised them. With regard to the attitude of parents and educators and the general public, I am aware that that is a problem of education and that time is a factor to be considered. I am aware also that in the past 20 years there has been a change of attitude on the part of all these agencies toward exceptional children, and I am convinced that the major effort must be made by the local community. Yet we are so busy meeting the local administrative problems that we do not give as much time as we should to the matter. We lose sight of the philosophic and mental hygiene aspects and also of the need of an educational program in the community to further the work. We need definite stimulation along these lines. Suggestions for programs, radio features, compilations of articles would all be helpful.

The second problem mentioned is the early discovery and early diagnosis of exceptional children. The preschool clinic immediately comes to one's mind. I was interested, in another conference held by the Office of Education earlier this

week, to know that normal colleges in the State of Pennsylvania are thinking of instituting clinics at which children of school age may be examined and diagnosed. That is a beginning which could easily lead to the organization of preschool clinics. We need all the encouragement that the United States Office of Education can give in this direction.

The third problem is that of adequate provision within the school organization. I feel very strongly that if the seeds of desirable attitudes could be planted in the teacher-training period and then fostered and nurtured through a program of education for exceptional children, they would bear fruit of great value in actual organization of the work. We have outlined philosophies of education. A short, understandable, and workable philosophy for each type of exceptional child could be formulated by a representative group and submitted to workers in the special and general fields of education. In all our efforts I am convinced that the emphasis should be placed upon the positive points of contact between the regular and special groups instead of upon their differences.

The next two problems I can consider together, those of training and of research, because they are very closely related. I think that the Federal office rendered an excellent service when it collected in a symposium the curricular practices over the land for mentally retarded children and made them available to teachers in that field. I wonder if it would not be possible for that to be done in other fields, and if teachers of other types of children would not find it just as helpful as did teachers of retarded children. We cannot know whether or not our training is of value unless we have research to prove it to us. I know that the Federal office did attempt such a program of cooperative research, but owing to lack of time and money local communities were unable to cooperate to the extent to which it was necessary to insure substantial results.

The last problem is guidance. I wonder if the people who are engaged in rehabilitation work should not be able to furnish us with more data than we have had in the past as to the types of occupations in which handicapped people could engage. I wonder, too, about the value of regional

conferences. I know that those of us who were here during the first part of this week benefited greatly from the group conference which we held on curricular problems for retarded children. If the Federal office could sponsor such conferences on the problems of various types of exceptional children, we should all receive much guidance for ourselves as well as suggestions for guiding the children under our care.

2. MRS. MARJORIE BELL, *Assistant Director, National Probation Association, Inc., New York, N. Y.*

I shall speak from the point of view of the delinquent and the socially handicapped child who is often handicapped physically and mentally as well as socially. I think the label "delinquent child" is an unfortunate one because it seems to classify a child in an entirely false way, but it happens to be a convenient term to describe the child who presents a serious problem of adjustment. In speaking briefly here I am going to accept the idea that the "delinquent child" is the one who has come before the juvenile court.

The thing I want to emphasize, which is a little different, of course, from the points that are being brought up by anyone else in this group, is the relationship between the school and the other agencies that are dealing with this problem of the delinquent child. The importance of the problem I am sure you already know, but the fact that there are about 200,000 children every year coming into the juvenile courts is some gage of the extent of it. Those 200,000 are probably only a minor part of the whole group of children who are really in need of some type of special treatment and educational care.

We know from experience and from studies that have been made that the child who comes into the juvenile court as delinquent has already been known as a problem child in the schools. He has probably been recognized definitely as such for at least 2 years previous to the time when he comes into the court for some specific delinquency.

The juvenile court as a social agency is only about 35 years old. It started out ambitiously with the idea that the delinquent child should be separated in treatment from the

adult criminal. If we could only say that this is actually being done after 35 years we should have some reason to be proud of its achievement. There are, perhaps, a half dozen really good juvenile courts in the United States. There are some States in which there is no juvenile court procedure which justifies the name. There are children all over the country being treated almost as much like adult criminals as they were 35 years ago. Children are held in jails, children are tried—actually tried—like adult criminals, even though the court itself may go by the name of "juvenile court." We are a long, long way from the realization of the juvenile court as a true social agency.

In the beginning the juvenile court was expected to do a real job of caring for the child, supposedly as a parent would care for him on the happy assumption that the State would take the place of the parent in his training. We have developed that theory in the gradual progress of juvenile court work. At the same time the schools have undergone a development of philosophy in which they have become social as well as educational agencies, so that in a sense the two are meeting, each one being both a social and an educational force.

There are the extremists who believe that all problems of delinquency should be handled by the schools. There are the other extremists, who, I am glad to say, are getting fewer and fewer, who think that all school problems—all problems centering, of course, in truancy and distinctly school-behavior problems—should be cast upon the juvenile court, in order that the big stick of legal authority may be held over the child and may somewhat relieve the disciplinary strain in the school.

The question of how far the school can go in handling the delinquent child is partly a jurisdictional, partly a practical one, also partly a question of the whole philosophy of education. There is no limit, of course, to what the school can do from the educational angle through the early recognition of the unadjusted child, and through the use of all of the resources of the school, such as the visiting teacher service and the clinics. Most important of all are the attitude and approach to the subject on the part of teachers and

principals. We are putting the burden of responsibility for adjusting the child more and more upon the school.

However, there are certain practical considerations which limit the program of the schools in handling cases of delinquency. The juvenile court must have actual legal jurisdiction which could not be transferred to the school altogether without converting the school into another juvenile court. In that case there would be no real differentiation of function. It is a handicap of the juvenile court as a social agency that it is necessarily a court of law, but in the last analysis we cannot get away from that fact. However, as it develops properly and idealistically, the juvenile court is trying to minimize that aspect of its work as much as it possibly can.

The relationship of the court and the school is one in which all of social work and education is concerned. This relationship has worked out in various ways in different communities, some successfully and some very unsatisfactorily. I have visited many courts and schools throughout the country, and I find that in a great many cases so far as the problem child is concerned the juvenile court and the public school are not working together at all. In the first place they are very often not evenly developed. That is, you may have a very progressive school system and a very backward juvenile court, or you may have the reverse situation. You have in many cases a lack of understanding on the part of each of the proper function of the other, and back of that I think very often neither the school nor the court, nor indeed the community, has a clear idea of what it should do for the delinquent child.

The school, for instance, frequently complains that the court does not stand back of the teacher in enforcing discipline when school problems are brought into the court. If the truant child is placed on probation instead of being sent to a truant school, the school may allege that the juvenile court is not fulfilling its function because it does not support the discipline of the school.

On the other hand, the court may fail entirely to see the school point of view. In one city the juvenile court announced that the school was to have nothing more to do with

any cases of truancy, that by being brought into court they became court cases and were no longer school cases. There was, of course, an utter lack of cooperation, teamwork, or understanding of the problem in that city.

Truancy is as individual as any other child problem, there being as many causes for truancy as there are truant children. But as a symptom of delinquency it furnishes a very good illustration of the need of the close cooperation of the two agencies, the juvenile court and the school.

One of the things in which I should like to see the Office of Education interest itself is the study in various communities of the working policy or relationship between the court and the school. Such a study would open the way for a much wider understanding of relationships among all the agencies. It would make it possible for the court and the school to clarify their own particular problems, to define their respective functions, and to work toward a better cooperative program.

3. MRS. WINIFRED HATHAWAY, *Associate Director, National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, New York, N. Y.*

Being a representative of a national organization, I am acutely aware of the inadvisability of interfering in State or local rights, but it would be a marvelous achievement if the Office of Education could imbue the various organizations, official and unofficial, national, State and local, educational, medical, civic, and social, with the understanding that, aside from remedial measures and deviations in educational technique, the question is not whether a child is lame or blind or deaf or gifted, but rather how any exceptional child can be given the greatest opportunity to make the most of his possibilities.

The Office of Education has already been of untold assistance to these groups of exceptional children by issuing pamphlets dealing with various phases of work, and by news releases and other publicity acquainting the public in general with the necessity for making possible such educational and other advantages as would enable these children to take their places in the social order. Perhaps the Office of Education may carry this good work still further by presenting in its official bulletins a greater number of articles and items

of real help and interest to those having the education of these children as their direct concern.

The Office of Education can be a power in influencing institutions for the training of teachers to include in their curricula courses that will give prospective teachers at least a fundamental understanding of the needs of the various exceptional groups. Courses in health education and in social and mental adaptation would appear to be some of the logical avenues for introducing this work. Such courses would not result in producing teachers specially trained for the education of specific groups, but they would assist greatly in giving a basic understanding of the many problems and in helping teachers who will later serve in small communities, where few opportunities exist, to meet the situation to the best advantage of the exceptional child.

The Office of Education may also be able and willing to take a stand for rational demonstration schools in connection with teacher-training institutions—demonstration schools representing a cross section of society such as any teacher would be likely to meet in her educational experiences—demonstration schools having a majority of classes for non-exceptional children but at least a sufficient number of classes for exceptional children to give prospective teachers a working knowledge of how such classes are organized and conducted, of necessary equipment, of desirable physical surroundings, and of the possibilities for social adjustment between the exceptional and normal child. Such demonstration schools might be patterned somewhat on the plan of the Ann J. Kellog School in Battle Creek.

The discussion of the second part of the subject assigned—"How can the Office of Education be of help to the particular group in which you are interested" (the partially seeing)—will exemplify the principles of service for all groups. Since all of those present may not be familiar with sight-saving classes established for partially seeing children, it may be well to say that this group consists of those who, after everything possible has been done for them, have too little vision to make use of the ordinary school equipment but too much to benefit by the education for blind children. It also includes children with seriously progressive eye de-

fects that require careful safeguarding of their sight. The great services that could be rendered this group would come about chiefly through cooperative research.

The differences of opinion existing among ophthalmologists, educationists, and others as to just what children should be included in this group, leads to constant confusion. A child moving from one State to another, and sometimes even from one city to another, may be a candidate in the one instance and not in the other. Cooperative research on the part of the Office of Education and the medical authorities in order to clarify admission standards would be of great help.

Although much research has been undertaken to determine the size of type that is best suited to the use of school children of various ages with so-called "normal vision", very little has been done for the deviate. In the beginning a 36-point type was used for the partially seeing. Difficulties immediately arose because of the small amount of material included in the eye span and an experimental piece of work was undertaken with the small groups then in sight-saving classes that resulted in the use of a clear type in 24 point. Subsequently, when efforts were made to induce the manufacturers of typewriters to produce a machine in this same type, it was found that two banks of keys would be necessary. The disadvantages of this arrangement seemed so far to outweigh the disadvantages of a smaller type that letters of approximately 18 point were used. Since the majority of the pupils seemed to be able to read this size somewhat better than the 24-point type because of the greater amount of reading material included in the eye span, an experiment is being carried on at the present time of presenting the Girl Scout Handbook for the partially seeing in such type. This, however, is being carried on by the trial and error method. What is definitely needed is scientific research to determine what is the most advantageous presentation. This is becoming the more necessary since experiments carried out with small groups of partially seeing children on the European continent are tending to result in the recommendation of the use of the same size of type for these children as for the normally seeing.

The most urgent need, however, is for research to determine not only what professions or occupations partially seeing children may safely undertake but which ones would open for them a real source of earning a living. Such research should naturally be followed by making possible training for such professions or occupations. The problem becomes more pressing every day. For almost every job the supply is greater than the demand; hence partially seeing people have less chance than ever before of obtaining employment.

Another service that might be rendered, if it lies within the province of the Office of Education, is to define what children should be considered candidates for schools for the blind. It is a well-known fact that because of the advance in medical science, and because of educational and social activities for the prevention of blindness, there is a marked decrease in the number of blind children. Unfortunately some schools for the blind are attempting to build up their falling registration by making efforts to bring partially seeing children into these schools. This is unfair to both groups. The schools for the blind are intended for those who, because of lack of vision, must use the sense of touch rather than the sense of sight as the high-road of educational approach to the brain. The school is and should be adapted to their needs. Even where special equipment is provided for the partially seeing in such schools, isolation from the normal group, association with the blind, and often the use of their service for assisting the blind militate against their best development. Moreover, any unnecessary removal from their home environment not only violates modern social principles but places an unnecessary burden upon the taxpayers.

If it lies within the province of the Office of Education, it would be a service to humanity to help provide for schools for the blind the same medical advantages given to children in regular school systems, so that those children might be discovered who by operation, treatment, or glasses could probably be restored to the seeing world and that they might have the necessary care and attention in order to bring this about. That there are such children in many schools

for the blind is a blot upon the educational system of America.

For the rural partially seeing child the Office of Education may give service in using its influence to encourage the formation of sight-saving classes in consolidated schools or in counties or sections of counties; in influencing State libraries to include in their traveling units books in large type for the use of partially seeing children in isolated sections. It might even initiate, in cooperation with other agencies, correspondence courses for the help of teachers of such children.

But the greatest service of all that the Office of Education can render is to help the great school system of America to safeguard the eyesight of all its children by taking advantage of every scientific advance in medical knowledge, by securing physical environment conducive to health, and by training the children themselves in the principles of hygiene, so that the decrease in eye difficulties will finally eliminate the necessity for special education of the partially seeing.

4. ELBERT A. GRUVER, *Superintendent, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.*

The deaf are disturbed in heart and mind. They are confronted by unusual and puzzling problems which are causing them deep concern. Hard times have made a lasting impression upon them. Their emotions have been stirred, their thoughts quickened, and their ideas stimulated. They are not easily aroused, but new conditions confront them, new experiences confuse them, and new inventions intrigue them, until it has become very difficult for them thoroughly to analyze their feelings, properly diagnose their troubles, and logically apply a remedy. This is not surprising. We, too, are confounded and confused. Add a physical handicap and the burden becomes heavier and the game of life harder to play.

The deaf are alive to these conditions and are ready to assume the responsibilities they impose, if they are shown the way and given a helping hand. Educators of the deaf are also watching developments and sense a quickening impulse in the public's attitude toward the promotion of preschool, nursery-school, and day-school activities for the deaf

child, in the development of vocational instruction for the deaf youth, and in the application of mechanical devices to aid the hard of hearing in social intercourse and to assist the teacher of the deaf in the classroom.

Close observers in the field of the education of the deaf see a new era approaching. It presents a direct challenge to the teacher of the deaf. In meeting this challenge, we must rediscover ways and means in the classroom, rethink policies, and revamp programs in order to meet the terms of the industrial civilization of the present.

The United States Office of Education is organized to render active service in solving these problems. It has on its staff able and progressive school men and women, putting its best into its aims, purposes, and policies. It has numerous departments and committees at work on the basic problems coming within its scope and operates as a clearing house for national, State, and local educational forces, bringing together these forces in a cooperative whole, participating and comprehensive in its action. In the natural course of its operations, it provides through competent persons Nation-wide channels for the dissemination of information on all types of educational endeavor, thus increasing public appreciation of the various activities and the abilities of the groups affected. It cooperates with other agencies in collecting, cataloging, and distributing information and material about the educational, industrial, and social activities of the deaf and has as its near neighbor and helper The Volta Bureau for the Diffusion of Knowledge Relating to the Deaf. Nowhere else is there so comprehensive a storehouse of valuable information regarding the deaf, ready for instant use and quick dispatch to all points, as is contained in the Volta Bureau.

The activities of the United States Office of Education must be general in character because of the nature of its organization and the type of work it is expected to perform. It cannot, therefore, be occupied actively in working out details of operation. These must be delegated to conferences and committees. I, therefore, suggest the following in discussing the major problems in which the United States Office of Education can be of assistance to the deaf.

ACADEMIC ASPECTS

Deaf children should receive special instruction and training in small classes in accordance with their particular needs at the hands of well-prepared and skillfully trained teachers. To this end:

1. The Office of Education might by National and State conferences and surveys determine the educational and physical needs of the deaf child, arrange suitable and adequate programs in the several fields of education and urge all schools and organizations handling deaf children to adopt them as their guide and goal, to the end that all deaf children may have opportunities for a broad educational development, a liberal vocational training, and proper guidance in physical and social growth.

2. It might urge that all schools for the deaf teach speech and lipreading to all the pupils all the time, not in the nature of propaganda or for the exploitation of any method of instruction, but as the God-given right of every deaf child to be equipped to meet the world in as normal a manner as possible. To this end every useful educational device and mechanical aid should be employed.

3. It might emphasize better qualifications for teachers by insisting that every teacher of the deaf have adequate preparation, thorough training, and liberal experience before being given a class to teach. In no other way can the deaf child receive proper training.

4. It might encourage the establishment of part-time and evening classes in academic subjects for the adult deaf.

5. It might circulate correct information to the general public regarding the abilities of the educated deaf, their possibilities and their adaptability to employment from which deafness does not bar them, so that more doors of opportunity may be opened to them.

VOCATIONAL ASPECTS

All deaf children should receive special training of the hand under the direction of competent teachers. To this end:

1. The Office of Education might urge all school authorities under whose jurisdiction there are classes for the deaf to provide suitable industrial instruction by the establish-

ment of vocational departments where possible. Particularly should this be done in day schools for the deaf.

2. It might promote the operation of part-time and evening classes in vocational instruction for the unemployed deaf.

3. It might encourage every agency to assist in securing employment for the deaf. The German plan of compelling employers to give deaf people jobs in proportion to the whole number of people employed is not to be condemned as a policy, for an employed deaf person makes a happy and contented citizen. The Office of Education can render valuable service by cooperating with other organizations in arousing public opinion against unjust discrimination of the deaf in employment and by creating public opinion in favor of their employment. Many deaf workers are equal and some superior to hearing competitors.

SOCIAL ASPECTS

The deaf as a group, because of their handicap, are barred from many social and civic activities, except those inaugurated for them and those promoted by themselves. In view of this:

1. The Office of Education could greatly assist by lending its influence and cooperation in disseminating useful information to the general public, to parents of deaf children, and to the adult deaf, through existing publications or by periodical bulletins.

2. It could promote through conferences and by bulletins a national movement among parents of very young deaf children to safeguard their health and welfare by securing the best possible medical and educational advice; by suggesting preschool and nursery school advantages, and offering programs for home occupation and training, thus bringing the school and the home into closer sympathy and cooperation.

3. By virtue of its organization and position, it can render great service in an effort to coordinate the various activities for the deaf by urging cooperation whenever and wherever possible and elimination of duplication of effort, unnecessary conflict in instruction, hair-splitting differences of classification and growing confusion in terminology, all very wasteful

of time and energy and detrimental to the cause of education and training of the deaf. There are now too many national organizations, social and educational in character, interested in the welfare of the deaf, each with its small coterie of supporters, striving one with the other for position and prestige. Their activities overlap, directors interlock, objectives clash, and activities conflict, thus weakening rather than strengthening any good cause contemplated.

It is very encouraging to see the efforts put forth in recent years by groups of teachers and others toward coordination of activities by joint meetings and conferences, but we have done little more than arouse a lukewarm desire for sympathetic cooperation. It will require intelligent guidance on the part of the leaders and earnest effort on the part of educational authorities to bring together the various groups in a cooperative spirit. Each group has its own policies and problems. The activities of the groups interested in the deaf may seem peculiarly difficult of coordination, but it would be too pessimistic to regard their problems as impossible of solution. The time is long overdue for an alliance of the efforts of all the national groups in a concerted forward movement for a fuller and richer academic, vocational, and social development for the deaf. The possibilities of such an alliance under the inspiration of the United States Office of Education fires the imagination and encourages the determination to renewed effort toward the culmination of such a worthy undertaking.

IN WHAT WAYS CAN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN BE OF ASSISTANCE TO THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

1. ELISE H. MARTENS, *Senior Specialist in the Education of Exceptional Children, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.*

If there is anyone in the Office of Education who has reason for gratitude for the many helpful things that have been done by representatives in the field, I am sure it is I. Throughout the 4 years during which I have been in Washington I have experienced so genuine and generous a response on the part of all who are interested in the education of exceptional children that I should like to begin the dis-

cussion today by giving you a few concrete examples of what you are already doing to help us—you and others whom you represent.

In the first place, this very conference seems to me to be an outstanding example of the cooperation we are securing from people in the field. The fact that you are willing to leave your work at home to come here and discuss some outstanding problems with us is a genuine mark of cooperative spirit. The conference which was concluded yesterday is another example of the same type. I never saw a group of 13 people work harder in constructive thinking than those who were with us on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday to consider the problem of curriculum construction for mentally retarded children.

The second way in which genuine cooperation has been given has been through the assistance of the organizations interested in specific types of exceptional children. I might remind Miss Timberlake of the number of letters that have come into this Office which have been referred to the Volta Bureau for additional information, perhaps even for all the information which could be given to the inquirer. The Office of Education does not propose to exercise that influence in the field which involves all the technical details of knowledge required in the education of exceptional children, particularly in the field of the physically handicapped. So when we receive letters asking for help that we are not able to give ourselves, we are generous enough to pass them on to someone else who can answer them satisfactorily. The Volta Bureau as a near neighbor has been exceedingly helpful in this respect; so also the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, the American Foundation for the Blind, the International Society for Crippled Children, and other organizations represented here.

A third source of great assistance to the Office of Education are the city school systems. What would we do without the willingness of city school officials to report the work that they are doing? Some of you are familiar with the Biennial Survey of Education issued by the Office of Education, which gives detailed statistical analysis of school conditions,

including the education of exceptional children. We depend upon the officials of city school systems for reliable statistics regarding the enrollment, personnel, financial status, and other items bearing upon the operation of special classes organized within their precincts.

About 2 years ago we conceived the idea of compiling a number of accounts of group activities or classroom units which would be suitable in the education of mentally retarded children. The only means through which those accounts could be secured was through classroom teachers who were working with mentally retarded children. So we sent out a call to about 50 cities and as a result received more than 200 manuscripts. It was impossible to print all of these, but a selected number were included in a bulletin on "Group Activities for Mentally Retarded Children", which has been much in demand everywhere. Such cooperative projects are among the most effective means of developing the program for which we all stand.

May I go next to the help that has come to us from the residential schools? All of the residential institutions for exceptional children are called upon every 4 years to answer questions giving statistical data as to enrollment, age distribution of pupils, types of work offered, and other items. An analysis of the data is then made in this Office, and the report becomes available for distribution.

With these examples of what is already being done to help the Office of Education, may I offer a few questions for your consideration in the furtherance of our combined program?

First, would it be feasible for you who represent national organizations to see to it that copies of the materials issued by your organizations, or at least announcements of the same, are sent to this Office for use in bibliographical work and for reference in answering inquiries? Similarly, we should like to receive reports from city school systems; from residential schools, and from any other type of agency representing exceptional children. If you can promote and encourage that practice, not only in your own immediate offices but through your national association meetings and at local or regional conferences, it would be of extremely great value to the Office of Education.

Second, would it be feasible for you, again perhaps through your national organizations, to promote and encourage complete and accurate returns on the questionnaires that are sent to you? I know questionnaires are a nuisance, but we must depend upon them for the preparation of periodic reports giving needed information regarding day schools as well as institutional schools. Both the biennial survey of education of exceptional children and the quadrenial survey of work being done in the residential schools are in great demand.

Third, can you cooperate in securing desirable revisions of these questionnaires? We are always looking for ways to improve our methods of work, and we need your suggestions in making the forms we use both practicable for securing information and helpful for disseminating it.

Fourth, and last, can you tell us from time to time about the problems that you think need investigation, or about the service that you would like to see us give? You have been doing it here this morning, and we are grateful for it. Even though we are often hampered by lack of facilities or funds, and need to plan our program most economically, yet we are eager to encourage continued cooperation resulting in our knowing the things that you would like to have us do and in your helping us to achieve the most desirable ends.

2. CHARLES SCOTT BERRY, *Director, Bureau of Special Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio*

The following are some of the ways in which representatives of the various groups of exceptional children can be of assistance to the Office of Education:

First, I would suggest that we request the Office of Education to continue the beginning they have already made in carrying out one of the recommendations of the White House conference, that of furthering a coordinated program for exceptional children. The committee which made that recommendation had primarily in mind the thought that the Office of Education is Nation-wide in scope, acting in an advisory capacity, not an institution that has any authority to tell us what we should do. As I look upon it, the Office of Education has wonderful possibilities from the standpoint of

service and research. My first suggestion, then, would be: A continuation of the development of a coordinated program that looks to the Office of Education for leadership. If letters requesting that the Office of Education carry on this work were received by the Office from representatives of various organizations in diverse parts of the country, a tremendous leverage would be gained toward securing the necessary funds for its continuance.

Second, I think we would do well to ask the Office of Education to conduct a national survey of all phases of special education. Dr. Cooper, while Commissioner of Education, had this in mind when the financial avalanche overtook us. At that time not fewer than five national organizations had requested that the survey be made. I would suggest that we submit repeated requests for such a survey. When one bears in mind the funds that are being expended on various projects throughout the country, it would seem that now is the time to bring the matter of a survey once more before the Commissioner.

Third, I would suggest that we express to the Commissioner our appreciation of the work that is now being done. Write directly to the Commissioner, not to any member of the staff. It will naturally come to the attention of staff members in the course of time. If the Commissioner knows that we appreciate the work that is being accomplished, he will have additional reason for requesting funds to undertake larger projects.

Fourth, I wish to reinforce the recommendation that has already been made, namely, that we reply as promptly as possible to requests for information with regard to the work that we are carrying on in our respective fields. One can readily see that the returns that will be forthcoming later on will be of so much worth that we will be amply repaid for the effort we put forth in that direction.

Fifth, I would suggest that we ask the Office of Education to secure as full information as possible with respect to existing legislation in the various States on the education and care of different types of handicapped children. It is almost impossible to ask any individual organization to keep up to date on legislation. In some of our States the advis-

ability of overhauling existing legislation is being considered, but it should be undertaken in the light of what has already been done in other States. The Office of Education has library facilities. If sufficient requests were received to enable them to secure the necessary information and to keep it up to date, they could serve as a valuable clearing house in this connection.

Sixth, I would suggest that we request the Office of Education to make as soon as possible a study of State support for the education of the various types of handicapped children. I do not know of anything more lopsided at the present time than the support that is now being given. In some States there is an abundance of support for some types of handicaps and nothing for others. After all, we are interested in helping the child who needs aid, regardless of the nature of the handicap. The various national organizations are tremendously important because each one has facilities to do specific work along a given line, but that does not mean that every organization is not interested in other types of handicapped children. Nevertheless, certain types receive much more aid than others because some organizations have been very active in developing community interest in these children. A good deal of public sentiment has been created and pressure brought to bear upon the State departments of education and upon legislatures by these active organizations. Through their influence progressive legislation for some types of handicaps has been obtained in certain States. In those same States, if there were a coordinated program, the chances are that we could secure equally good legislation for other types as well. Right now I don't know what the most valuable form of State subsidy is for this type of work. I know it varies greatly in different States and is changing more or less. We now have the problem in Ohio as to what we should attempt to do in the next few years in the way of legislation.

Seventh, I think we should turn to the Office of Education for information with regard to the advisability of extending the age of the census down to the first year of life. This is done now in a few States. In the State of Ohio, for instance, census enumerators are supposed to se-

cure information in regard to the blind, the deaf, the feeble-minded, and the crippled as early as the first or second year. However, in looking up the matter I find that this law has been enforced only in a few counties. The next thing to do, then, is to see if we cannot bring some influence to bear so that requirements set up will be carried out.

Eighth, we should use the Office of Education as a central clearing house for information in regard to projects. Tomorrow, in Ohio, there is to be a meeting of representatives of three organizations interested in exceptional children for the purpose of considering the advisability of undertaking a State-wide survey of the handicapped. We need all the information that is available with regard to surveys that have already been made in other States. If we cannot turn to the Office of Education for such information we must send out letters to all parts of the country in order to obtain it. An immense amount of duplication of effort is thus entailed which could be avoided.

Finally, there is one other suggestion that I have in mind which is of a little different character. Bear in mind that at the present time, as nearly as we can determine, we have special schools and classes for probably not more than 10 percent of the children who are handicapped. The remaining 90 percent are in the regular schools. I would suggest that this Office make use of every opportunity to call together representatives of various organizations, including superintendents of schools, for a discussion of ways and means of educating regular grade teachers in order that they may become alive to the importance of this problem. With about 90 percent of the handicapped children under their care, it seems to me that we, as organizations, cannot afford to lose sight of the importance of seeing if our influence cannot extend over into that large group. For instance, there will be a meeting of the superintendents' branch of the N. E. A. in February. Why should not this Office invite in a few of the progressive superintendents of the country, on their way to the convention, for a round-table discussion of some of the problems in regard to handicapped children? It would entail no expense to the Office, and I am sure that by bringing together a few of these men and

getting their reactions with regard to the best procedure of awakening an increased public sentiment in favor of caring for all types of exceptional children, much more can be accomplished than if we work only within our own groups.

3. KATHRYN MAXFIELD, *Director, Arthur Sunshine Home and Nursery School for the Blind, Summit, N. J.*

It is difficult to suggest ways in which representatives of organizations working with and for exceptional children can be of assistance to the Federal Office of Education without ascribing to that Office definite functions in connection with which public and private organizations might cooperate. However, there are certain duties toward the Office of Education which such organizations might well assume.

Information.—Probably the most important duty of these organizations should be that of interpreting to the Office of Education, through their representatives, their problems and general point of view. The trends of thought and the practices prevailing in the various fields should be communicated to the Office and suggestions made to it regarding ways in which it can stimulate improved procedures. The most obvious and by far the simplest step to be taken in keeping the Office of Education properly informed on trends and practices is that of seeing that it is on the mailing list for all publications, including annual reports. All organizations doing research work in connection with the care and training of exceptional children should keep the Office informed of research which has been completed as well as important studies which are under way.

Reporting on basic statistics.—Often national organizations have in their files the most reliable figures obtainable on causes of mental or physical disability, the number of children suffering from a given handicap or group of handicaps, the chances of educational and vocational success of such children, and other topics relating to their respective fields. However, at least in work for the blind, there is a definite realization that the best figures are far from adequate since they are likely to include data from parts of the country in which slight local interest has been shown in the discovery, care, and training of exceptional children.

Representatives of national organizations, as well as of some of the outstanding local institutions, dealing with exceptional children might cooperate with the Office of Education in deciding what types of basic information should be gathered by the Office, to be kept in a continuously checked file.

If this were done, these organizations should agree to collect these data from local agencies, public and private, throughout the country; the data should be sent to the Office of Education for permanent record, the collecting agencies reserving the right to keep a copy in their own files. If they could arrange the duties of their staff members so as to provide for this service as part of their regular program, the Office of Education would be assured of their continued support. It might even be advisable from time to time for some group of organizations to cooperate with the Office in sending out a trained worker to stimulate interest in the welfare of exceptional children and to gather information in sections of the country which have thus far shown little initiative in this particular field.

Cooperating in specific fields.—There are certain small and hitherto neglected groups of exceptional children which it seems to me should be the special concern of the Office of Education because of the fact that they belong to no other existing organizations. They are the groups of children suffering from more than one handicap who are so few in number that existing schools and other organizations are not prepared to give them proper attention. The group with which I have had most to do is that of the deaf-blind. Neither schools for the deaf nor schools for the blind are prepared to assume heavy expenses for the training of the one, two, or three such children who may come to their attention during a period of 2 or 3 years, and yet throughout the country as a whole there are enough deaf-blind youngsters to benefit by training in some central institution. Every thoughtful person who has had experience in the training of these children feels sadly unqualified to meet their problems. Much experimental work needs to be done on both the psychology and education of deaf-blind children, especially at the preschool level. The establishment of a central institution for the education of the deaf-blind would

fill a need at present almost entirely unmet. Before the Office of Education could undertake such a proposition, however, local organizations throughout the country would need to make thorough surveys of their localities in order to report to the Office the number of such children, together with their ages, causes of deafness and blindness, and age at which these handicaps were first noted. It would be desirable to have the probable degree of mentality reported also, but since the usual conclusion with regard to small deaf-blind children seems to be that of assuming that they are feeble-minded, such records might be very misleading. The doubly handicapped child, whatever his handicaps are, who is also known to be mentally superior, should be reported to the Office of Education in order that it might be looking toward the right provision for his future, both educational and social.

How can useful and willing service by workers with and for exceptional children be assured to the Office of Education? My suggestion would be that an advisory council be established, composed of representatives of the various groups of exceptional children who would meet with staff members of the Office of Education at stated intervals. The representatives of the organizations probably should be recommended by such national organizations as the American Association of Instructors of the Blind and the organizations for the deaf and hard of hearing which represent both individuals and institutions throughout the country. Any such appointees should be approved by the Office of Education. The members of this advisory council should work with the Office of Education in developing a better rapprochement among the groups of workers for exceptional children whom they represent and the Office. They should also be of service to the Office of Education in helping to shape its policies relating to these special groups.

4. SMILEY BLANTON, *President, American Speech Correction Association, New York, N. Y.*

Speech difficulties fall into two fields: (1) Those caused by organic injury or defect of the brain or paralysis of the nervous system, caused before, during, or after birth, and (2) those found in children who have some lack of brain

development or who have had some infection of the brain or nervous system which causes weakness or paralysis.

The speech disorders caused by organic disease and injuries of the nervous system are very much smaller in number than those caused by emotional difficulties. Though these organic difficulties constitute only a small percent of the speech difficulties they should receive our attention. Children with such defects cannot adjust themselves to the world or even act in a fairly intelligible fashion. These cases require definite and specific training in corrective phonetics. For example, a boy suffered from a birth injury which left one side of his body partially paralyzed. This interfered with his articulation so that his speech was very imperfect. The boy's intelligence was intact and he was able to graduate from high school. He had some knowledge about practical electricity. I was able to get him several jobs but he lost them all because the people with whom he came in contact thought he was insane or feeble-minded because of his imperfect speech. If this boy had received adequate training for his speech at the proper time he could have made a good psychological and economic adjustment.

The White House conference estimated that approximately 1,000,000 children in the United States (about 5 percent of the school population) have handicapping speech defects. Various surveys which we have made in the school system during the past 20 years lead us to the more conservative statement that at least 3 percent of the children of the public schools of this country have definite and handicapping speech defects.

The American Speech Correction Association (formerly the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech) sent out a questionnaire to all school superintendents in towns of 10,000 or more, asking what speech work was being done for children with speech defects. Replies were received from about 50 percent of these school systems, and it was found that only 5 percent of them were carrying on any speech correction whatever; and that at least 3 percent of the children enrolled have some definite speech defect. This means that some 700,000 children in our schools are struggling with a very serious problem.

I believe that the Office of Education could be of great help in creating a desire on the part of the schools in this country to meet this problem which affects so many hundred thousand children. Perhaps this could be done by sending out a pamphlet under the auspices of the Office of Education which the American Speech Correction Association will be glad to prepare for the approval of the Office.

Speech disorders in which there is a large emotional element may be listed as follows: (1) Indistinct speech; (2) Lisping speech; and (3) Stuttering and stammering.

About one-half of 1 percent of school children stutter. The number of stutterers in our schools is not fewer then 200,000. Such children suffer from a definite and specific emotional difficulty, an anxiety state—subtle and elusive sometimes, sometimes more definite—which prevents them from adjusting themselves in a satisfactory manner to their playmates, to their school work, and to the world in general. The stuttering child, because of his feeling of anxiety and timidity, develops marked feelings of inferiority in his relation to other people. Sometimes a child may stutter by substituting one word for the other. There is no outward sign that he has a speech defect. It may be asked: Why do some children stutter because of fear and others do not? Probably in those cases in which anxiety causes stuttering there is some inadequacy in the speech mechanism, so that fear and anxiety interfere with the proper functioning of the complicated and delicate speech mechanism.

Most stuttering makes its first appearance when the child begins to talk and practically in all cases stuttering occurs before the ages of 6 or 7. The most effective time for treatment, therefore, is in the first two or three grades of school. Also, an opportunity here is offered for working with children of preschool age in the home. Preventive work must be accomplished by bringing to the parents the knowledge of mental hygiene and child guidance which will help to prevent the development of stuttering. The best work will be accomplished with children with speech defects by teachers well trained in speech correction practice who will teach these children during the first few years of school life. If teachers of this type can be placed in the schools, many of

the speech defects can be cured altogether and most of them can be reduced to a large degree before the children reach the higher grades.

There are many colleges and institutions now that are training teachers to do speech-corrective work. I mention only a few: The College of the City of New York, University of California, University of Iowa, University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin. If, therefore, there is sufficient call from the schools for trained teachers in speech correction, there are enough training places to fill the needs for the immediate future. However, there never can be, as far as I can see, enough special teachers of speech provided to deal with all the children who have some speech difficulty. Therefore, the problem must be met, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many school executives, in some other way.

In the Department of Special Education of each school system there should be enough teachers who have specialized in speech correction who can correctly and adequately supervise the work of speech correction throughout the whole school system. These teachers who specialize in speech correction should be trained not only in phonetics and public speaking, but in psychiatric social work and in mental hygiene as well. These teachers can help train certain of the grade teachers to do some of the speech-correction work, the grade teachers being allowed a certain period each day for this work.

I believe that in all teachers colleges there should be courses for all graduates giving the fundamental facts of speech defects, their causes, and treatment. This training need not be so thorough as that of the specialized teacher, but it should be thorough enough to enable the graduate to know something of speech disorders and to cooperate with the teacher who specializes in speech correction. If the classroom teachers could be assigned for an hour or so a day to devote their time to speech-correction work supervised by the teacher in speech correction, we might be able to meet this problem. Mrs. Raubicheck, Director of Speech Correction Work in the New York City schools, believes that this is the only arrangement which will enable us to reach the

large number of children who have speech defects in our public schools. If the classroom teachers who do this extra work could be given some relief from other duties, perhaps a very small amount of extra pay, it might facilitate the plan.

If, therefore, the Office of Education could see its way clear to bring to the attention of the school systems throughout the country the great number of children who have speech difficulties and the degree to which these speech defects handicap children in their educational, social, and economic life, and if it could also make suggestions for solving the problem, it is our belief that a good beginning in meeting this serious situation could be made.

I think it was old Dogberry who said that "reading and writing come by nature but to be a well-favored man is the gift of fortune." That seems to be the attitude of most people, if you will allow me to insert the word "speech" instead of "reading and writing." Speech does *not* come by nature. It is learned just as arithmetic and history are learned. One's accent, one's ability to speak, one's use of English, are determined not only by the model one has to imitate but also by the emotional atmosphere by which one is surrounded.

IN WHAT WAYS CAN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN BE OF ASSISTANCE TO ONE ANOTHER?

1. META L. ANDERSON, *Director of Binet Schools and Classes, Newark Public Schools, Newark, N. J.*

I don't know how we can work together. I have thought a great deal about why we don't work together more. I include myself very much. It is perhaps the responsibility of the psychiatric group to study us a little more and tell us more about ourselves as to why we don't. I think that it is a great fault to be found with all the special groups, as I see them, including my own group. It is one about which I am very much worried and about which I think our superintendent is worried because he thinks my own special group is rather exclusive.

In trying to improve the situation among the members of my own staff without dictating to them, I hear one or an-

other of them say, "It won't be half so nice when we get some other people in." I have tried to trace it down to learn just why they feel this way, and I don't believe I know why. I suspect that it is because most of us in the special work have labored against many handicaps. In going back over the early history of the work I know that we were so swamped with so many hard things to do, and we had so many antagonisms from all around, that we have become altogether too sensitive. In other words, we have a "chip on our shoulder" which is very quickly knocked off, I fear. There is no doubt that we will have to use some good mental hygiene and overcome that problem in ourselves.

I am particularly interested in our working together. I am a bit appalled at the isolation of all special groups from all general education. To me good education is good education wherever it is. A good special class teacher is a good teacher, I don't care what she is teaching. There is a science of teaching aside from any subject matter, and even aside from any type of children. A good teacher, after all, understands the children that she is teaching, whether they are imbecile, whether they are superior, or whether they are blind or deaf or both, or delinquent. It is a teacher's job to understand what she has before her and to do something about it in the situation in which she is placed.

We cannot have an ideal situation (at least we don't seem to have it) and our job is to succeed in the situation in which we are placed, with the facilities that we have, working with the kind of teachers that we have, and with the kind of superintendents that we have. You know we are all full of human nature. We can easily talk about the children, but teachers, too, are full of it, and supervisors are full of it, and superintendents are all full of human nature—and I for one am glad of it. I think it makes life very much more interesting and it would be very dull if we cleared up all of our problems at once.

There must be something done somewhere. It does seem that it must come from some organization like the Federal office, that would help us get together. I think a conference like the one we are now having, at which we learn to know one another and not to distrust one another, is exceedingly

helpful. For instance, the group interested in the mentally retarded is often the largest group at a conference. Others are likely to feel a good deal of resentment because they say that this group dominates the whole conference. Of course, when it comes to voting, 100 votes count for more than 6. What are you going to do about it? It is just one of those things about which we are going to have to face the facts. The majority group will have to understand the minority group, and the minority group understand the majority group. It is just life itself.

I have felt, as all of you have been talking, that we have so much in common. It is extremely important that we should in some way understand one another's problems. I don't mean to say that we should understand one another's techniques. I think that would be too hard to do and I don't know why we should, but there are fundamental principles of education that must apply to every single group that we are handling. We just must be interested in understanding what the other one must do, on the basis of the principles that we already know.

As I said, I feel very keenly the need of this coordination and cooperation. Perhaps it is connected with the big social problem that we are all facing now. Perhaps the whole country is trying to learn that very thing. We are a part of the whole situation. We give a good deal of lip service about working together, but I wonder how much of it we really do, even when we want to do it. I don't know why we don't do it better unless it is just because we are human and we need a great deal more training.

2. E. JAY HOWENSTINE, *Executive Secretary, The International Society for Crippled Children, Elyria, Ohio*

Immediately upon receiving notice of this conference, a hasty survey of the educational status of the crippled child in each of the States was made. From the replies received, together with the information and data at hand in the office of the International Society, the report given below was made.

For the purposes of discussion in this conference, we shall hold to the following definition of a crippled child: "The

physically handicapped child, in the orthopedic sense, is a child that has a defect which causes a deformity or an interference with normal function of the bones, muscles, or joints. His condition may be congenital or it may be due to disease or accident. It may be aggravated by disease, by neglect, or by ignorance."—WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE REPORT.

In the study that is presented here today, the States of the Union have been divided into three groups. The first group includes those States which afford no special education for crippled children except perhaps in isolated points. These are: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming.

The second group includes those States that have special classes in the larger cities, but have an inadequate program of special education for the crippled child. These are: Arkansas, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, and Washington.

The third group of States has a very well developed program in special classes and home teaching. The States presenting the best program of education for the crippled child are: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, West Virginia. Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia.

According to the White House Conference report of 1930, it was estimated that there were in the United States 300,000 crippled children, and that of that number 100,000 were in need of special education. The report stated that a total of 11,590 crippled children were receiving the advantages of special education in public schools, hospitals, and private schools.

In those States listed in the third group and reported as having a fairly satisfactory program of education for crippled children there are approximately 180,000 crippled children. If we assume that in these States the ratio of crippled children needing special education to the total number

of crippled children is the same as that given by the White House Conference, namely, 1 in 3, or 33⅓ percent of the total, this territory would then have a total of 60,000 crippled children who should receive the advantages of special education. Yet in the whole country only 11,590 crippled children are reported as receiving special education. This comparison is drawn to show that even this group of States reported as having a good standard of special education does not in fact offer adequately the advantages to which these children are entitled.

(Mr. Howenstine then discussed problems of finance and teaching personnel as related to crippled children; also the problems of the mentally retarded crippled child, the socially maladjusted crippled child, and the mentally gifted crippled child.)

The last part of this report deals with the objects of this conference and our suggestions and recommendations to this group.

The first object of this conference has been stated as follows: To clarify the means through which the United States Office of Education may be of help to the cause of exceptional children.

The conference prospectus defines exceptional children as the physically handicapped, mentally gifted, the mentally retarded, and the socially maladjusted.

In this field of education the United States Office of Education is unquestionably the proper governmental agency with which voluntary organizations should deal. The Office of Education could be of very great assistance to the voluntary agencies dealing with crippled children by sponsoring:

(a) A universal census of crippled children.

This might be managed most efficiently in conjunction with a national census which may be contemplated in the near future by the Federal Government. In this connection we might note that some States have recently made surveys to determine the number of crippled children, the educational facilities available, and those needing these facilities. However, the majority of our States have no such records available.

(b) A State plan for the education of the crippled.

It is doubtful whether a single standard plan could be adopted due to the lack of uniform legislation dealing with the education of the crippled child in the respective States. A general plan, however, might be devised which would stimulate State legislation providing for proper educational opportunities for the crippled child.

(c) The enactment of such legislation as might be necessary to permit the United States Office of Education to administer a Federal subsidy to the States in an amount per child over and above the normal cost of education, up to such maximum amount as the Office of Education may determine.

This plan would not be contrary to the government's attitude in certain other phases of the educational field. Many States would be stimulated to appropriate sufficient money to pay the normal cost of educating the child, if the Federal Government would pay the excess amount incurred for the crippled child in a special program.

2. The second object of this conference is: To further the possibilities of mutual helpfulness among the representatives of various groups.

Voluntary organizations dealing with all four groups of exceptional children have common problems in many phases of their activity. The United States Office of Education is correct in assuming that there is not now in existence a real coordinating force in this field. Yet coordination could undoubtedly be of great value. Pioneering steps are being taken by many groups in many sections. These programs and their results should be available for all coordinating agencies. It would seem, therefore, that a larger budget for publicity in the United States Office of Education would be most helpful in this plan of mutual helpfulness.

3. The third object of this conference is: To work toward a better coordinated program in the interests of *all* exceptional children.

So far in this report little or no mention has been made of the part which the boards of education in the public

schools must play in this coordinated program. Opportunity schools for the mentally retarded, special classes for the blind, special classes for the hard of hearing or deaf, special schools for crippled children, and special classes for mentally gifted children may be found in many of the best public-school systems of this country today. There are also in many States legislation, rules, and regulations providing that these facilities may be made available for the various groups of exceptional children. However, there is no authoritative force assigned from the agencies so listed to see that these facilities actually serve exceptional children. With the exception of the larger metropolitan areas educational opportunities for exceptional children may be said to be definitely limited. It would seem feasible, then, to suggest extending the facilities of the present service of the Office of Education for exceptional children. This service could, through the machinery available in the public-school system of this Nation, arouse a greater interest on the part of school authorities to the end that the children of their communities be given the educational advantages to which they are entitled. It could sponsor proper legislation and adequate rules and regulations so that recognized standards for the education of the exceptional child might be made possible in all of the States of the Union.

Dr. Anderson brought out the necessity of having some central group act as a clearing house. When we get to the point of considering the mechanics of such a thing, we immediately meet jealousies—chips, if you please. We have the question of financing such a central group which may serve as a clearing house. It seems to me that the Office of Education might serve as a clearing house in a very fine way. I think it would be utterly hopeless for this group to attempt to set up any independent body which might do this job, but I do hope that as a result of this and any future conferences the United States Office of Education may increasingly serve in that capacity and supply us with the coordinating atmosphere which will bring our programs more closely together, that we may each of us give to the other our support of his effort and in return receive his support of our effort.

3. JOSEPHINE B. TIMBERLAKE, *Superintendent, The Volta Bureau, Washington, D. C.*

For more than 100 years, society has recognized certain groups of children with special needs and has attempted to make some sort of provision for them. The idea, however, that such children have a right to special attention and should as a matter of simple fair play be granted opportunities equal to those of the average child has doubtless been born within the memory of the youngest of us here today. When the United States Office of Education created, for all children who differ from their fellows in any way that may deny them equal opportunity, a service for exceptional children, it created a "department of justice."

Those of us who devote our lives to improving conditions for children who are deaf, or defective in speech, or blind, or crippled, tend to forget the children who have bad hearts or lungs, or limited mentalities, or unaccountable dispositions—and especially the children with minds born for leadership and dominance, who will some day lead America in the wrong direction unless we train them to lead her in the right. These specialists here in the Office of Education, and a few far-sighted individuals in the classified groups, have made various efforts within the last few years to bring us all to a greater consciousness of one another's importance, and to the importance of team work for special education as a whole. In response to their call, we have come together in conferences, we have done a bit of semiunited committee work, we have even established two organizations whose avowed purpose is to coordinate our efforts and substitute unity for duplication. Evidently we are ready and willing to be cooperative—but have we learned how? I think not.

What happens when delegates from our various groups attend a joint conference? Why, it divides into sections, and if you go to the section in which you are most interested, you will find there all the people you expect to see. They all speak your language, and you all talk over the same old problems, and express the same old ideas as to what ought to be done about them, and maybe pass a few resolutions, and go home again. And have you learned anything that tells you how you can help all those nice people who are off

in all the other sections speaking their own languages, or how they can help you? I think not.

Perhaps it was for some such reason as this that so few of us were invited here today. We must of necessity pay attention to one another's vocabularies, and I hope very warmly that before we go home again we shall have reached a sufficient degree of understanding to enable us to map out a program that will bring results, not just more words. Of one thing I feel certain, not one of us thinks there should be any more organizations. Of another thing I feel almost equally certain, every one of us thinks there are too many organizations already. How then can we use what we have in such a way as to hasten the time when all workers for exceptional children will see the whole elephant, not just his trunk or his tail?

I frankly confess that my ignorance on this subject is boundless. The suggestions I am about to offer are not based on any knowledge of what may have been done anywhere. Perhaps they have been offered, perhaps tried and proved worthless. They have to do entirely with work in local communities, and perhaps I should be assured at once that it is not the province of this national conference to consider local efforts. At any rate, here are the suggestions for such consideration as you may wish to give them.

Could this conference be influential in establishing, in possibly three representative cities of the United States, definite efforts to coordinate all of the local educational work for exceptional children? I think it might be possible to get such efforts started in response to a request from the United States Office of Education. They might be regarded as experiments, or bits of research. There should be equal recognition for all groups of exceptional children, and an understanding that all attempts to secure at least minimum provisions for each group would be given united support.

It would be necessary, of course, to have committee representation for each special type, and real understanding among the members of one another's needs would necessarily come slowly, but a beginning might be made at a point upon which there is little doubt that all would agree—the necessity for annual physical examinations, worthy of the

name, for all children. This audience need not be told how farcical are many of the so-called "physical examinations" given in the average school today. To use my own field as an illustration, there are seldom, if ever, facilities for discovering incipient deafness in the school clinics—and in the whole country there are probably less than a dozen otological clinics for children. Certainly all can agree on a program for better physical examinations, the ultimate aim of which should be to lessen the number of cases in need of special education.

Agreement might also be expected on the point that there should be adequate educational facilities for each special group. Costs, of course, vary widely with the nature of exceptional needs, but it would doubtless be conceded that minimum requirements for each group should be determined by the workers in that group, not by the uninformed. Each group should also make clear the special type or types of handling needed in this field. For instance, the workers in our particular field would want recognition of the fact that education in segregated classes usually is desirable for the deaf and usually is not desirable for the hard of hearing, but that there are exceptions to both rules, and that there are really three subdivisions, not two, to be considered—the deaf, the slightly hard of hearing, and the severely hard of hearing, with a different sort of school environment recommended for each. Our workers would wish also to stress the point, often entirely overlooked, that the hard of hearing are one of the largest groups in need of special attention. Not fewer than 342,000 need lip-reading instruction as well as medical care, and thousands more should at least have medical treatment.

Undoubtedly discussion of many problems will arise: Whether, for instance, all the children needing special education should be cared for in a single specially equipped building or in regular school buildings in different parts of the city; whether some training for specialties other than their own should be demanded of teachers; whether unusually high standards of teacher training should be required throughout the special education department; and numerous other problems.

I am not sufficiently well informed to take up further details necessary for bringing the special educationists to an understanding of one another's interests. I am confident, however, that common ground can be found and some understanding can be secured, and that sympathy will follow. United efforts to bring before the public the necessity for a complete program of special education, with special stress upon early detection of handicaps, upon correction when possible, upon special preparation for social adjustment and vocational adaptation, are almost sure to result in teamwork and the desire for more teamwork. If there are joint meetings of the workers in the several fields, avoidance of any tendency to divide into sections ought to make for still more emphasis upon the interests of the group as a whole.

What I am trying to bring out is that if such a program as this can be made to succeed locally, the points upon which its success is based can probably be adapted for use nationally. Unless and until some such success is demonstrated, I confess that I feel somewhat pessimistic about an interchange of assistance among our national organizations, even with the help and guidance of the Office of Education. Work for special classes has long ceased to be regarded as charity, but cooperative effort among its various groups is still like charity in one particular—it should begin at home.

4. LAWSON G. LOWREY, *formerly Director, Institute for Child Guidance, New York, N. Y.*

As I have listened to the discussions today I have found myself more and more in the situation of being a little appalled at being called upon to contribute. My point is that I happen to be interested in *children* rather than in specific *defects* they may have, and almost everything that has been said so far has to do with children who are handicapped physically or mentally or in some other way.

I am much concerned about the superior children and what is happening to them. For example, there recently turned up in one small clinic to which I go a youngster 6 years 8 months of age, doing very good work in the second grade, with a mental age of 12 years 11 months and an I. Q. of almost 200. I think you have heard about his kind before. What do you do with a chap like that? He says that the

reason he doesn't like the second grade is because they won't give him mathematics. He is given word tests and he uses words like "luminosity" and "economics" and "encyclopedia", which at 7 or a little under 7 I think is doing pretty well. I should hate to ask this entire group if they can all define "luminosity."

This is a sample of one type of problem that it seems to me education is far from meeting properly. The second type of problem that I think it is far from meeting properly is the group of children who are above the level of the feeble-minded, but who are below the level of the average child and therefore cannot make progress within the school system at the proper rate. These are children who are quite unlikely to profit by any type of formal education beyond the age of 14, who are perhaps required by our compulsory-education laws to stay in school until they are 16 or 17, who are motor or manual types, but who are not in most school systems given manual work until they reach the seventh grade, which they are not likely to reach. For these a serious problem in their own inner adjustment is being constantly created by the types of competition to which they are exposed and the types of failures they undergo.

What about the mental health of the teachers? What is the influence of the mental health of the teacher upon the mental health of her children? Upon the behavior of those children? Upon their learning capacity? I am not talking about the teacher's ability to teach along certain lines. We must recognize, it seems to me, that in the intensity of the interest of many different groups in attempting to make certain that the teacher is equipped to do all of the different things she is called upon to do, we forget the teacher herself. We have a problem there that strikes me as a very real one.

Take this group. What has this group said? You have asked that the teacher have more training along the lines of special class education, more of an idea of the social background of children with reference to their behavior adjustment. She ought to know more about teaching speech. She ought to know more about teaching lip-reading, and she ought to know more about dealing with sight-saving. You have brought out points that in many school systems she does

the actual first rough testing of vision. I might add that in others she learns how to detect sore throat, as well as other symptoms of physical maladjustment.

My suggestion would be that the Office of Education, utilizing its facilities, has an opportunity to bring together the best that may be had in the thinking and the writings of many different groups, and out of those in various ways to further the acquaintanceship of these individual groups. I agree with you about enthusiastic jealousy, but at the same time I maintain that there should be also some—not too jealous—cooperation.

What, if anything, are we doing in teacher-training institutions, or elsewhere, to help the teacher to a better understanding of human beings and of herself and her relationship to other human beings? Dr. Anderson's comments are the basis on which I offer this suggestion, and it strikes me as the most important aspect of the whole thing. As a practical suggestion I should say that one of the greatest needs is a training syllabus for teachers on mental hygiene, or on human behavior and social adjustment. That is one of the big needs of the moment. There isn't one in existence. There are more and more teacher-training institutions that want to do something about it. People like Dr. Blanton and several others have done a good deal of work in that direction, but it hasn't reached the point of being sufficiently crystallized, so that it is useful for other people.

Everybody who has spoken in the group has seemed to me to present a very strong and very important mental hygiene point of view without ever mentioning the term, or without apparently (I shall not say this is really so) quite having expressed to himself these factors of human relationships, social relationships, and the inner complexities. This last was certainly not clearly stated—the inner complexities of the psychological and personality reactions of the individual who is different, whether he be superior or inferior, or whether or not he be handicapped in one or another way. Perhaps if we once got our special interests down to the point where we have a certain center of emphasis that represents all of us, then with our special interests we might get much further along in our cooperative relationship.

HOW CAN THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND REPRESENTATIVES IN THE FIELD WORK TOGETHER TOWARD A BETTER COORDINATED PROGRAM FOR ALL GROUPS OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN?

1. MRS. KATHERINE M. COOK, *Chief, Division of Special Problems, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.*

It seems to me significant that practically everyone who spoke yesterday considered the desirability of devising plans for cooperation and coordination among the different groups interested, and many suggested means of attaining that end. The statements seemed to me expressions of a need that we are all feeling, namely, the desirability of coordinating our work on common problems, as well as on specific ones of the interested groups, when possible, for the interest of all exceptional groups rather than for the interest of only one.

Much has been said about the necessity of improving *attitudes*—attitudes of the parents toward the classes for exceptional children; of superintendents and supervisors; and of normal pupils toward the children in the special classes. So I believe possibly it may be worth while for us to try to gather up some of the suggestions that you made yesterday as to ways of improving these attitudes, as well as the attitudes of organizations toward one another, in order that we too may improve our attitudes through a better understanding, first of the needs of the children in groups other than the specific one with which we are connected or primarily concerned, and, second, of what all organizations are doing each for its specific group. Surely such understanding will lead not only toward more tolerant attitudes but perhaps eventually toward the feeling that each individual group can promote, if not as a major, at least as an incidental purpose, the welfare, and especially the services, of the other groups.

I think such cooperation was suggested to me in part by a conversation I had the other night at the meeting of one of the committees preparing the program of the International Society for Crippled Children, which is to meet here next spring. The executive secretary of a State society for crippled children made some inquiries about the purposes of this conference. She said she had heard about it and wanted to know what it was all about. I told her that it

was called in the interest of coordination of effort among different groups, and she immediately said, "That is splendid. In my own work I have wondered why I couldn't, as I went about working with crippled children, also help others working in the interest of partially seeing or deaf children, because so many of the things that I am doing are equally needed by the other groups. Sometimes I could save the time of somebody else belonging to another group, if only there were an organization in my State cooperating with me but directly interested in the other group."

Miss Timberlake likewise pointed out yesterday that there are many problems common to all or several groups, and suggested as a possibility that each organization might consider as one of its incidental purposes the welfare of groups other than the specific one in which it is immediately interested.

Much was said yesterday also about this Office as a clearing house of information. We do act as a clearing house of information among educational systems and organizations, but our activities are not as effectively done as they could be if your organizations used us more and informed us more fully of your purposes and achievements, and if you asked us questions on which you seek information.

Now that Mr. Howenstine is here I think I can say that he himself suggested to me a few days ago that before he perfected a plan on which he is working—I think it is for legislation—he intended to send it into the Office of Education for review, for our information, but particularly in order to find out if it in any way crossed the purposes of other organizations in working for their groups, or if it was something that would perhaps apply to groups other than the particular one in which he is interested. Am I quoting you correctly, Mr. Howenstine?

(Mr. HOWENSTINE. That is right.)

There, it seems to me, is one possible place, namely, in the field of proposed legislation, for mutual cooperation. Certainly there must be other ways in which one organization can work in the interest of other groups, perhaps of all groups.

It has been suggested here a number of times that the Office of Education should help more than it has been help-

ing on important research problems. I was interested because so many of the problems suggested we ourselves have in mind: The matter of State legislation for exceptional groups, for example, methods and amount of State support for handicapped children, and others. These have been concerning us for some time, but we have not yet found a way for making these extensive studies. The same is true of census enumerations that Dr. Berry emphasized as being so essential. The first thing we need to know is how many children there are in each of these separate groups. With your interest and cooperation, I think we shall start out with renewed enthusiasm perhaps, to see what can be done about some of these very important problems which you have mentioned.

I was interested in what Dr. Doll said about the desirability of each group's being as enthusiastic as possible about its own work, a thing which does not seem to me to interfere in any way with one's being enthusiastic about the work of other groups. I have always felt that the specific experience I have had with one group of underprivileged children has helped me tremendously to be enthusiastic about and to understand others. I think that is true with all of us, and I am sure that we all feel that we do not want to lose one bit of the enthusiasm which we have for work with our own group.

All of this leads me to the problem concerned with definite means of cooperation and coordination. A number of suggestions were made yesterday about the desirability of conferences—national conferences, regional conferences, conferences in connection with other meetings and organizations. I am wondering if I may suggest for your discussion this problem: Do conferences of the kind that we are having here help in promoting better understanding and more cooperation among organizations interested in exceptional groups? I am suggesting that for discussion, I hope immediately, Madam Chairman, instead of later, if possible. If you believe they do help in other directions, will you let us know several things?

Are these conferences, if helpful at all, helpful enough to justify your organizations in shouldering the expense, if it should be necessary, of future conferences? This time the

Office of Education was in a position to finance a conference. We did not know whether it would be of value to you or not. We felt sure it would be of value to us. But we are not sure that we will always be in a position to finance other meetings. If we should not be able to do so, are they sufficiently worth while to warrant the organizations concerned in financing them? That is one question on which we should like to have further light.

The other question is—If the effort is worth while and we continue the conferences, what organizations should be represented and who are the individuals who should represent those organizations? The latter happens to be a problem Mr. Howenstine brought up to me the other day. He said, "Am I the right person to attend the conference? I think you perhaps invited the wrong person from our group." I said, "Well, perhaps we did." [Laughter.] But I am very glad you are here, Mr. Howenstine. If we made mistakes along this line, we should like to know what you think they were, and we should like to have some guidance for the future. This particular question follows, as I tried to point out, the other one, namely: Are the conferences at all worth continuing? I should like to have those questions discussed.

2. LOUISE STRACHAN, *Director, Child Health Education, National Tuberculosis Association, New York, N. Y.*

The development of open-air schools and classrooms has long been identified with the anti-tuberculosis movement and was a natural outgrowth of the sanatorium treatment for tuberculosis. The National Tuberculosis Association through its affiliated State and local associations in this country was a pioneer in the promotion and establishment of this type of special class for delicate or undernourished children who in the early days were looked upon as being "pre-tuberculous."

As knowledge of tuberculosis has increased, however, along with a better understanding of the health needs of all children, the need for open-air schools and classes is rapidly decreasing and the National Tuberculosis Association has ceased to advocate their establishment. Delicate children still are in need of protective care, of course, but this can be

done in their regular classes, without separation from their fellows.

In 1931, at the National Conference on College Hygiene held at Syracuse University, the following recommendation was made, which seems to me pertinent to this present discussion:

> Instruction in community health problems should seek to develop within the individual an appreciation of the health needs of his own community. He should be shown the nature, organization, and responsibilities of official and voluntary health agencies, the results which such agencies have accomplished and the way in which such results may be measured.

This instruction can readily be made to include instruction in the special problems concerned with the education of exceptional children.

Would it not be possible for us to develop in our teacher-training institutions not only an orientation course, if we may call it that, to make teachers in training *aware* of these special problems, but also in our general colleges and universities a similar course for *all* students regardless of whether they are going to be teachers or not? They are going to be, we hope, leaders in their communities after their college careers are finished. Therefore, they ought to be made *aware* that there are problems concerned with children who are physically or mentally handicapped or socially maladjusted. The average college graduate may not be technically interested in any one of these things, but he ought to be aware that such things exist, and that there are organizations such as these represented here, doing special work along these lines.

In regard to the suggestion that the United States Office of Education act as the clearing house for problems concerned with the field of exceptional children, I am heartily in favor of it. Everyone should know of the services available from the Office, and that, for the price of a post card, he can be put in direct communication with the organization that can help in a given situation.

I think it is perfectly amazing to find, as I do in traveling about the country, how many people are utterly ignorant of existing organizations and of the work that is being done in special lines. I think we can all help each other a great

deal in two ways. Each of us ought to be familiar with the aims, objectives, and programs of one another's organizations, so that we will know how each organization functions, and be able to give intelligent direction and advice to the people whom we meet in our own work who are interested in other types of service.

On the question of research and guidance, I think perhaps you may be interested in a recent study that has been made by one of our staff members on rehabilitation of the tuberculous. As you know, our great problem in tuberculosis is with the adolescent group. Tuberculosis is still the leading cause of death in that group, and we find many young people in their "teens", between 15 and 20, in our tuberculosis hospitals. In this investigation the background and training of patients in the tuberculosis hospitals over the country were studied and also methods for meeting their needs and of rehabilitating them along the line in which they could best function upon leaving the institution. That report has been summarized and published, yet probably none of you know about it. If it had not been for this meeting it would never have occurred to me that the report might be useful to agencies outside the tuberculosis field. As a result of that report a number of tuberculosis sanatoria have already initiated programs of constructive help in the rehabilitation of their patients.

Mrs. Hathaway has suggested that a bulletin be prepared by the Office of Education for general circulation, giving simply and clearly the high points of programs being carried on by the various agencies in the field of special education, and what service is available. I think this is an excellent idea. We can reach a certain percentage of our general population through our college orientation courses and through our teacher-training institutions, but we still have the rank and file of the general population that will never be reached in that way. A bulletin along the lines suggested would be very useful in this field.

I think we ought not to lose any opportunity to make the general public *aware* of what is going on in all these lines of health and social service. In conferences of this type we are so likely to forget that 70 or 80 percent of the country's

population will never know anything about this unless we interpret it in simple terms to them. We appreciate that we have much to learn ourselves; still we ought also to remember that the work we are doing we want understood in the "highways and byways", and unless we make our knowledge available in the simplest terms, we are not going to get as far as we should.

3. VIRGIL E. DICKSON, *Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Berkeley, Calif.*

As Dr. Lowrey suggested a moment ago, such a conference as this helps us to coordinate our thinking, helps us to use a common language, and helps us to educate one another. Each of us goes from this conference back to his own field of work with more of strength because of the collective thinking here. The philosophy and purposes of special education in all of its branches are made a little clearer to each of us working in his own field. Each division here deals with children who have handicaps but who are living in a society composed mainly of those supposedly without handicaps. Most of the children with whom we are dealing are unable to adjust themselves to make a living without help in that society. Should it be our purpose to try to make these pupils with handicaps able to compete on equal terms with those who are not handicapped? Working with the Office of Education we should attempt to come to some agreement in defining our philosophy and our objectives.

This conference has helped us to be more conscious that we are dealing with the *whole* child and with these handicapped children in relation to *all* children. The child is more than eyes or ears or speech or mental or social behavior. He is a combination of all of these and more. He will be either a member of society at large or a member of a more closely supervised institutional group.

Our coming together in this conference should help each group to orient itself as a part of this large "special family." An "only child" is sometimes jealous when a new baby is born. Some of our organizations have at times been jealous when a "new baby" comes into the field that takes a lion's share of the attention. Our sitting around this table in cooperative conference should make us more con-

scious of the fact that we are all members of the same large family.

In our cooperative discussion here we have been informed that certain peculiar skills and methods are necessary in order to educate certain special children. Repeatedly, however, someone has called our attention to the fact that, after all, the proper education emphasized for the special children is just as proper in the education of all children. Undoubtedly there are specific skills and specific methods that are necessary for a few of the types of handicapped children. The specialists in each division must help to determine what these are. On the other hand, Dr. Doll has well emphasized[1] that although a child may be handicapped in one or more ways, there are usually many characteristics in each child that approach the normal, and that, therefore, in most respects the handicapped child should be dealt with in normal fashion. Can we as specialists in each field set up such standards that will enable us to determine just when a child becomes a case for special treatment, special education, or segregation? If the child is segregated can we determine when it is best for him to be returned to take his place with other normal children?

These two types it seems to me are distinct with reference to treatment. In one case we are endeavoring to restore the child to life in society. On the other hand, we are attempting to give institutional care and guidance, realizing that the child should never be expected to live without such supervision. Working with and through the Office of Education we should be able to make a clearer distinction in identifying these two groups and come to a more common understanding about what type of education it is best to offer to each. We can help by pooling the results of our research and experiments to assist that large mass of teachers and school administrators who will continue to educate and to help in the adjustment of the vast majority of exceptional children. After all, only a small percentage of the exceptional children of any of our groups come to the attention of specialists at the present time. The very handicaps of children often do things to the personality of the child, to the personalities of

[1] In the informal discussion preceding this part of the conference.

other children, and to the personality of the teacher. In turn the personality of the teacher may do things to the children. We should be able to help teachers to recognize how handicaps are likely to affect the personality and behavior of the child. We should help her to be able to recognize a few of the symptoms of trouble and how to give the help that will mean most. We should also be able to point out that teachers themselves may have personality handicaps which must be removed by them or else their contact with the children becomes in itself an educational and social problem.

By cooperation with the Office of Education we should be able to help the general public to be conscious of the costs of special education. Sometimes we talk as though the only thing the public has to do is to educate that particular class of defectives with which we are concerned in order to remove a large percentage of social ills and community troubles. Let me speak for the superintendent of schools, who has frequently come in for his share of criticism for his unwillingness or his ignorance. We all know that it costs to give special education to exceptional children. As was suggested by Mrs. Roosevelt yesterday, it probably costs more if we *fail* to give it. This is a thought which we must consistently get before the general public. We may criticize the superintendent of schools who fails to give us what we think we need. After all, we must remember that he keeps his finger on the pulse of the community or else he will cease to be the superintendent. Now the pulse of a community is frequently closely related to the flow of money. The superintendent often does want to do much for special education that he cannot do because he does not control that flow of money. We as specialists need to cooperate with the superintendent. Can we with him sell our product to the people? It is often easier to sell it to him than it is to the people. If we convince him he will help get the matter before the public. The people are the ones who buy. They must be convinced before they will continue to pay the costs. Whether they pay the costs of failure to educate or whether they pay the costs to help us to educate depends upon our united skill in getting them to understand *which costs are better* for them to pay.

May I indulge in a few figures of speech to illustrate how I believe our groups and the Office of Education can coop-

erate for the betterment of all. First, the Office of Education can be the "church bell." At stated times the church bell rings to call together all the special classes of sinners and those who are not, if any, for the common good of their souls.

Second, the Office of Education can be the "post office" to bring in and to send out messages. We may help by sending in; the Office of Education may help by sending out.

Third, the Office of Education can be the "gavel"—not a knocker—to call us to order and to give each an opportunity to say what he has to say and possibly make him quit when he is through.

Fourth, the Office of Education can be "the editor-in-chief" with a pair of scissors and paste and with plenty of editorial privilege and poetic license.

Fifth, the Office of Education can be the "city manager", a highly respected officer with tremendous power. The Office of Education does have tremendous power. When the Office of Education writes to us in our respective communities presenting data or requests, it gives us power with our local constituents when we present such a communication. The Office of Education is like the city manager, one who is appointed to help us as neighbors to live together more peacefully and more effectively. Each may have his own home for his loyal support and each may beautify his own home in accordance with his own tastes. He may even plant flowers in his own yard. His loyalty to his own home does not or should not interfere with his loyalty to the community. It does not authorize him to throw rocks at his neighbors or pull up their shrubbery. At the very time that each of us attempts to live more effectively in his own home, each also delegates to the "city manager" the responsibility to help all of us make more effective use of the "city commons."

4. GEORGE S. STEVENSON, *Director, Division of Community Clinics, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, N. Y.*

The question that we are concerned with in my presentation is: How can the National Committee for Mental Hygiene and the Office of Education unite their efforts in order to improve their services? While the Office of Education

functions under Federal funds and has certain peculiarities for that reason, I believe that its similarities to the private national agencies are so much greater that it may be considered along with them. The characteristics of national agencies and their origin are determined by traditional patterns and represent a historical stage in the development of local service agencies. To understand a national agency requires, therefore, that some attention be paid to fundamentals of community function.

Why do communities exist? Why have they developed from place to place parallel services? In general, the functions of a community—its protective function, health, welfare, education, recreation, etc.—represent an instrument of our culture and civilization designed to meet the individual requirements that culture and civilization have put beyond the capacity of the individual or his family, and yet require him to have. The public school is probably the best example of this, although the earlier community functions have arisen not so much from individual needs as from points of irritation in the community—disease, dependency, crime. The first responses of the community to these irritations and needs are very limited and specifically related to the problem. The orphaned child is housed; the threatened man is protected; the illiterate child is taught to read. These functions tend not to touch one another at first, but those in whom the responsibilities are vested are not satisfied with the noncritical, superficial response. They insist on analyzing their subjects and in seeking more refined methods of meeting the need. They tend to look for the need before it has become acute and irritating. They come to a preventive program.

In expanding in this way, these community services tend to meet. Some of them merge easily; for example, the physician and the surgeon used to be separated. Now they are closely coordinated. Others come into conflict. For example, a short time ago, I was informed of a conflict between the educational and the mental health authorities of the State as to which should be responsible for child guidance clinics. These conflicts are inevitable, are sometimes expensive, are usually irritating, but seen from another angle are encouraging, in that they prove that a gap is being

closed between two formerly separate agencies. This is important because so often these agencies find that their greatest concern is with the same individuals in the community. These individuals are integrated human beings, not at one time persons in need of food, and at another time in need of education, and at another time in need of medicine, but continuously personalities that are giving rise to problems diversely expressed. It is a violation of this fundamental unity of the individual to have communities functioning independently on parts of him. We come, consequently, to a principle of integration of community functions as an ideal.

The expansion and merging of service fields through local leadership here and there brings about a demand for the sort of service that a national agency can give. A national agency can actually advance its field only as local development proceeds in a healthy manner. It is rather striking that the development of national leadership in the field of education has been so disproportionately small and tardy, considering the immense amounts of money expended for education. On the other hand, we have here an expression of the fact that only recently have certain types of education, or lack of education, been seen to be a public nuisance, whereas crime, dependency, and mental disease intrude themselves without delay. The basic technique of the national agency has been to facilitate exchanges of experience within its field, and to introduce pertinent experience from some other fields. In this latter activity, it has been especially well situated to enhance the integration of community services. The national agency, because it is determined by local needs, must effect an integration of its function with other national agencies. It must do this as a designed effort to coordinate, and more easily, it must do it because the expansion of its field forces it to overlap the fields of others. The history of the National Social Work Council is an excellent example of this:

> For 6 years a number of leaders in national social work agencies have been meeting together from month to month to talk over their common problems. They have come to understand one another, to know each other better, and to enjoy working together. At first the group had no constitution, no officers, no treasury. Later it was

realized that full-time leadership was needed because so many important matters were coming up which needed to be followed through, and no one had the time necessary to do the work required. So the group formally organized and the name finally chosen was the National Social Work Council.

Its purpose (as stated in the constitution) : To help national social work agencies, groups of such agencies, and formal organizations of such agencies representing social interests more readily to exchange information, to provide for regular conference between leaders, to provide, through its committees, for the investigation and study of common problems.

The formal organization of this council, consequently, grew out of an already expressed activity. There has been no national council to carry the same coordination in the field of education.

It seems to me that our meeting here at this time represents an activity correspo: ding to that which preceded the development of the National Social Work Council. In this instance, as in the other, it deals with specific limited phases of the field. We can at this time discuss general principles of coordination, and come to a better acquaintance with one another; but real coordination, the testing and elucidation of the principles, and a thorough acquaintance will come in the joint consideration of specific cases; for example, if we were today discussing the possibilities of coordination in the Minneapolis public schools of the work of the visiting teacher, social worker, child study department, and educational counselors, our general principles would be made very real and concrete. This meeting, as I see it, can study and define some of the things that we should get together on. To bring it down to a bipartisan relationship for simplicity, the Office of Education and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene have certain joint interests: They are interested in the conservation of the superior child, the development of the defective child, the safeguarding of the normal child—compensating the handicapped, treating the maladjusted—and in the mental health of the teacher for her own sake. The field has touched practically every part of education. The two have worked together on specific projects, in a search for the clarification of the objectives of the two fields in various aspects of State educational pro-

grams for mental defectives and local educational programs of special education.

The National Committee for Mental Hygiene has an advisory committee on mental deficiency and had, for a period, a temporary advisory committee on mental hygiene in education. Mental hygiene in its more formal sense has been concerned with personal mental hygiene services in higher education, clinical services to children in public schools, and teacher training and selection. Up to 1929, there was a close relationship between those interested in child-guidance clinics and the National Committee for Visiting Teachers. With the discontinuance of the National Committee for Visiting Teachers, the National Committee for Mental Hygiene was announced as one of the two legatees of this function. The Office of Education and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene have come together primarily during the past 5 years. There is an occasional exchange of correspondence and experience. The National Committee for Mental Hygiene has appreciated and depended upon publications of the Office of Education. The two have worked together on educational matters, where the franking opportunities and the mailing list of the Office have made possible the distribution of information which the wide consulting facilities of the national committee were able to enrich along certain lines. At the same time, the wide contacts of the Office of Education provide an invaluable mechanism for securing information from the country as a whole. Going even further, the position of the Office of Education in calling regional or general conferences, such, for example, as the present conference, is a great asset and a thing that at times might be jointly conceived.

At the present time, the National Committee for Mental Hygiene is making a survey of psychiatric clinical facilities for children throughout the country. In the larger communities, the schools refer 25 percent of the cases seen by these clinics; where State services are more scattered this rises to 60 percent. In 1928, the Children's Bureau published a directory of such clinics. For the present survey, this material could be made available to the Office of Education in forming an up-to-date list of facilities. In general,

the Office of Education is able to bring to projects a long-time plan, stability, and a wide range of contacts. The private national agency is able to center on special projects, to experiment at times in directions that may be out of the range of the public agency, and to sound out a prospective course. The chief difficulty that I see in closer coordination between the two fields is distance. While there is rather free interchange among the many national agencies centered in New York—particularly among those at the Rockefeller Center, comprising chiefly the National Health Council, and among those at the Russell Sage Building, the exchange with the Federal agencies has been difficult. On the one hand, the distance prevents the one from knowing as much about the other as is necessary, and, on the other, the delay of several days in correspondence is often sufficient to prevent the joint consideration of problems that may start as very small matters but sometimes grow to large proportions without the outside counsel that should be provided. It is no slight consideration that I can step into the National Probation Association, National Tuberculosis Association, National Organization for Public Health Nursing, American Child Health Association, and so forth, inside of 2 minutes. I think it would be valuable to the advancement of our cooperation if the Office of Education could establish a contact office in New York. Several State departments in New York State have found it valuable to establish a branch in that city. To have a small contact office at 50 West Fiftieth Street, would, on the one hand, be valuable to the various agencies located there, in whose programs the Office of Education certainly has a place, and I believe it would be helpful to the Office of Education to have an agent in close proximity to these organizations to secure the consultation that they would be able to give. In addition the facilities of the National Health Library and bibliographic service, which is an adjunct of the National Health Council, would be available.

I speak rather freely, because I am not speaking officially. I am more or less thinking out loud. I believe, however, that it would be possible to secure the space necessary for such an office. On a budget of about $6,000 to $6,500, such

an office could be operated. While it is far from affluent, the national committee would, I am sure, provide this space itself, so much would it value the availability of this resource.

5. EDGAR A. DOLL, *Director, Department of Research, The Training School at Vineland, Vineland, N. J.*

Special education is one phase of education in general. The special teacher is first of all a teacher; she is an educationist first, and a special educationist after that. Special education individualizes the child for purposes of instruction in line with the concept that the ideal of all education today is to fit the child for that station in life to which his constitutional endowment predisposes him.

The educational motto which is engraved in the records of The Training School at Vineland applies to all education; namely, that "the proper education of feeble-minded boys and girls is to teach them what they can learn and will make use of when they become men and women in years." That motto applies equally well to the education of all children, not only the feeble-minded.

As a clinical psychologist, I am interested in the whole child and in his particular idiosyncrasies. We must remember that the abnormal child is really a normal child in respect to many phases of his personality. In other words, when we speak of a feeble-minded child as subnormal, we refer to his mental subnormality, for he may be normal physically and perhaps reasonably so socially. That is, he is not subnormal in all particulars. We need also to distinguish between normality from the point of view of function, and normality from the point of view of the frequency with which the condition occurs.

In the report of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the White House Conference the conclusion was reached that about 10,000,000 children of school age are exceptional in some important respect. As I recall offhand, there are about 25,000,000 of school age. About 10,000,000 of these, or almost 50 percent of all school children, were listed as exceptional in some way. That means that the exceptional child becomes the average because the average is represented by the 50 percent—which is a bit of a paradox.

The field of special education is exerting a tremendously good influence on education in general. If we now have 40 percent of children labeled as "exceptional", shall we not soon reach the point where the education of every child is individualized according to his special abilities or special disabilities? A particular ability or disability is relatively merely an exaggeration of a single characteristic of the individual. Those who are defective in vision, for instance, may be of normal mentality, or, conversely, those who are mentally subnormal may be visually normal. We need to keep the emphasis on the doughnut as well as on the hole. Several sections of the White House Conference, especially that section dealing with the handicapped child, urged capitalizing the normal aspects of handicapped children rather than merely providing for their deficiencies.

We need to formulate more adequate definitions of exceptional children, and to discover how many school children there are of each type. One very important function of the Office of Education is the finding, interpreting, and recording of such data. The resources of the Office of Education are too limited to enable it to make any very definite impression in the field of research by engaging in original research as such. That had better be left to other persons and organizations, such as universities, schools, and other agencies. The Office of Education is, however, an extremely important research clearing house, not only for publicity and information, but for collecting the facts upon which administrative programs suggested by such research should be grounded.

It is important to know how many children are classified in various educational categories, and to what extent exceptionalities of individuality are related. How many blind children are also deaf, or also defective in speech? Likewise, how many feeble-minded children are deaf and blind and speech defective? It is not simply a question of double handicap, as has been suggested. There are triple and quadruple handicaps as well. How many defects are present in the same person, and what are the frequencies of these multiple abnormalities?

Another immediate problem is that of selection. It has been suggested that medical inspection, which might appear

to be the most obvious means of selection, is not conducted at the present time with sufficient thoroughness to detect all exceptional children. The teacher can certainly be very helpful, for she is in a position, through her daily contact with these children, to recognize constitutional disabilities and the educational consequences thereof. A feasible method for selecting exceptional children is greatly needed, and presents a problem with which the Office of Education might well concern itself.

We should also bear in mind the relative importance of these groups from the point of view of the "spectacularity" of the defect. The International Society for Crippled Children has dramatized the crippled child to such an extent that this group is getting attention out of all proportion to that accorded to others. In New Jersey, for example, we have more specific provision for the instruction of crippled children than for any other type of exceptional school child. Provision for other groups need not be developed at the expense of the crippled, of course, but the tendency in some school systems is to do "show work" on certain types of exceptional children, and to leave other serious problems that may not be so obvious to take care of themselves.

We must be very careful lest it become necessary to "rediscover" the feeble-minded. Public-school men generally find so little enthusiastic support for the special education of the mentally subnormal, and it is so much easier to dramatize the education of the blind, the crippled, and others, that the feeble-minded are now likely to be lost in the educational shuffle.

The exceptional child reveals an exaggeration of some particular phase of an otherwise unexceptional individuality, and whether we consider him as a speech defective, or a hearing defective, or mental defective, we must bear in mind that this is simply an exaggeration of a single trait; that the correlation of abilities tend toward the normal rather than toward the abnormal; and that these special disabilities frequently are reflected against a background of characteristics which are essentially normal.

Some of the more severe types of disabilities do seem to require 24-hour care. The seriously delinquent child, for

example, cannot usually be readjusted in the ordinary educational environment. While there is merit in the general idea that delinquency is symptomatic of other difficulties, nevertheless there is frequently some residue of delinquency that in our present state of knowledge cannot be handled except by commitment to a residential school. Similarly, the work for the blind indicates that the totally blind child should be cared for in State schools rather than in local schools, and the same seems to be the case for the totally deaf. The same is true of certain types of cripples where 24-hour care in a hospital school seems to be more effective than public-school care. So even among these exceptional groups we may find what we call the very exceptional; that is, the bed-ridden among the crippled, the totally blind among the visually handicapped, the idiots among the feeble-minded.

I should like to suggest that the public school is primarily an educational agency and not a social-welfare agency in the more limited sense. The chief business of the school is classroom instruction. The correction of mental and physical disabilities is rather a new thought in education and we should not press the school too hard in respect to it. The State undertakes to provide certain facilities for those individuals so severely handicapped that they need 24-hour care or a coordination of effort such as the ordinary public-school system cannot provide.

The correlation between the public school and the public institution requires some sort of policy as to the classification of individual cases. For example, it is conservatively estimated that the feeble-minded constitute 1 percent of the total population. Yet we find less than 0.1 percent represented in public institutions. This means that the schools or families are taking care of 90 percent of all the feeble-minded. In children of school age the proportion cared for by the schools would be even higher.

Because of the difficulty of providing for exceptional education in rural districts, it may be that such districts should be favored for institutional commitment as compared with the cities. The difficulties for providing special education for small rural groups of exceptional children, and of assembling such children from widely scattered sources, are great.

There should also be some policy regarding the ages at which different sorts of children should be cared for in public institutions rather than in public schools. In some school systems epileptics are excluded from the schools, often contrary to law. In some school systems the feeble-minded are excluded from school, often contrary to law; and in many places crippled children are excluded from the schools, either by their disabilities or by limited school facilities, usually contrary to law.

There is a tendency also for the State institutions to fall outside the usual supervisory agencies which State departments of education may provide. Some State schools or institutions are in welfare departments; others are in educational departments. In any case, these public institutions provide school departments that often operate without State supervision. The experiences of the public-school system ought to be carried over into the educational departments of public instruction, and this should be provided by empowering State departments of education to supervise all State institutions, or at least the educational departments of such institutions.

PART III

Voluntary Organizations Devoted to the Education of Exceptional Children

THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION recognizes the outstanding service rendered by various organizations of national scope which carry on specialized activities for the respective types of exceptional children. The informational, advisory, and technical assistance available from these sources is looked upon as a most valuable contribution without which the entire program would be seriously crippled. It is true that a multiplicity of national organizations all working in the same field is sometimes confusing and indicative of conflict. Yet, undoubtedly, the welfare of physically, mentally, or emotionally exceptional children has been vastly enhanced through the services of voluntary groups or societies devoted to their interests.

One of the concrete suggestions made at the Conference on Coordination of Effort was to the effect that the assembling in printed form of the names of these organizations, together with a brief statement of the services rendered by each one, would be a valuable means of making more widely known the help that was thus made available. The Office of Education is glad to take the opportunity of including this material with the proceedings of the conference. In the following pages, therefore, are listed all the known voluntary organizations of national scope which offer definite service for the education of one or more types of exceptional children. The statements made regarding their activities were prepared or approved by officials of the organizations concerned. It is hoped that the information given will lead teachers, school administrators, supervisors, and all others interested in the education of exceptional children to use more extensively the assistance which these organizations have to offer. Within each major group the names of individual organizations are listed alphabetically.

ALL TYPES OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

1. *Department of Special Education of the National Education Association.*

Headquarters: 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and address of secretary.

Secretary (1935): Latische Henderson, John Marshall High School, St. Paul, Minn.

The Department of Special Education is one of the major divisions of the National Education Association, holding annual conferences at the summer meetings of that organization. It sponsors all progressive movements for increased attention to the education of exceptional children and to adjustments of methods and curriculum to meet their needs. It has at present no facilities for direct service to persons in the field.

2. *International Council for Exceptional Children.*

Headquarters: Address of secretary.

Secretary (1935): Marion Hebbard, 224 East Twenty-eighth Street, New York City.

The purpose of this organization is to promote the education and welfare of exceptional children, including both the handicapped and the gifted. The official organ is the *Journal of Exceptional Children*, which is published quarterly.

BLIND AND PARTIALLY SEEING CHILDREN

1. *American Association of Instructors of the Blind.*

Headquarters: Address of secretary.

Secretary (1935): B. S. Joice, Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The organization meets biennially and publishes an account of the convention. The chief purpose of the association is to provide an opportunity for instructors of the blind to discuss various problems, to hear reports of committees appointed to investigate certain phases in the education of blind children, to become acquainted with work in different sections of the country, and to make personal contacts with one another.

2. *American Foundation for the Blind.*

Headquarters: 15 West Sixteenth Street, New York City.

Executive director: Robert B. Irwin.

The Teachers Forum is published by the Foundation five times a year, and contains for the most part articles of professional interest

to workers for the blind. *The Outlook for the Blind* also is published five times a year. Its articles are of a more popular nature. Occasionally, leaflets or releases are sent out to inform the members of the Foundation and the general public about some new invention such as the "Talking Book" or to make a plea for some particular branch of the work. Information regarding legislation for the blind is also released.

The American Foundation for the Blind acts as a clearing house for information on all phases of work for the blind. It carries on extensive research programs, the latest mechanical achievement being the perfection of the Talking Book. Funds have been raised for gift radios for the needy blind, annual scholarships for professional and vocational training of 15 students, books for the blind, and for experimental work on improved methods of printing for the blind. A new Braille writer is on the market as a result of experimentation. Educational research and experimentation have resulted in the publication of several volumes on the problem of reading. Vocational studies have been made and bulletins published. A reference library on work for the blind is maintained for the use of students of the subject throughout the country. A study of State laws for the relief of the needy blind was made and the findings published. These and other activities too numerous to mention combine to make the American Foundation for the Blind an organization rendering invaluable service to work for the blind.

3. *National Society for the Prevention of Blindness.*

Headquarters: 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York City.
Managing director: Lewis H. Carris.

The National Society for the Prevention of Blindness is a lay organization engaged in a program for the elimination of preventable loss of vision. As stated in its by-laws, the objects of the society are: (1) To endeavor to ascertain, through study and investigation, any causes, whether direct or indirect, which may result in blindness or impaired vision; (2) to advocate measures which shall lead to the elimination of such causes; and (3) to disseminate knowledge concerning all matters pertaining to the care and use of the eyes.

The society utilizes field work, the press, publications, motion-picture films, correspondence, personal interviews, and other media of public education in carrying out its services, which include activities directed toward the prevention of (1) prenatal syphilis, (2) infections of newborn babies, (3) eye accidents in child play, and (4) eye hazards in industry. Among the services which the society promotes are (1) eye examinations for preschool children, (2) the establishment of sight-saving classes, (3) training courses for sight-saving teachers, (4) medical social service in eye clinics, and (5) the inclusion of an eye health program in the curricula of colleges and other institutions for the training of teachers. The *Sight-Saving Review* is the official organ of the society published monthly.

CRIPPLED CHILDREN

1. *The International Society for Crippled Children.*

Headquarters: 800 Lorain County Bank Building, Elyria, Ohio.

Executive secretary: E. Jay Howenstine.

The International Society for Crippled Children, Inc., was organized in 1921 by Edgar E. (Daddy) Allen, of Elyria, Ohio. The purpose of the society is to create, maintain, and assist State and provincial societies and cooperate with other agencies in providing a continuous program for the care, cure, and education of the crippled child; and to direct a campaign to destroy and eliminate the causes of crippledom. The society has affiliations in all States and provinces and 30 countries.

Through its general program of activities the society—

1. Presents through affiliated national, State, and provincial societies and representatives a great network of local units that have been established and which afford care, cure, and education to thousands of crippled children not heretofore receiving adequate attention.

2. Maintains a continuous program of building new organizations and strengthening affiliated societies.

3. Affords, through its crippled children seal division, to State and local societies, complete plans to supply adequate finances for their activities annually at Easter time.

4. Provides a legislative program resulting in recognition by States and provinces of governmental responsibility in the care, cure, and education of the crippled child and a National program to supplement the State activity.

5. Fosters a program of placement whereby the handicapped may be made self-supporting instead of a charge upon the community.

6. Advances prevention as one of its major objectives.

7. Wages war on infantile paralysis as the principal cause of crippling.

8. Educates the public on the latest scientific discoveries and developments and the importance of securing immediately proper medical facilities.

9. Publishes *The Crippled Child*, a monthly periodical, through which it is leading the fight for the crippled child and preventing crippling conditions through the school and the home.

10. Operates the crippled children radio broadcasting chain of 100 stations throughout the continent broadcasting news flashes from a weekly bulletin.

11. Conducts the following major assemblies: Midyear District Conference, Tampa, Fla., 1935; International Assembly, Mexico City, 1935; Fourteenth Annual Convention, Washington, D. C., 1935; Fifteenth Annual Convention, St. Louis, Mo., 1936; Third World Conference, Budapest, Hungary, 1936.

12. Prints and distributes reports of major conferences and conventions.

13. Offers a bureau of information, covering all phases of the crippled child on a world-wide basis.

DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING CHILDREN

1. *The American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf.*

Headquarters: 1537 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Executive secretary: Josephine B. Timberlake.

Founded in 1890 by Alexander Graham Bell, the association grew out of the Convention of Articulation Teachers of the Deaf, which had been meeting since 1874. At that time, oral instruction of the deaf was carried on in only a few schools, and the object of the association was: "To aid schools for the deaf in their efforts to teach speech and speech reading * * * by the employment of an agent or agents who shall, by the collection and publication of statistics and papers relating to the subject, disseminate information concerning methods of teaching speech and speech reading, and by using all such other means as may be deemed expedient to the end that no deaf child in America shall be allowed to grow up dumb or mute without earnest and persistent efforts having been made to teach him to speak and to read the lips." This object is unchanged.

Statistics published in 1884 showed that in that year 27.2 percent of the pupils in schools for the deaf were taught speech, while 72.7 percent received only manual instruction. In 1934, 84.6 percent were taught speech, while 15.4 percent received only manual instruction. While the association does not claim entire credit for this increase, nor that the increase as shown by the figures represents the actual command of speech on the part of graduates of schools for the deaf, it does feel gratification at the steady advance in the number of pupils taught to speak, and at its own influence in this progress.

The association furthers this work through the Volta Bureau (q. v.) a center of information on all matters relating to impaired hearing (except medical and legal problems) and through the publication of the *Volta Review*, a monthly magazine for teachers and parents of deaf children and for the adult hard of hearing.

The association cooperates each year with a leading university (Johns Hopkins, 1931; California, 1932; Chicago, 1933; Johns Hopkins, 1934) in conducting a summer school at which courses are given relating to the instruction of the deaf and the hard of hearing (speech, voice, lip reading, etc., as well as the academic training of the deaf).

The association registers and certifies teachers of the deaf, and conducts a free employment bureau for its teacher members. It holds biennial meetings, which are attended by educators and others interested in the education and welfare of the deaf and the hard of hear-

ing. The proceedings of these meetings, published in the *Volta Review*, form a compendium of knowledge of the problems of deafness.

The association cooperates with parents of preschool deaf children in every possible way, furnishing information, personal advice, free literature, etc., and conducting a correspondence club of parents of deaf children, who exchange experiences by means of "round-about" letters. This personal interchange provides much help and inspiration to bewildered mothers who are confronted with the problem of educating a deaf child.

2. *The American Society for the Hard of Hearing, Inc.*
Headquarters: 1537 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
Executive director: Betty C. Wright.

Founded in 1919 by Wendell C. Phillips, M. D., the objects of the Society are to improve the conditions of, and offer relief to, persons whose hearing has been lost or impaired; and to stimulate and promote all approved scientific efforts in the prevention of deafness and the conservation of hearing, particularly in children. The means used by the Society for the attainment of its objects include the following: Encouragement of scientific research on the causes and treatment of deafness and on special methods of instruction; assistance in procuring and retaining employment; the creation of facilities for the development and exchange of ideas; the general education of the public concerning the problems of the hard of hearing; and all other lawful activities that may be appropriate to the general purpose of the corporation.

The Society encourages the study of lip reading and gives information about where and how to study it. It popularizes lip reading through tournaments at the annual meetings and through newspaper and magazine articles. Detailed information concerning hearing aids, work for hard-of-hearing children, questionable treatments for deafness, the Everywhere League (a correspondence club for the isolated hard of hearing), organization problems, suitable vocations, and the formation of local leagues may be obtained from headquarters.

Each year the Society holds a conference where papers are given by experts in medicine, psychology, social work, pedagogy, and other subjects. These valuable papers are available through the proceedings of the conferences, published annually by the federation. Other publications include the *Federation News*, a monthly bulletin containings of the conferences, published annually by the Society. Other work for the hard of hearing, special pamphlets and reprints for parents of hard-of-hearing children, and material for the guidance of prospective leagues for the hard of hearing and those already in existence.

During the 16 years of its existence the Society has sought to change the attitude of the public toward the hard of hearing. It has investigated the best methods of testing the hearing of children; distributed thousands of sheets of free literature; cooperated in matters of legislation affecting the hard of hearing; sent speakers to national gatherings of doctors, educators, and social workers; prepared exhibits for meetings of outstanding national organizations; cooperated with educational, health, medical, civic, and social-service organizations; and worked actively with the Bureau of Standards, Office of Education, and National Research Council.

3. *Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf.*

Headquarters: Address of president.
President (1935): J. W. Blattner, Sulphur, Okla.

The conference of executives of American schools for the deaf held its first meeting in 1868 and continued to meet, with some irregularity, until 1931, when it became an incorporated body. Its objectives, as given in its charter of incorporation, are to promote the management and operation of schools for the deaf along the broadest and most efficient lines, and to promote the general welfare of the deaf. Its active membership is limited to the heads of schools large enough to have five or more teachers. Through its meetings and discussions, it has done much toward outlining the curricula of schools, including vocational training; has assisted in standardizing the requirements for the training of special teachers of the deaf; has certified and registered teachers of the deaf; has outlined a course of study for normal training classes; has investigated and reported on the salaries of teachers; and has done much to elevate the education of the deaf throughout the world. It publishes the *American Annals of the Deaf*, established in 1848, the official organ of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, in which its proceedings appear. Dr. Percival Hall, Washington, D. C., is chairman of its executive committee.

4. *Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf.*

Headquarters: Address of president.
President (1935): Alvin E. Pope, West Trenton, N. J.

The Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf was founded in 1850 and incorporated by act of Congress in 1897. It is an organization of educators of the deaf in the United States and Canada. The general object of the convention is to promote the education of the deaf on the broadest, most advanced, and practical lines. For this purpose, it aims to secure the harmonious union in one organization of all persons actually engaged in educating the deaf in America. Its secretary is Victor O. Skyberg, 99 Fort Washington Avenue, New York City.

142120°—35——6

5. *The Society of Progressive Oral Advocates.*

Headquarters: Address of president.

President (1935): Max A. Goldstein, Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo.

The Society of Progressive Oral Advocates was organized in 1918 by Dr. Max A. Goldstein, Director of Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo. Dr. Goldstein has been its only president. Its membership is open to all who wish to further the oral education of the deaf. It holds annual meetings, proceedings of which have been published in part in the *Volta Review, Oralism and Auralism* (discontinued 1931), and the *American Annals of the Deaf.*

6. *The Volta Bureau.*

Headquarters: 1537 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Superintendent: Josephine B. Timberlake.

The Volta Bureau was founded in 1887, by Alexander Graham Bell, and endowed by him with a fund he had accumulated by winning and investing the Volta prize awarded by the French Government for the invention of the telephone. Hence, the name Volta. The bureau is housed in a building erected for the purpose in 1894. It has been controlled since 1908 by the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf (q. v.).

The Volta Bureau Library contains the largest collection of works on deafness in America, perhaps in the world. This includes periodicals and reports from schools for the deaf and organizations of and for the deaf and the hard of hearing throughout America and in 35 foreign countries. There are books and magazines in 14 different languages.

The information service provides personal advice and help, by means of correspondence, for parents of deaf and hard-of-hearing children, educators, welfare workers, sociology students, physicians, and all persons interested in the prevention of deafness and the amelioration of its effects.

The Volta Bureau issues and distributes without charge quantities of reprints and bulletins of information on matters relating to its special field. It has published, from time to time, phonetic studies, books of statistics, informative works and volumes of more or less popularized information, such as, *Histories of American Schools for the Deaf, Graphical Studies of Marriages of the Deaf, Hearing and [illegible] Child, Those in the Dark Silence* (blind-deaf), *The Story of Lip Reading, The Volta Bureau's Book of Lip Reading Practice Material*, etc.

In the Volta Bureau building are the offices of the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf and the American Society for the Hard of Hearing.

DELICATE CHILDREN

1. *American Heart Association, Inc.*
Headquarters: 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
President (1935): John Wyckoff, New York, N. Y.

The publications which the association issues are (1) a quarterly bulletin devoted to activities of the national, State, and local associations, and to miscellaneous news notes; and (2) monthly articles and reviews of the various practical aspects of cardiovascular disease, sent to all active medical members of the Association in addition to affiliated groups.

Among the educational materials released are the following:

1. *Diseases of the Heart.*—A very interesting and instructive booklet written by outstanding physicians for the general laity.

2. *Heart Disease Mortality Statistics.*—A handbook containing 13 tables and charts of the latest available statistics on heart disease in the United States registration area.

3. *Hearts—Good and Bad.*—A prepared talk for layman and lecturer accompanied by 18 lantern slides.

4. *Standard Requirements for a Cardiac Clinic.*—An invaluable booklet to be followed in the organization of a cardiac clinic.

5. *Taking Care of Your Heart.*—An excellent booklet for lay reading.

6. Pamphlets for general distribution, covering various phases such as arteriosclerosis, marriage and pregnancy, rheumatism, syphilis, school life, prevention, and treatment.

7. Cardiac clinic charts, both detail and abridged forms, monthly report sheets, and *functional classification of patients with heart disease.*

8. Films, including *The Valves of the Heart in Action*, 16- and 35-millimeter gage, a moving-picture film, and *Endocarditis and Valvular Disease*, a strip film. These two films are primarily for medical groups. A popular strip film, *Young Strong-Heart*, is available for lay audiences.

9. A set of 16 lantern slides showing X-ray and pathological specimens of normal and abnormal hearts; a set of 13 slides showing statistics given in the book *Heart Disease Mortality Statistics;* and a set of 18 slides for the illustrated talk *Hearts—Good and Bad.*

Briefly the purposes of the association are to amplify the educational activities of medical and lay persons by the preparation, publication, and distribution of books, pamphlets, and abstracts dealing with the subject of heart disease; to foster the organization of local heart associations (city, State, county, and regional); to promote the establishment of additional efficient cardiac clinics where needed and to encourage the maintenance of already existing ones at highest standards; to develop adequate hospitalization and convalescent care for patients with diseases of the heart, as well as a policy for the

best management of cardiac children of school and preschool age; to urge the development of occupational therapy during illness and convalescence, vocational guidance for children and young people, and trade schools in large centers; to encourage postgraduate instruction and investigations of the morbidity and mortality rates of various diseases of the heart, etiology, and treatment.

2. *National Tuberculosis Association.*

Headquarters: 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

Managing director: Kendall Emerson.

The publications of the association include the following:

1. *American Review of Tuberculosis.*—A scientific monthly journal on tuberculosis containing authoritative articles on tuberculosis work in the United States and Europe, and abstracts of articles from publications all over the world on every phase of tuberculosis work. Illustrated.

2. *Bulletin of the National Tuberculosis Association.*—The monthly house organ of the association, distributed to promote interest in methods of tuberculosis work and to disseminate news of the work of the National Tuberculosis Association and affiliated groups. Sample copy on request.

3. *Journal of the Outdoor Life.*—Published monthly, primarily for tuberculosis patients, public-health nurses, and executives engaged in tuberculosis work. Contains scientific articles written for the layman, fiction, stories of personal experience, suggestions for occupation and diversion, also book review, question box, and nature study departments; and the Rainbow Guild, an international correspondence club. Descriptive circular and sample copy on request.

4. *Transactions of annual meetings.*—Each volume contains reports of the meeting and of the executive office; also, in full or in abstract, the papers read by outstanding authorities before the clinical, pathological, sociological, and administrative sections. There is also a geographical list of the association members. A file of *Transactions* will afford ready reference to scientific information on all phases of tuberculosis prevention, treatment, and research.

5. *Tuberculosis Abstracts.*—Brief news of current medical articles on tuberculosis of interest to general practitioners. Published monthly. Sample copy on request.

6. Pamphlets and circulars, books and monographs, posters and exhibits dealing with the medical, social, and educational aspects of tuberculosis; also with general health education, including school health education.

There are more than 2,000 State, county, and city tuberculosis associations and committees affiliated with the National Tuberculosis Association. These work in cooperation with health departments and related health agencies.

The services of the National Association as distinguished from those of its affiliated State and local agencies are as follows: (*a*) It serves as a clearing house for information on all phases of tuberculosis for individuals and organizations; (*b*) to increase efficiency and reduce expense, it furnishes supplies and publicity material, thus also improving the quality of printed matter; (*c*) it provides a common meeting ground for field workers through conferences and special committee meetings; (*d*) it serves the affiliated associations through field visits of the staff to assist and advise on medical care, after care, child health, legislative activities, statistical service, training of workers, and in the development of local organizations and their programs.

Research work is carried on by the national association through its committee on medical research. Studies stimulated and made possible by grants from this committee have resulted in important discoveries by leading tuberculosis scientists working in collaboration in various laboratories.

MENTALLY DEFICIENT CHILDREN

1. *American Association on Mental Deficiency.*
   Headquarters: Address of secretary.
   Secretary: Groves B. Smith, Godfrey, Ill.

The Annual Proceedings of the Association, known also as the *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics*, is a straight publication of all addresses and discussions presented at the annual meeting and also affords a record of business sessions. The addresses deal with various aspects of mental deficiency and related problems from medical, educational, social, biological, psychiatric, and psychological points of view. Papers cover research and administrative aspects of these problems.

The association does not have facilities for offering any other services except as the secretary gives genefal information and reference service to numerous inquirers.

SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED CHILDREN

1. *American Orthopsychiatric Association.*
   Headquarters: 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
   Secretary (1935): Mary Augusta Clark.

The American Orthopsychiatric Association is a society of professional members, chiefly psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers, designed to provide a scientific assembly for matters of common interest. As a medium of dissemination of its scientific papers, it publishes quarterly the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*.

2. *National Committee for Mental Hygiene.*

Headquarters: 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

Executive officer: H. Edmund Bullis.

Mental Hygiene is a quarterly publication containing articles and papers by psychiatrists, neurologists, psychologists, and others working in the field of mental health. The national committee also publishes numerous pamphlets dealing with mental hygiene and psychiatric subjects and distributes pertinent material published by other organizations. The list of publications is available upon request.

The services rendered by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene include the following:

1. *Mental hygiene education.*—In addition to publication of literature mentioned the national committee maintains a library and bibliographic service, assists in the formation of mental hygiene courses for school and study groups, participates in programs and conferences with medical, public health, education, social work, and religious organizations and agencies, and cultivates contacts with the public through the press, radio, lectures, and displays.

2. *Information service.*—Acts as a clearing house for information on all matters pertaining to psychiatric and mental hygiene activities. Hundreds of personal and mail inquiries are handled each month.

3. *Child guidance.*—The division on community clinics acts as a national consultation bureau for communities that have established or plan to establish child guidance work.

4. *Psychiatric education.*—This special division works with the medical schools of North America to improve the psychiatric training of medical students and those doing postgraduate work.

5. *Hospital service.*—This division works toward the betterment of standards of care and treatment in institutions for mental disorders and mental deficiency.

6. *Research.*—A special committee is at present making a survey of all research projects in the field of dementia praecox.

7. *School studies.*—A special committee is studying the problems connected with the selection and mental hygiene training of students at teacher-training schools throughout the country.

8. *Consultation service.*—Such service has been rendered to Federal, State, and local agencies, including mental hygiene societies, educational bodies, social-work agencies, medical and public-health associations, parent-teacher groups, women's clubs, fraternal organizations, and emergency organizations and committees.

9. *Surveys and studies.*—The national committee has made 75 State-wide and local surveys in 35 States concerning provisions for the care, treatment, and prevention of mental illness.

10. *Statistical service.*—The national committee attempts to secure up-to-date statistical information on all phases of the mental health

problem and has worked with the United States Census Bureau and other agencies toward uniform record keeping.

11. *Legislation.*—The national committee works toward improved legislation in the various States regarding the care and treatment of the mentally ill. It maintains digests of the laws of the various States and assists State agencies in evaluating local laws and recommending legislative improvements.

12. *Fellowship training.*—In connection with its attempts to raise standards among the personnel engaged in mental health work the national committee has made fellowships available for selected candidates in psychiatry and related fields.

13. *Demonstrations.*—The national committee stimulates and assists in experimental mental hygiene demonstrations.

3. *National Probation Association.*

Headquarters: 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

Executive Director: Charles L. Chute.

The publications of the Association include *Probation*, a small magazine issued five times a year, containing short articles on delinquency, crime prevention, and related subjects, also news items and editorial comment; and the *Year Book*, a compilation of the addresses given at the time of the annual conference of the association. These addresses are all on the general field of delinquency and crime. A list of pamphlets, posters, reprints, and other materials issued by the association is available upon request.

The National Probation Association has a Nation-wide membership of probation workers, judges, and citizens interested in the successful application of the probation principle. In its working program it carries on the following services:

1. Conducts city and State surveys of courts and probation departments.
2. Drafts laws to extend and improve probation and juvenile courts and assists in securing the enactment of these laws.
3. Promotes State supervision of probation and aids State and local departments and associations.
4. Assists judges in securing competent probation officers.
5. Assists efficient probation officers in obtaining placement.
6. Conducts an annual conference for probation officers in connection with the national conference of social work.
7. Arranges special conferences and institutes for probation officers' training.
8. Carries on a research program for the study of practical problems.
9. Serves as a clearing house for information on probation, juvenile courts, domestic-relations courts, and crime prevention for the entire country.

SPEECH-DEFECTIVE CHILDREN

1. *American Speech Correction Association.*
   Headquarters: Address of secretary.
   Secretary: Samuel D. Robbins, 419 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

This organization has a committee on research information which will be glad to answer any questions on speech correction from parents or superintendents or other school authorities. The committee is also ready to render any service they can:

1. In helping parents to apply to the nearest source for help for their children.
2. In helping to find teachers for speech-correction classes.
3. In furnishing speakers to various organizations, on problems of speech defects and their correction.
4. In furnishing State departments with the laws which have been passed in various States for the benefit of children who have speech defects.