# The Place of Visiting Teacher Services in the School Program

BULLETIN 1945, NO. 6

Federal Security Agency

U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

# CONTENTS

By KATHERINE M. COOK
*Consultant in Educational Services*

**Bulletin 1945, No. 6**

Federal Security Agency.....Paul V. McNutt, *Administrator*
U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION.....John W. Studebaker, *Commissioner*
United States Government Printing Office.....Washington: 1945
For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office,
Washington 25, D. C. Price 10 cents

# FOREWORD

The work of the visiting teacher in our school systems is rapidly becoming a professional service of significance in the realization of the objectives of education, namely, complete development of the whole child. Like many new services, this phase of pupil personnel work has had a Topsy-like growth without adequate safeguards as to placement in the school structure, as to qualifications of the officials performing the assigned functions and as to legal certification based on acceptable qualifications for designated functions in school systems.

Recently renewed interest in this area of school service has brought these shortcomings to the attention of school officials interested. The U. S. Office of Education, realizing the need and in answer to requests of school people in general, including officials of the American Association of School Social Workers (now the National Association of School Social Workers), initiated a questionnaire study of visiting teacher services in cities 10,000 and above in population to secure preliminary information on the status of visiting teachers in the systems indicated. The results of the study are summarized and discussed in this bulletin.

BESS GOODYKOONTZ
*Assistant U. S. Commissioner of Education*

# CHAPTER I

## The Growing Importance of Pupil Personnel Services in the Schools

THE PREVAILING conception of the school's responsibility for adequate preparation of children and youth for full participation in social and economic life according to the "American way" has broadened widely in recent years. No longer are the school's functions confined within the four walls of the classroom and to development of the child's intellectual capacity. Education is concerned with the development of the whole child, in the home, in the school, in the community, as a citizen of the world. As our horizons broaden, as we learn more about and understand better the potentialities of the more than 25½ million children who day by day fill our classrooms, the significance of complete development becomes more and more apparent. The extent to which the community and the school appreciate the responsibilities implied and provide for meeting them, at least throughout the normally accepted school period, is of the utmost importance not alone to the children concerned but to the community, the State, and the country of which they are a part.

The recently disclosed number of young men disqualified for war service because of ill health, illiteracy, or emotional disturbance is sufficient evidence of neglect in providing preventive and remedial measures at an age when they would have been most, if not fully effective. Recent studies indicate that many of the same physical defects discovered but not remedied during the elementary school years were those for which the men concerned were rejected by the Selective Service.[1] Emotional disturbance, another prolific cause of rejections, may prove to have a similar history when studies are available.

While not all school systems are meeting the increased responsibilities implied for various reasons, among which those concerned with adequate support are the most common, they are by no means oblivious to them. Varied and enriched curriculum programs designed to appeal to the unusual or exceptional as well as to the average child, adjustments to individual conditions and needs, flexibility in school organization and programs, are examples of common, almost universal practices in school systems which evidence this fact. In addition, and of special importance to the discussions in this bulletin, an increasing number of school systems are providing professional services of highly specialized types designed

[1] Child Health and the Selective Service Physical Standards. By Antonio Ciocco, Henry Klein, and Carroll E. Palmer. In Public Health Reports, Vol. 56, No. 50, Dec. 12, 1941, U. S. Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency.

to facilitate adjustment of individual pupils to enable them to participate fully in school programs and community living.

Such services are variously known as pupil personnel services, as child guidance programs, as child welfare bureaus or clinics, and by other titles usually similar in their connotations. (The first named is the term used in this bulletin.) They are organized in a number of different ways and are in varied stages of completeness as to functions and practices. A complete pupil personnel service usually includes four somewhat differentiated though in practice frequently overlapping services, namely attendance services, guidance services, clinical organization for child guidance in schools, and physical, medical, and health services.

Organized services of this kind began with the more difficult behavior problem children. As schools began better to understand their responsibilities and to expand their functions, the desirability of extending such services to all rather than a few children became apparent. Extension may be made through a coordination of established services or, as is more general and effective, through new departments or services integrated into the regular programs of school systems. Responsibility for administration, supervision, and support is usually shared by State, intermediate, and local school agencies and officials, though other public agencies, health and social welfare particularly, sometimes assume certain responsibilities consonant with their specialized fields. The important consideration is that the services are available to all children where and at the time they need them.

*Attendance service.*—Obviously enrolling and keeping all the children in school during the full school year and for the complete school period is the first requisite in assisting them to avail themselves of the opportunities the school offers. Experience has shown that compulsory education laws which now exist in all States, do not solve the problem of nonattendance, nor does the compulsory age period generally cover either the whole school term or the total 12 years' schooling which school systems make available. The school's program and the individual child's welfare both suffer when there is lack of efficient and economical attendance services. As one consequence, dependence on compulsory education laws is rapidly being supplemented by administrative provisions designed to study and discover the underlying causes of nonattendance and to supply so far as possible effective remedies.

Increasingly the State, as such, is charged with a large share of responsibility for attendance services, not only through attendance laws and their enforcement, but more significantly, especially in States with well-organized departments of education, through a professionally prepared staff assigned to the promotion and stimulation of regular and full-time attendance. Such an organization provides for particular attention to

supervision of attendance officials in local systems, to the causes of nonattendance, and to the consideration of remedial and preventive measures. Pennsylvania offers a good example in its specially certificated staff of home visitors located in the State department of education. In Louisiana, under recent legislation, the State supervises and certificates locally employed (the parish being the local unit) professionally prepared visiting teachers whose duties include attendance services. A recent handbook for attendance workers issued by the Connecticut State Department of Education expresses the changed point of view as follows:

> In a modern school system, the official obligation goes beyond the mere legal requirement that educable children be kept in school. It is becoming generally recognized that if the child is physically and mentally well and feels that the education he is receiving is worth while, he will wish to attend school. Such a viewpoint requires that the attendance worker approach his task as one of educational adjustment and social welfare rather than one of force.

This interpretation makes it essential that an analysis of the cause of nonattendance be made in each case, the results of which determine what remedial measures are necessary to proper adjustment, whether in the home, the school, or the community. Increasingly State as well as local school systems implement this point of view through the services of visiting teachers.

*Guidance programs.*—With children in regular attendance at school, the purposes of guidance programs are to assist them to choose wisely among the possibilities the school offers and to take full advantage of such opportunities; to insure that each learn more about himself and his capacities and abilities, and how increasingly to adjust satisfactorily to the complicated provisions and needs of education and of life after school. While guidance is associated chiefly in some school systems with high-school programs, it is not and should not be confined to them. The trend is toward more liberal interpretation. Modern guidance programs aim to discover individual abilities, interests, aptitudes, as well as available opportunities for their development in school, including their use as a means of guiding youth into a life career or occupation and satisfactory placement when training is completed. Such discovery and the understandings involved require early acquaintance with the child as an individual, the earlier the better. Physical, mental, and emotional disturbances, obvious in later childhood and youth, often begin long before the child comes to school. Often such disturbances, as well as personality limitations, can be overcome or remedied if discovered in their incipient stages. Their adjustments are, therefore, essential functions of the school from the kindergarten through the elementary and secondary years. In locating causes of many such difficulties, often traceable to

home or community conditions, visiting teacher services may again have an important contribution to make.

*Clinical organization for child guidance in schools.*—Complete services to individual children, necessary to enable them to profit fully by the school facilities available, include certain essential adjustment measures designed to overcome conditions or problems sometimes due to "emotional conflicts, unfavorable home or school conditions, inadequate or unwholesome environment, or to mental maladjustments." The causes of such difficulties should be identified, treatment prescribed, and the respective cases followed up through appropriate agencies of correction.

Services of the kind referred to are provided in a growing number of school systems, sometimes as a phase of guidance programs or pupil personnel services, sometimes through clinical organizations for child guidance. They may be administered directly by the school system or in cooperation with other public or private agencies. They may be State-wide, county-wide, or school and community-wide in extension of service. The staff may include the school psychologist, an attendance worker, a school counselor, a visiting teacher, a psychiatrist for full- or part-time service. Staff size and composition vary according to conditions and needs. Guidance, health, and attendance services are sometimes within or coordinated with clinical child guidance services. Matters which involve contacts with the home or which concern problems of the environment are usually entrusted to visiting teachers, school or psychiatric social workers. Classroom teachers are strategic persons in the early location of difficulties and in follow-up measures with children who need any type of special attention on the part of the school or the adjustment agencies.

*Health, physical education, and medical services.*—Health is so important an objective of education that increasingly provisions are being made for its preservation and promotion and for health instruction in all school systems reaching all children. Adequate programs for health and physical education services include provisions for (*a*) periodic medical examinations; discovery of physical defects and their recommendation to family attention; immunization; and dental, nursing, and nutrition services; (*b*) a health instruction program that carries over from school into daily life and includes nutrition and other desirable aspects of a stimulating program in this area, and (*c*) maintenance of a healthful environment. Increasingly provisions for desirable mental health of both children and teachers are being considered responsibilities of the school system. Physical education and recreation are included in the instructional program in an increasing number of school systems. They should be integrated into the program and contribute to physical, mental, emotional, and social health.

These four services are discussed briefly here because they represent,

whether provided separately or through a unified service or department, the setting in which visiting teachers usually operate in school systems. Placement of visiting teacher services in the administrative structure of school systems varies. In some systems they are placed in a pupil personnel service or department which is an organized department of the school system with a central office and staff and visiting teachers assigned by regions or schools. Philadelphia, Pa., and Newark, N. J., are among many possible examples. In some systems placement is in the attendance department of the school system; Pittsburgh, Pa., is an example. In others, visiting teacher services are administratively placed in a child service department, as in Rochester, N. Y. In some small systems, one or more visiting teachers with a psychologist and part-time consultative service from nonschool agencies are attached directly to the superintendent's office. Whatever the type of organization, visiting teacher services are important in the realization of the objectives of the total pupil personnel program of the school system.

The place and function of visiting teacher work in school systems is described briefly by Ruth Smalley of the School of Social Work of the University of Pennsylvania, as follows:[2]

> The service offered is a specialized form of social case work identified with an integral part of the program of the public school. It is a method of helping individual children to use what the school offers and of increasing the value of the work of the classroom teacher. It involves interviews (1) with the individual child having difficulty in using the school; (2) with teacher, principal, psychologist, school nurse, or other school personnel who can both contribute to and gain from the worker's understanding of the individual child; (3) with parents; (4) with social workers in community agencies who may already know the child or who may be helpful to him or his family. Success in this work requires specialized training in social work in addition to training and experience in education, and certain personal qualifications.
>
> In nearly every school system there are at least a few children who fail to make good use of the opportunities the school offers through (1) failure in school subjects, (2) aggressive, anti-social behavior, (3) withdrawn, recessive behavior, (4) bizarre or socially undesirable behavior, (5) truancy, (6) lack of physical energy due to illness or neglect. The visiting teacher assists in locating the cause of the difficulty and in discovering and applying means of remedying it.

Public education involves teaching children in *groups*—often large groups—made up of individuals differing widely in endowment physically, intellectually, and emotionally, as well as in individual experiences. Many children progress normally under these conditions, others need individual help to make the most of the group opportunity. Children who fail to use fully the opportunity for learning in the social situation offered by the school miss the chance for healthy growth and the purpose of the school is only partially fulfilled. The visiting teacher helps to locate with the

[2] Reprint, Education for Victory, *Helping Children Use What the School Offers.*

child, teacher, parent, and sometimes with the community, the factors interfering with the child's use of the school. She helps the child to take responsibility for himself in school; helps the parent to share responsibility for the child with the school; makes necessary contacts with appropriate community agencies; and assists with whatever family, financial, health, or other problem may be interfering with the best use of the child's opportunities. She represents the school in community social welfare activities.

Pupil personnel services, including some or all of the types indicated, are increasingly recognized as essential phases of educational programs designed to meet the needs of all the children who are or should be enrolled in school. They may be State-wide, county-wide, or school and community-wide in extension of services. In the practical implementation of personnel programs by whatever term designated or however organized or placed in the administrative structure of the school system, the visiting teacher is a strategic person.

## CHAPTER II

# Development of Visiting Teacher (School Social Worker) Services[1]

THE CONCERN of educators for the individual child is not new. From the beginning of education in America there have been some teachers eager to help each child to get from his school experience whatever will be most useful to him. However, until recently these educators were the exception and not the rule. Many factors have contributed to a changed viewpoint in education in the last three or four decades. The far-reaching changes in social and economic conditions affecting the whole gamut of our American life, and the development of the "mental hygiene" movement profoundly modifying the thinking of educators, social workers, and other professional groups are, perhaps, two of the most significant. However, it was with the passing of compulsory education laws on a Nation-wide scale and the unprecedented school enrollments reaching into increasingly higher percentages of the total school age group, that educators really began to think of fitting the school and the school curriculum to the child's needs. Their job then became not that of setting up a "good" school for the educationally "elite," but of providing an education varied enough and flexible enough to fit the growth and educational needs and the wide range of interests and abilities of all children.

The visiting teacher movement has been a natural and inevitable outgrowth of this change. It has its roots both in education and in social work, and in order to see clearly what its possibilities are today, and to understand what part it has in the expansion and growth of present-day education, it is well to look at some of its earliest beginnings, as well as its more recent developments. In 1906 and 1907, Boston, New York City, and Hartford, Conn., "developed simultaneously but independently a similar type of work to meet a common need."[2] Its development in these cities reveals some important facts about the effects that public-spirited citizens concerned for the good of children may have on educational practices.

In New York City, the work originated in two settlement houses, Hartley House and Greenwich House, where settlement workers felt the need of knowing the teachers of the children who came to the settlements. They assigned two visitors to visit schools and homes in three school districts, and worked closely with school and community groups to bring

[1]Chapter II contributed by Mrs. Margaret Huntley, Acting Director, Department of Child Guidance, Public Schools, Greenwich, Conn.

[2]The Visiting Teacher in the United States. The National Association of Visiting Teachers and Home and School Visitors. New York, The Public Education Association of New York City, 1921.

about a closer understanding between home and school in the interests of the children. One of the moving spirits in this new work was Mary Marot, a teacher who had for many years been interested in developing a "social outlook" for the school, and in thinking of the social as well as the academic aspects of education. In January 1907, a committee to extend and develop this work was formed by the Public Education Association. This association maintained the work until the New York City Board of Education officially took it over in 1913.

In Boston, the work had more of a social service motive than in New York, and less effort was made to have it taken over by the public-school system. In 1907, the Woman's Education Association established a home and school visitor in the Winthrop School in that city for the following reasons:

> Lack of understanding between home and school often results in loss, sometimes serious injustice to the child. . . . To meet this difficulty a subcommittee of the Woman's Education Association has employed a social worker in the Winthrop School District, and she has attempted by working in both home and school to bring about greater harmony between the two and so make more effective the education of the child.[8]

Other public-spirited organizations in Boston followed suit and provided visiting teachers for several school districts. In 1923, there were seven such teachers in elementary schools and two in high schools. In contrast to many other places, the work in Boston never became an integral part of the school system.

In Hartford, Conn., the work was undertaken in connection with the Henry Barnard School in 1907 upon the suggestion of the Director of the Psychological Clinic, who realized the need for visiting teacher service in connection with his work with school children with serious problems. The visiting teacher assisted the psychologist in securing the history of children, and in carrying out the recommendations of the clinic in regard to social service, physical treatment, or school adjustment.

Visiting teacher services were begun in Philadelphia in 1909; Worcester, Mass., in 1910; Rochester, in 1913; Kansas City, in 1915; Chicago, in 1919; Minneapolis, in 1916; and during the period 1913-1921 Newton, Mass.; Mt. Vernon, N. Y.; Utica, N. Y.; Mason City, Iowa; Fargo, N. Dak., and many others, made some appointments of visiting teachers in grade and high schools. The influence of the New York City group, and the experiments carried on by the Public Education Association in that and other systems, played an important part in the development of the work throughout the country. An excellent report published by the

[8]Oppenheimer, J. J. The Visiting Teacher Movement. New York, Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 1925. p. 3. Quotation from Report of the Home and School Visitor, Winthrop School District, Boston, 1908.

Association in 1916[4] included a statement of the functions and an analysis of the work of the visiting teacher during the period 1913 to 1915 in New York City. The report pointed out the significance of an interchange of ideas between educators and the community, and of the recognition by the majority of educators that it was the duty of a democratic community to concern itself with the education of future citizens.

The New York experiment influenced and stimulated similar services elsewhere, perhaps especially in Rochester, N. Y., where a visiting teacher service was established in 1913. Rochester was the first city in the country in which the visiting teacher service from its inception was entirely supported and controlled by the board of education. This is an extremely important point in the history of the work as the trend has steadily been, since that time until the present, for the most effective visiting teacher service to be organized as an integral part of the school system. Along with an increasing recognition that visiting teacher work should be done by social workers with a special orientation to education, there was a definite trend toward placing these workers in a special department within the school system, under the administrative direction of the superintendent of schools or his assistant or associates, with technical supervision by a professional person trained and experienced in school social work. The development in Rochester, therefore, is particularly significant in our consideration of the whole field, as the work of visiting teachers in that city was never separated from that of the whole school system and the community. It is only in a situation of this kind that the relationship of the visiting teacher to other agencies for social service, both within and without the school, can be correctly understood. This situation in Rochester is of outstanding significance, and we will consider for a moment how the understanding and aims of the visiting teachers' work came gradually to permeate the entire school system.

For 7 years after the work began in Rochester in 1913, it was carried on by one visiting teacher who laid the groundwork for the organization of a visiting teacher department which was established in 1920. At that time the board of education determined to see what could be done for a large group of "problem children" in certain schools through increasing the number of visiting teachers, and through unifying and clarifying their services by organization of a visiting teacher department. It was hoped that because of the increase in the number of visiting teachers the amount of preventive work would also be increased. The work of the new department began with a study of the causes of truancy and nonattendance, and as in so many other places, spread from this early emphasis to

[4] Johnson, Harriet M. The Visiting Teacher in New York City, New York. The Public Education Association of the City of New York, 1916.

include many other kinds of difficulties, special attention being given to preventive work.

The board of education in Rochester early recognized the need for educational experience and additional experience and training for social work as basic requirements for success as a visiting teacher. With the initiation of the work, an elementary school principal was released for a year to attend the School of Social Work of the University of Chicago to prepare to become a visiting teacher. The department, established in 1920, required that all applicants for positions as visiting teacher be graduates of a normal school of approved standing or have education equivalent thereto, a license to teach in the State of New York, a health certificate, and in addition to these qualifications, social service training or experience with a recognized agency.[5] The board also provided that candidates for a position as visiting teacher without training in education might establish eligibility to certification through examination.

In 1925, a report of developments in Rochester was published as one of several in this field by the Joint Commission on Methods of Preventing Delinquency under the Commonwealth Fund.

No history of the development of visiting teacher work can be complete without at least a reference to the way the work developed in Philadelphia. The White-Williams Foundation, formerly the Magdalen Society, was organized in 1800 for the purpose of caring for delinquent and wayward girls. However, in 1916, the Society had outgrown its original purpose, and its work was taken over by other city agencies. Influenced by visiting teacher and child welfare work in New York, Boston, and Chicago, the Society decided with the approval of the superintendent of schools to take up the study of delinquency in the public schools. The work was begun in 1917 in the Bureau of Compulsory Education where girls came to get working certificates, and soon a service in vocational counseling was developed. Later, through the aid of the White-Williams Foundation, the Junior Employment Service which had been established by the United States Government during the war, was taken over by the board of education. Soon it became evident to the Foundation that there was need for educational guidance in a child's life before vocational guidance could be effective, and, consequently, school counseling, including certain visiting teacher functions, was established in schools and grades of various types.

The aim of the White-Williams Foundation as reported in its annual report for 1921 was as follows:

> We act as a laboratory for the public schools in determining through social case work the kind of children who need social, educational, and vocational guid-

[5] Ellis, Mabel Brown. The Visiting Teacher in Rochester. New York, Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 1925.

ance; how and when it should be given to these children in their progress from kindergarten through grade or high school, industry, business, or profession; and how this work should be fitted into the public school so that ultimately it may be adopted by the board of education for all the schools.

The level of work was so high that the influence of the White-Williams Foundation was felt throughout the country wherever there was an interest in visiting teacher work. It continued to operate as a private foundation until recently when the work was taken over by the Philadelphia Public Schools.[6]

Influenced by all these varied experiments, the National Committee on Visiting Teachers, affiliated with the Public Education Association, was given financial backing by the Commonwealth Fund of New York in 1921 for a country-wide demonstration and for experimentation in the field of visiting teacher service. The committee stated at that time that the Fund's object in subsidizing visiting teacher work was to help the "child who was tending toward delinquency, who fails to 'get along' in his school, home, or neighborhood environment, who is troublesome, or 'difficult,' or maladjusted."[7] The committee held that the school is in a strategic position in regard to child welfare work, and that "sound social case work is valuable in making the work of the school more effective."[7] This committee placed 30 visiting teachers in 30 different communities for a demonstration period. Cities, towns, and rural counties were chosen in as wide a variety of social, industrial, and educational situations as possible. The aim of the program was to provide a body of concrete data of practical experience so that the communities could adapt the work to their local needs, and also to stimulate a thorough consideration of all problems involved in conducting a visiting teacher program in various kinds of communities. These placements were made through the boards of education under the general supervision of the superintendent of schools, although the technical supervision remained a responsibility of the National Committee on Visiting Teachers. That committee assumed two-thirds of the salary, and the local boards one-third. In a vast majority of these cases, the boards later took over the salary and supervision entirely.

It was from this experiment that some of our best material on visiting teacher work was collected. The Joint Committee of the Commonwealth Fund on Methods of Preventing Delinquency published much of the material. Notable among these publications are, *The Visiting Teacher Movement,* with special reference to administrative relationships, by Julius John Oppenheimer, published in 1925; *Visiting Teacher in Roch-*

[6] For a recent description of the Philadelphia program see EDUCATION FOR VICTORY, vol. 3, no. 13, Jan. 3, 1945.

[7] Oppenheimer, J. J. The Visiting Teacher Movement. New York, Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 1925.

*esther*, report of a study by Mabel Brown Ellis in 1925; *The Problem Child in School*, narrated from case records of visiting teachers by Mary B. Sayles in 1929; and *The Visiting Teacher at Work* by Jane Culbert in 1930. These four books constitute a very complete descriptive and analytical picture of developments until 1930.

A professional organization of visiting teachers to define and promote high standards of training and performance was established in 1919.[8] This organization encourages interchange of experiences among members, as well as the study of methods of work and common problems; it conducts surveys of the field, and seeks to develop both within education and social work not only a recognition of what the content of sound training and services must be, but an increased understanding and recognition of mutual problems among its members in their work with children. The Association is supported by annual dues from its membership, and the work is carried on by the officers and standing committees made up of persons actively employed in visiting teacher work. Among others, there are committees on publicity and training, an editorial committee to prepare case records and other material for publication, and a committee of regional representatives covering the whole United States. The Association holds two country-wide meetings a year showing their dual affiliation with both education and social work: one in the winter with the American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, and one in the spring with the National Conference of Social Work. The Association has helped wherever possible in the setting up of adequate certification requirements for visiting teachers, and has required for membership and recommended for all certification a year of graduate social work training in an approved school of social work with a year's experience or supervised field work in this area. The Association prefers a year of teaching experience, and in any case sufficient courses in education and educational experience to enable a visiting teacher to meet local or State requirements, and to work effectively within a school system. With the increased interest in the visiting teacher in the schools, an effort is being made to put this national organization on a more secure financial basis so that its service to communities, boards of education, and others interested in establishing or improving the service may be more effective.

Education, particularly special educational services, suffered during the depression period of the thirties along with so many other activities. A survey was made by the American Association of Visiting Teachers in 1939 which showed that while there had been no great expansion during the depression period, nearly all programs were too well established to

[8] This was first called National Association of Visiting Teachers; later, American Association of Visiting Teachers; and now, American Association of School Social Workers.

be seriously affected by retrenchment programs. It was not possible at that time to secure the exact number of visiting teachers in the United States as not all of those at work in school systems were affiliated with the national organization. An estimate, however, was made that there were well over 150 centers where this type of work was being done. In a report called "The Visiting Teacher Service Today, a Study of its Philosophy and Practice in the United States Today," published in 1940, it was pointed out that

> . . . as the work has grown the visiting teacher, in addition to her work with individual children, has become a means whereby the school maintains contact with community agencies, and develops cooperative activity for the welfare of children. She has developed a consultant service to teachers and parents, and has increasingly shared in group activities that are concerned with mental hygiene and education. Her cumulative knowledge of causes of maladjustment has become useful as a starting point for administrative changes resulting in a more effective program for all children. The task itself, as it has developed, is recognized as one requiring adequate preparation in social work, mental hygiene, and problems of community organization and relationships.[9]

The developments and modifications in visiting teacher work during the last decade have naturally followed somewhat the changes that have occurred within the fields of education and of social work. As we look over the recent developments within the service itself, we can see at least three significant trends. The first is a change in the essential visiting teacher service, or what the visiting teacher does for the individual child. Interest in the individual child has not lessened, but it has become more and more clear that the visiting teacher can handle only a small percentage of the individual problems that are usually referred to her. In many school systems there is a trend toward the visiting teacher becoming more of a diagnostician and a liaison worker between the school and other community agencies than formerly. If the community is well equipped with case work agencies and child welfare clinics, a far greater number of children can benefit from these services than would be reached without some direction from this school worker. Since to be a sound diagnostician often requires even greater skill than social work treatment, and since there will always be some cases that are best handled by the visiting teacher herself because of her specialization in case work related to school problems, the need for good training and experience for the visiting teacher is increased. Teachers, in general, have made great progress in the last few years in their understanding of child growth, and in their ability to deal with the many problems arising in their classrooms. This means that a visiting teacher can frequently help a teacher solve a child's problem through consultation with her regarding the child. This usually

[9] Everett, Edith. Visiting Teacher Service Today. Minneapolis, Minn., (Child Study Department of the Board of Education), American Association of School Social Workers, 1940.

takes less time for the visiting teacher, and so frees her for more intensive work on the more serious problems.

The second trend is for school systems to coordinate more closely visiting teacher service with other special services, notably, psychological and attendance work. Certain health services, guidance, visiting teacher, and other services of a child welfare nature, are sometimes coordinated into a department or bureau in the administrative structure of the school system. This coordination, if consistent and efficient, may result in economy of money and effort and save overlapping and duplication of service. It is also sound organizationally, as in this coordinated effort the interest of the school remains focused on the child and his needs instead of on the development of many specialized services. Examples of this trend can be found in Rochester, N. Y.; San Diego, Calif.; and Greenwich, Conn., to mention only a few. Descriptions of these departments can be secured in more detail from other sources, but it is significant that in San Diego a former visiting teacher is the director of the bureau of child guidance, in which are located the visiting teachers, attendance supervisors (trained in social work), psychologists, home tutors, and speech-correction teachers. This bureau of child guidance with these various workers serves as "a unifying, coordinating agency between various schools and community activities as they affect the individual child."[10] In Greenwich, a much smaller system, all the above services (with the exception of a speech-correction teacher) are carried on in an office under the director of child guidance. The school psychologist and visiting teachers confer constantly regarding the children with whom they are working, thus making the services of both of much greater effectiveness to the child. In Rochester all special services are organized under a coordinator of child services into seven departments: Visiting teacher; attendance; parent education and child development; health and physical education; coordination and research; educational and vocational guidance; and child study and special education.

The third modern trend toward an increasing amount of group and community work really consists of two parts. There is, first, the educational work done with groups of parents, or even sometimes with groups of children, and, second, the increase in understanding and cooperation between the school and community agencies set up to help children and their families through social work services. Parent education, or the encouragement of more interest and understanding of the whole life of the child including his school experiences, has always been a part of the visiting teacher job. This has increased greatly with the growth of

[10] Newer Developments in Visiting Teacher Work, by Gladys E. Hall. Visiting Teachers' Bulletin, vol. 16, no. 3, June 1941. (Periodical of the *American Association of School Social Workers*, Child Welfare Department, *Board of Education, Minneapolis, Minn.*)

parents' groups interested in education, and with the development of the school's recognition of the great importance of the home, and of the need for closer cooperation between home and school. Just how visiting teachers have helped in this whole picture is another report in itself. Social agencies and social work services have undergone many changes in the last decade, as well as considerable expansion in the direction of both case work and group or character building. Many examples of the closer working together of schools and visiting teachers with these agencies can be found, although better understanding of modern education on the part of social workers, and of social work by teachers and other educators is still needed.

There are widespread indications, some of which are set forth in this bulletin, that visiting teacher work is facing a period of expansion. It is possible that the war situation has given impetus to a movement already poised for its fuller participation in our educational program. As we look over the history covering a period of three or four decades we see the visiting teacher movement reflecting changes in thinking and in practice that have affected all our American life. We see deeper incorporation and integration of individual services to children within our educational system. The professional training and qualifications for effective visiting teacher service have become more and more clarified as essentially including preparation in social work in contrast to some of the earlier beliefs that a good teacher with friendly interest in children was adequately qualified. As schools have advanced in their understanding of, and facilities to meet individual needs, the work of the visiting teacher has, as we have indicated, inevitably changed correspondingly. Visiting teachers now, beside the basic skill of individual therapy, must take their places in the school and in the community as persons aware of possibilities inherent in good group work or the group approach, as well as the individual approach. They must be able to interpret social and economic changes and, as relationships among community agencies are better recognized, they must play an effective part not only in facilitating the interchange between schools and other agencies interested in children, but participate also in creative social planning for the continued development of all agencies designed to improve the level of American citizenship.

# CHAPTER III

## Visiting Teacher Services in Cities: The Present Status

THE CONTRIBUTION which the visiting teacher makes to pupil personnel services, as developed in modern school programs, and its importance in the attainment of the objectives of the school has been indicated in the preceding chapters. Unfortunately at present these services are, with some few notable exceptions, maintained only in urban systems, usually those with large or at least above-average populations and in a minority even of them. There is, however, a growing understanding of their need and value, and increasing interest in their development on the part of school administrators and boards of education responsible for the efficiency of school programs.

As indicated in the preceding chapter and as increasingly followed in practice, visiting teachers are added to school staffs for the general purpose of assisting in securing for all children a satisfactory basis of healthy and well-balanced lives and the fullest use of all opportunities which the school and the community offer in accord with their abilities and interests —accepted objectives of the whole educational program. They are primarily members of the school staffs in the systems in which employed, responsible for certain duties in both the education and social work fields and for liaison relationships and functions with organized social agencies when such are available. They are, therefore, expected to and should have adequate preparation for, and, insofar as feasible, experience in both fields in which they work, i.e., education and social work.

At the present time visiting teacher services in school systems are organized as to staff and functions in quite different ways and placement is in a variety of units in the Administrative structure—child welfare departments, attendance divisions, and guidance programs, among others —sometimes immediately under the superintendent, even in a few cities located in and financed by other than school agencies. As in many other developing services, practices followed as to titles, functions assumed, qualifications, salaries, staff size, and other matters concerned with the professional status of visiting teachers are not uniform nor standardized, a situation resulting in a general lack of information concerning this field of service. As in other phases of educational work, there is imminent need for such information. For this reason a study was planned in the U. S. Office of Education designed to secure the most essential facts concerned with staffs and services representative of practices in the United States. It was planned as a questionnaire study and involved certain factors relating to the status of visiting teacher staffs in school

systems in cities of 10,000 or more population. It is in these school systems that the bulk of existing services of this type are located.

The form used (see Appendix, page 41) included questions suggested by officials of the American Association of School Social Workers, as well as others, and was sent to school administrators of cities in the population groups indicated, of which there are approximately 1,100 on the mailing lists of the U. S. Office of Education. The forms were sent out in April 1944, and returns were received from 748 of the cities canvassed located in 45 States and the District of Columbia, most of them during the summer of 1944. The information, therefore, refers to conditions as of the school year 1943-44. The high percentage of superintendents canvassed who replied, their promptness in returning reports, and the many comments they made, indicate real interest in the service. Only one canvas was made though it is not unusual in questionnaire studies to make two or even three before more than 50 percent replies are received. In this study, of the 1,100 cities, 748, or approximately 70 percent, returned the form with the information called for following the first request. The discussions and interpretations in this section are based on the returns.

*Interpreting the returns.*—There are, of course, the usual weaknesses characterizing questionnaire data, somewhat aggravated in this case in that, as indicated, the services are relatively new and terminology is not uniformly established. Titles, for example, vary widely among systems; more than 50 different titles used to designate officials performing the duties usually considered those of visiting teachers were reported. To avoid misunderstanding, 6 generally accepted visiting teacher functions were named in the form with the request that persons assuming the duties indicated be reported by whatever title identified in the respective systems. This precaution, while not always successful in achieving clarity and completeness of returns was reasonably effective, at least to the extent of securing the full number of visiting teachers employed.

It is well known to those familiar with pupil personnel work, including that of the visiting teacher, that specialists are often employed for certain phases of the service on a part-time basis. Superintendents to whom the form was addressed were, therefore, requested to reply to the inquiry on number of visiting teachers in terms of the full-time equivalent of all persons so employed. This meant that many part-time—one-quarter- or one-half-time—persons were reported, and were so designated in compiling returns.

A number of superintendents reported that while no regular visiting teacher service was maintained in their school systems, many of the duties of visiting teachers named on the form were made available through the regular staff and by voluntary cooperation; local physicians or nurses, for example, occasionally volunteered certain limited services. It was

necessary, therefore, to adopt some means of distinguishing between the systems maintaining established services of visiting teacher staffs and those offering some service of the visiting teacher type by volunteers or by school staff members with other full-time jobs. For this reason, cities which reported the maintenance of visiting teacher services with a full- or part-time visiting teacher staff are referred to here as systems having "organized services" of which, as table 1 shows, there are 266, all but 28 of which report at least *one* full-time, presumably professionally prepared, visiting teacher. Cities reporting one or more visiting teacher services offered by regular staff members such as principals, teachers, attendance workers, school nurses, and others not regular visiting teachers, are designated as those offering "some service" usually by other than visiting teachers, but not having organized services as defined for purposes of this discussion. One hundred and two cities are classified in this group.

On the whole the data reported are believed adequate in number of cities reporting, and sufficiently representative as to area, size, financial ability, etc., of cities, to provide a means of judging prevailing conditions in the United States in visiting teacher work.

*Number of visiting teachers.*—A summary of the returns concerned with the number of visiting teachers, according to number of cities employing them, is shown in table 1.

**Table 1. Summary of visiting teacher services in 748 cities reporting**

| *Services rendered* | | *Number of cities* |
|---|---|---|
| Organized services | | 266 |
| Classified by full-time equivalent of persons employed: | | |
| 1 full- or part-time | [1]159 | |
| 1¼ to 3 | 65 | |
| 3½ to 6 | 15 | |
| 7 to 10 | 10 | |
| Above 10 | [2]17 | |
| Some service by staff other than visiting teachers | | 102 |
| No services | | 380 |
| Total | | 748 |

The largest number of cities, 159, as indicated in the table, report employment of *one* person—full-time in 131—responsible for the services. In this group are a large number of relatively small cities 10,000 to 30,000 in population. In such cities one visiting teacher, with the cooperation of a school psychologist, an official now employed in many cities of the size referred to, or that of the school administrative and

[1] In 28 of these, only part-time personnel were employed.
[2] Nine cities employed 20 to 30 persons; 1 city reported 292.

health staffs, the principal and classroom teachers, with part-time service from nonschool agencies, can render effective if not always adequate service to the whole system. Much depends on the cooperative spirit of the other agencies and the organization of the schools and the school system served. The systems employing additional visiting teacher staffs, as shown in the table, are usually those larger in size and with more adequate financial resources. Expansion of staff often begins with part-time services in the field of special local need. However, of the 266 cities reporting, fewer than half, 107, report a staff of more than one, though many of them have a population much above 30,000. Neither the summary table nor the completed questionnaire forms show any consistent relationship between size of city and size of visiting teacher staff, except the very general one that the cities with the large staffs are, of course, large cities, though often a medium-sized city maintains a larger visiting teacher staff than many much larger ones.

Philadelphia reported the largest staff of any single city, 292, including 90 attendance officers who are also professionally prepared workers. New York is another city with a large staff, reporting 48 in this area. Nine cities other than the 2 mentioned report 20 to 30 visiting teachers on their respective staffs.

Among the cities not included as maintaining organized services in the visiting teacher area are some which are known to have efficient provision for many of the services associated with this field. For example, a city of approximately 35,000 population recently reported to the U. S. Office of Education a child guidance department directed by the city superintendent and including a director of child guidance. There is a central policy-making committee composed of the administrative staff and a guidance committee in each school carrying out its policies. The school committee is led by the principal and composed of the teachers, the school nurse and physician, and the school counselor. Each committee, with the director, develops a program in cooperation with welfare and recreation agencies, social and health agencies, and placement officials of the community, to meet the needs of the children. Reports indicate that effective services are available through high-grade teamwork with leadership from the central administrative office.

It is of interest that of the 380 cities which reported no service available at the present time, 17 were expecting or had planned to employ 1 or more visiting teachers the following year. From the 266 cities reporting "organized" services, approximately 1,000 full- or part-time visiting teachers (not always with that title) were reported.

Ten cities reported that some visiting teacher services were available to the schools from non-school agencies. Among such agencies reported are the Red Cross, the Parent Teacher Association, State and city wel-

fare services, private and family welfare services and health centers. It was not always possible to ascertain from the replies which of the different types of services were provided by these agencies, nor how satisfactory this kind of cooperative arrangement proved.

*Variety in titles reported.*—A surprising number of titles was disclosed in the replies by which persons working in the field studied are known. "Visiting teacher" is the title most commonly used.[1] Of the 266 systems reporting "organized" services, 122 used the title "visiting teacher." Eight reported the use of the title "school social worker." Among the titles frequently used are "home and school visitor"; "counselor"; "guidance director"; "home visitor." At least 50 different titles[2] were received from the 266 cities reporting organized services in the area.

Interestingly enough each of the two largest cities reporting visiting teachers on the questionnaire form reports several titles. Philadelphia, e.g., uses at least three—consultant, counselor, and counseling teacher. New York reports psychiatric social worker, social case worker, and visiting teacher. Qualifications and salaries differ for each group. Provision is included also for chiefs and assistants in the staff organization which numbers 48.

Confusion in relation to titles characterizes State visiting teacher services as well as those of cities. Examples as noted elsewhere are Pennsylvania, which employs a large number of State attendance officials professionally prepared and certificated (as are locally employed attendance officials) and known as "home and school visitors." Michigan and Louisiana use the title "visiting teacher" and Alabama that of "attendance supervisor."

*The visiting teacher working load.*—An effort was made in the questionnaire to get some estimate of the working load of visiting teachers in terms of the relationship of the number of visiting teachers to the total school enrollment. It was believed that it might be possible and advantageous to compare the prevailing visiting teacher load, as judged from the reports, with certain standards or criteria, such as those suggested by the White House Conference, or set up in the Michigan plan for employment of visiting teachers, or such as have been commonly established for classroom teachers, elementary and secondary. However, there is practically no uniformity in practice in this respect among cities as is indicated by the reports which are summarized in table 2. Of the 189 cities reporting on this item, 6 reported 1,000 or fewer enrolled children per visiting teacher; 29 reported between 1,000 and 2,000 children. The largest number of cities, 86, reported 2,000 to 4,000 per visiting teacher.

[1] For this reason and to avoid confusion and repetition, the title "visiting teacher" rather than "school social worker" is used throughout this bulletin.

[2] See Appendix, table I.

Thirty-nine reported 5,000 to 9,000, while 10 reported 10,000 and over.

**Table 2. Number of pupils enrolled for each visiting teacher, by number of cities reporting**

| Number of pupils enrolled for each visiting teacher | Cities reporting |
|---|---|
| 1,000 or under | 6 |
| 1,001- 2,000 | 29 |
| 2,001- 3,000 | 57 |
| 3,001- 4,000 | 29 |
| 4,001- 5,000 | 19 |
| 5,001- 6,000 | 11 |
| 6,001- 7,000 | 14 |
| 7,001- 8,000 | 10 |
| 8,001- 9,000 | 4 |
| 10,001-15,000 | 8 |
| 18,000- | 1 |
| More than 25,000 | 1 |
| Not reporting | 77 |
| Total | 266 |

It is apparent that there is no widely observed standard as to the number of children one visiting teacher should serve. The Michigan plan which provides State aid to local districts for establishing the service, adopted the "general estimate that one visiting teacher should be able to serve a school population of 2,500."[9] In some cities the area to be covered, or number of schools rather than number of children, is the criteria considered in visiting teacher assignments. In others, one visiting teacher is employed for each school; and in still others visiting teachers are located in central area offices which are called upon for service to schools in the designated area as needs arise.

The data quoted above are, of course, only rough indications of the actual working load of the visiting teachers in the cities reported since the duties assumed and the assistance available differ widely among cities. In some cities advisory and consultative services of several specialists, social workers, psychologists, and the like, are available, who presumably assume or share many duties which in others are solely those of the visiting teacher. The availability and services of public and private social agencies, welfare clinics, etc., also affect the amount and kind of work of visiting teachers, as does the school or system organization itself. The visiting teacher's work may be confined largely to serious behavior problems and consequently relatively few children, or she may work closely with the classroom teachers on minor adjustments in which case she is usually concerned with a high percentage of the total enrollment. Where

[9] A State Program for Visiting Teachers. Lansing, Mich., State Department of Public Instruction, 1944.

social agencies are well staffed and offer considerable help to the school in certain social problems, the visiting teacher need act chiefly as liaison official between such agencies and the schools. In other cities little help from social agencies or specialists of any type in or out of the school system is available. In them the visiting teacher must carry a far heavier burden.

The effects of such differentiations require more intensive study than the scope of this investigation permitted, if definite conclusions are to be drawn. The figures should be considered rather as some indication of prevailing conditions, and of the extent to which the public recognizes and understands the significance of this type of work than as a measure of the work load of the visiting teacher. They point very definitely to the need for studies in this and other phases of this work.

*Visiting teachers' salaries.*—Salary range, i.e., minimum and maximum, rather than *actual* salaries paid visiting teachers employed, were requested and generally reported on the questionnaire form. It is common practice in cities of 10,000 or more in population to have an established salary scale. Presumably, therefore, superintendents could more readily answer the question in that than in some other form. Superintendents were asked also to which other group in the school system salaries of visiting teachers were most nearly comparable, i.e., whether teachers, principals, or others.

Table 3 summarizes the replies from the city systems reporting salary ranges established for visiting teachers. Some additional cities, presumably those not having established salary scales, reported on actual salaries paid. These are not included in the table, but are included in calculations of minimum and maximum salaries for the total of 253 cities which gave information of any kind on this question.

**Table 3. Minimum and maximum salaries paid visiting teachers, by number of cities reporting range[1]**

| Salaries (by intervals) in cities reporting salary range[2] | Number of cities reporting | |
|---|---|---|
| | Minimum[2] | Maximum[2] |
| $1,000 or less | 6 | 0 |
| $1,001–$2,000 | 99 | 32 |
| $2,001–$3,000 | 28 | 74 |
| $3,001–$4,000 | 1 | 26 |
| More than $4,000 | 0 | 2 |
| | 134 | 134 |

[1] 253 cities gave some information on salaries; 134 cities reported range of salaries. In the 253 cities reporting on salaries, the lowest paid was $720; highest, $5,500. In the 134 cities reporting salary range, the prevailing minimum was $1,800; the prevailing maximum, $2,400.

[2] Read table thus: Of the 134 cities reporting range of salaries, 6 reported a minimum of less than $1,000, 0 reported a maximum of $1,000 or less; 99 reported minimum salaries between $1,000 and $2,000; 32 reported maximum salaries in that range; etc.

The table is arranged to include salaries within intervals of $1,000 as follows: $1,000 or less; $1,001 to $2,000; $2,001 to $3,000; and so on. It seems reasonable to assume that in the cities reporting established salary scales, the basis of each scale is preparation, experience, and efficiency, following customary practice in this respect.

As the table indicates, among the 134 cities reporting on range of salaries paid visiting teachers, the prevailing minimum (entrance salary) falls within the interval $1,001 to $2,000; the prevailing maximum within the interval $2,001 to $3,000. The prevailing minimum salary for all 134 cities—not shown in the table—is $1,800; the prevailing maximum, $2,400.

The figures are of interest since they seem to indicate a rather close correspondence with salaries of teachers as reported for 1944-45 by the National Education Association.[4] Median salaries of teachers reported from cities 10,000 to 30,000 in population are: Elementary teachers, $1,780; junior high school teachers, $1,978; high-school teachers, $2,235. Since the data for visiting teacher salaries and that for teachers were collected on different bases, exact comparisons are, of course, not possible nor intended. Relationship, however, seems apparent, and tends to confirm the reports of superintendents referred to in the next paragraph.

To the inquiry concerning the school group whose salaries were most nearly comparable to those of visiting teachers, approximately 70 percent, 179 of 253 cities, reported that salaries were "the same" or "nearly the same" as those for teachers. In these cities, generally speaking, the single salary scale prevails although in a few replies reference is made to elementary or to secondary teachers as the comparable group. In 41 cities the salary scale is comparable to that of supervisors, and in 9, to that of principals. In only 3 are salaries lower than those paid to elementary teachers, and in 4, the salaries are comparable to those of "directors" (directors, it is assumed, refers to heads of departments such as health, curriculum, etc.). Thirteen cities report comparability to both teachers and principals, indicating at least two levels of responsibility in visiting teacher services.

*Costs of visiting teacher services.*—Data concerning costs of specific units or services of a total school program are of special interest to administrators, school boards, and patrons when planning the introduction of new staffs or units or services into their programs. Yet such data are difficult to secure with accuracy, partly because present methods of cost accounting do not provide for the particular separation needed, and partly because the services are and should be so closely inter-related with the regular school program that segregation is difficult if not impos-

[4] National Education Association Research Bulletin, vol. 23, No. 1, February 1945. Salaries of City-School Employees, 1944-45. Washington 6, D. C., Research Division, National Education Association of the United States.

sible. However, while recognizing this difficulty, it was believed worth while to include a question concerning costs; total pupil enrollment was the basis selected. This selection was made in the belief that the visiting teacher serves or should serve the total enrollment and not just specific cases of behavior problems and that the service provided involves preventive as well as remedial aspects of school and pupil problems.

As one would expect from the information already given concerned with the salary of visiting teachers and the number of children served by each in the systems reported, the range in annual per pupil costs is wide, varying from 10 cents or less in 10 cities reporting to $3 or more in 8 cities. Approximately 38 percent of the 266 cities reported a per capita cost between 40 cents and $[illegible]. Twenty-eight cities, or 10.5 percent, reported costs from $1 to $3. (See table 4.) Data on costs of the service would probably be more valuable if reported in terms of percentage of the per capita cost of the total school program. While it was not feasible in this particular study to request such data, in a recent study of personnel services, including visiting teacher, child welfare, and health services, made in the U. S. Office of Education, it was found that the cost of personnel services varied from $1.22 to $6.01 in 12 representative cities and constituted from 1 percent to 3 percent of the total per capita school costs. If the cost of visiting teacher services was similarly segregated within the organization unit in which they are placed, it seems reasonable to conclude from data collected in these studies that they would on the average be responsible for only a small percentage of the total cost of the program of any school system.

**Table 4. Annual cost of visiting teacher services per pupil enrolled, by number of cities reporting**

| *Cost per pupil enrolled* | *Cities reporting* |
|---|---|
| $0.10 or less | 10 |
| $0.11 to $0.40 | 52 |
| $0.41 to $0.70 | 52 |
| $0.71 to $1 | 49 |
| $1.01 to $3 | 28 |
| More than $3 | 8 |
| Not reporting | 67 |
| Total | 266 |

*The functions of visiting teachers.*—The responsibilities commonly assumed by professionally prepared visiting teachers include the following: (*a*) Attendance duties or acting as attendance officers; (*b*) working out problems causing nonattendance; (*c*) assisting in adjustment of behavior problems; (*d*) helping with home-school relationships; (*e*) referral of appropriate problems to outside agencies; (*f*) direct treatment of children's difficulties.

Because of the variety of titles by which school staff members performing these functions are identified in different city systems and the consequent possibility of misunderstanding, the functions were stated on the questionnaire form, as given above. Superintendents were asked to underline those performed by the staff members reported as visiting teachers from their respective systems. Superintendents from 250 city systems complied with the request, underlining one or more of the functions named. The results are summarized in sections A and B of table 5 which follows:

**Table 5. Functions of visiting teachers**

A. NUMBER OF CITIES, BY TYPE OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED

| *Type of function* | *Number of cities* |
|---|---|
| Acting as attendance officer (a)[1] | [1]169 |
| Working out problems causing nonattendance (b) | 233 |
| Adjustment of behavior problems (c) | 206 |
| Home-school relationships (d) | 225 |
| Referral of problems to outside agency (e) | 209 |
| Direct treatment of children's difficulties (f) | 127 |

B. NUMBER OF CITIES, BY NUMBER OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED

| *Number of functions* | *Number of cities* |
|---|---|
| Six (Functions (a)-(f) enumerated above)[1] | [1]74 |
| Five[2] | 77 |
| Four | 59 |
| Three | 26 |
| Two | 12 |
| One | 2 |
| Total | [1]250 |

Section A of table 5 gives the number of cities reporting each of the functions named above, considered separately. It appears that functions (b), (c), (d), and (e), considered separately, appear most commonly among the visiting teacher services reported by the 250 cities. These constitute the heart of visiting teacher programs, especially (*b*), working on causes of nonattendance, and (*d*), helping with school-home relationships. These are crucial problems in the solution of which regular classroom teachers need professional assistance. This section of the table indicates also the importance of attendance in visiting teacher services. Generally attendance officials and visiting teachers work cooperatively on

[1]Read tables thus: 169 cities reported "acting as attendance officers" as one of the functions performed; 74 cities reported all six functions listed on the questionnaire form as performed by visiting teachers in their school systems, etc.; a total of 250 cities reported on the item related to "Functions."

[2]See table III, Appendix, for data on combinations of functions.

attendance problems, the former primarily but not solely concerned with attendance laws, the latter with causes of nonattendance and its elimination, tracing them to school or home or community situations.

The data in table 5, section B, especially those concerned with the two large groups, namely 74 cities reporting *all* the functions named as included in the visiting teacher services, and 77 reporting 5 (all but 1), if studied in connection with table III in Appendix (showing the combinations of functions assumed by visiting teachers), have some important implications. The variety of combinations of services shown in table III indicates the lack of uniformity of practices in this field previously referred to. However, and of equal importance, the tables show also that the functions *not* reported by cities in the second group, table 5, numbering 77 (*see also* columns 1 and 2 of table III in Appendix) are either (*a*) acting as attendance officers, or (*b*) direct treatment of children's difficulties, in all but one city. In view of the fact that where professionally prepared attendance officials are employed by State or local school systems, thus obviating the necessity of visiting teachers assuming attendance duties, the service represented by function (*a*) may well be taken care of in the 36 cities (table III, line 2, column 1) in which it is omitted. It is also true that in many cities organized social work agencies function in cooperation with the schools, thus possibly eliminating the need for visiting teachers assuming function (f), namely, direct treatment of children's difficulties. Forty cities fail to report (f) as a function of their visiting teacher staff (see table III). It seems possible, therefore, that the services represented by (a) and (f) are available from other than visiting teacher services in the 76 cities reporting five services, as they are through the schools in the 74 reporting six services—a total of 150 city systems. If this assumption is a valid one, it follows that at least these 150 city systems, 60 percent of those reporting on functions, provide through the schools or cooperating agencies the full program represented by the six functions indicated.

For similar reasons the 59 cities reporting four functions, usually (b), (c), (d), and (e), may be considered as having efficient, *possibly* complete (according to the functions named on the questionnaire) visiting teacher services. Of the remaining 40 cities offering organized services consisting of one to three of the functions, it can at least be said that a beginning has been made toward development of an efficient service, and probably urgent needs are being met.

*Professional qualifications of visiting teachers.*—Obviously the year 1943-44 is a particularly unsatisfactory one so far as conclusiveness of studies of teacher qualifications is concerned. With visiting teachers as with all teachers, conditions are far from normal and standards of qualifications lower than those prevailing in other years. The questionnaire

form sought information concerning the qualifications required of visiting teachers in the school systems reporting. It was intended to apply to standard requirements under normal conditions. However, many replies were based on the actual qualifications of the persons serving. Because of this, as well as of the general situation, it is probable that qualifications reported do not always meet the standards normally required. For example, one city reports, "normally we require a State teacher's certificate, 3 years' experience, an A.B. degree, 1 year of professional training in social work, or 12 weeks' summer school in social work. This year none has a degree, two of the three have teaching experience, and the third has no experience." Another city reports that "a married woman gives one-third of her time to this work. She has no degree, but considerable experience in social work." Other comments with similar connotation were not uncommon.

Despite the abnormal situation indicated, it was believed desirable to make an effort to secure and summarize information concerning the professional preparation and experience required of visiting teachers in the cities which maintain organized services in the two fields, i.e., education and social work. To secure information on education, the form carried an inquiry concerning degrees required, training on the college level leading to degrees, and on teaching experience in years; in the social work field, the amount of professional training in an accredited school of social work by years was asked for and the years or fractions of years of experience required in that field.

Reports on one or more of the items indicated were received from 250 cities. While incomplete and overlapping in some cases, due in part to the fact that there are not generally established standards met by all members of the visiting teacher staff and in part because actual qualifications of visiting teachers employed as well as established requirements

**Table 6. Professional preparation and experience of visiting teachers, by number of cities[1]**

| Professional preparation | Number of cities | Experience | Number of cities |
|---|---|---|---|
| In education: | | In education: | |
| College degree | 171 | Some, 1 year or less | 37 |
| Some college training | 7 | 2-5 years | 44 |
| Other training | 10 | 5 or more years | 53 |
| None | 65 | None | 119 |
| In social work: | | In social work: | |
| Some, 1 year or less | 76 | Some, 1 year or less | 47 |
| 2 years | 12 | 2-5 years | 26 |
| Major or graduation | 7 | 5 or more years | 19 |
| None | 158 | None | 161 |

[1]Of the 266 cities reporting organized visiting teacher services, 253 gave some information on professional preparation and experience. In general, the reports seemed to indicate these were qualifications possessed by incumbents at time of reporting, rather than requirements of school systems reporting.

(if any) were reported, the results are not as conclusive as would be desirable. They are presented for what they are worth in table 6 on page 27. The information is undoubtedly indicative of the situation, but should not be interpreted too literally nor as typical of normal pre-war conditions.

In educational preparation a high percentage of the cities reporting on this item report college degrees as a requirement or as held by the visiting teachers employed. Nearly one-fourth, however, report no college training required. In social work, 158 cities report no training required of visiting teachers; 95 report college training varying in amount as shown in the table.

The table also shows a surprising number of cities which employ inexperienced visiting teachers—inexperienced in each, possibly both education and social work. When one considers the responsibilities usually accepted by visiting teachers, the information points to the need of planning for greatly improved conditions now as well as for the postwar period.

*Certification.*—So general is the requirement that school officials, not only teachers, but supervisors, administrators, and even custodial employees in some systems, hold legal certificates, State or local, that it is a natural expectation that visiting teachers would be expected to hold some type of certificate in order to be eligible to receive salaries from public funds. It is, therefore, somewhat surprising that of the 266 cities reporting, only 182, or 68 percent, reported that certificates were required of the visiting teachers employed. (See table IV in Appendix.) It is possible that in some systems possession of the A.B. or B.S. degree may be recognized in lieu of a certificate, or failure to report on this question may be due to oversight or to the emergency situation. In 103 of the 182 cities in which certificates are required, State teaching certificates are those reported. Special child welfare certificates, special attendance, "special" certificates are among others reported. Eight cities report a special visiting teacher's certificate, a type now issued and required in several States. Such certificates are issued by State or local certificating authorities, including local boards of education which employ visiting teachers, in much the same way as regular teaching certificates are issued and required. Forty cities report "special" certificates, including special attendance and "child welfare and attendance credential." Fifteen cities report teaching certificates other than State certificates.

The possession or requirement of a teaching certificate by candidates for positions as visiting teachers does not obviate the possibility that school officials require additional preparation, probably in the social work field, as a prerequisite to employment. Certainly many of them do. The Superintendent of the Baltimore, Md., City Schools, among others, in

replying to the questionnaire form on which this study is based, gave the requirements in that city as follows:

> Requirements for visiting teacher certificates include experience and professional training in *either* teaching or social work; plus 1 year's probationary status with this department; plus a professional examination covering educational psychology, philosophy of education, knowledge of the Baltimore school system and social agency set-up, principles and practice of visiting teacher case work.

Atlanta, Ga., requires in addition to "such general qualifications as may be required for a teacher in the division of schools to be served . . . special training and experience for this particular work."

Cincinnati issues a visiting teacher certificate requiring in Education an A.B. degree, 1 year of teaching, 1 year of social work experience, and an additional year in either of the preceding, i.e., training or experience.

These examples indicate considerable variety among local systems in certification policies. Only among cities located in States in which there is State-wide certification is there an approach to standardization in the certification of visiting teachers. Some examples of State certification requirements are given in the Appendix as well as additional information on types of certificates held according to States in which the reporting cities are located.

*Some comments of administrators.*—Among interesting side lights which the canvass of the city systems shed on the visiting teacher situation were remarks from many superintendents in whose systems visiting teachers are not now employed, who took the time to comment on and return the questionnaire and to express an interest in and a desire to develop such services. Such comments as, "We hope to add this service as soon as funds permit," or "as soon as public sentiment is favorable," were commonly expressed. At least 39 superintendents expressed their interest in or purpose or expectation to secure visiting teacher services during the following school year as indicated below. Eight of these were from Michigan, showing the influence of the newly passed State Legislation subsidizing visiting teachers employed by local school districts from State funds. A few representative replies follow:

> We started a guidance clinic this year and hope to obtain a visiting teacher for next year.
>
> None in capacity indicated. We should have. Our district has a population of approximately 28,000.
>
> None; but feel need for the service. Should like to have result of the survey when completed.
>
> Necessary to discontinue this position this past year due to inability to obtain properly qualified person for work.
>
> Have not since the depression restored visiting teacher.
>
> We use regular teachers on part-time special assignment. Our limited experience brings conviction as to value of visiting teacher service. Difficult to create

opinion in its favor. Should be the chief element in attendance service; officers to finish legal cases only.

We have an attendance officer who is policeman. I have recommended appointment of visiting counselor; but school committee has done nothing.

None at present, but we are interested for next year.

We hope to add possibly two full-time visiting teachers next year.

State program just now being established. Board of education has approved project here.

Provision has been made to employ one July 1, 1944.

No visiting teacher this year, but hope to have next.

We have no visiting teacher but our school nurse does a fine piece of social work on her home visits. We believe every district this size (18,000) should have a visiting teacher.

We are to add one or two visiting teachers next year.

# CHAPTER IV

## Extending and Improving Visiting Teacher Services

PROVERBIALLY the gap between accepted theory and practice, what we know or agree is efficient and what we actually do about it, is wide in many phases of our education programs. Such is undoubtedly the situation in the area with which visiting teacher work is concerned. The principle that school programs should provide the best possible conditions for the complete development of all children, and the conviction that visiting teachers have an important role in assisting in its achievement are now widely accepted. Responsibilities growing out of the principle, however, are not as widely assumed by school systems as now organized. In general it is true that conditions over which the schools have little or no control have not only retarded development in new areas, but have curtailed progress in established ones; supervision, music, art are examples. Before the ill effects of the depression on financing school programs were adequately overcome, defense needs, and then the war itself, prevented fulfillment of many plans under way and discouraged new developments generally. The necessity for protecting important phases of the established program has retarded progress in providing for visiting teacher and other phases of pupil personnel services. Comments of school officials replying to the questionnaire form on which chapter III is based, while not appearing in this bulletin, are evidence of the fact that lack of more liberal school support and of adequate understanding of children's needs on the part of parents and patrons are serious obstacles to the extension of visiting teacher programs at this time.

Despite these conditions, present interest in postwar planning, wider knowledge of the effects of neglect of emotional and health problems disclosed through experiences with Selective Service, and recent educational movements resulting from research in child welfare should be favorable influences in securing the extension of school services now in the planning stage, to include this and other neglected areas. In efforts to accomplish this end and to improve programs generally the situation disclosed in the cities canvassed offers some suggestions.

*Extension and expansion of services.*—The most striking need disclosed by the canvass of cities is that for extension of visiting teacher services into a larger number of school systems. As data already quoted show, only 266 of 748 systems from which replies to the questionnaire form were received maintain organized visiting teacher services. If State and county school superintendents, as well as those of city systems

had been canvassed, some additional services would no doubt have been found, though they are all too few in such systems. However, the returns from the city systems alone offer sufficient evidence of the need for extension of services in this field. Again, if it had been feasible to extend this study to include size of visiting teacher staff in relation to need, measured by school population, visiting teacher load, or other agreed-upon criterion, there is evidence that in that realm, too, the need for expansion of the present staffs would be apparent.

Observation as well as comments of visiting teachers in the cities recently visited by a member of the U. S. Office of Education staff and of others from whom letters have been received in connection with collection of the information in this bulletin, indicate that understaffing is almost universal. Some probable causes of this situation are indicated above; other possible ones will be discussed later. There is little evidence that lack of success of the work, once it is established, is among them. Dr. W. Carson Ryan, after a wide survey of conditions throughout the country, one of the few such surveys available, assured us that "few educational innovations have as clear a record of adoption on their merits as the work of the visiting teacher."[1]

*Desirable uniformity in standards.*—A second definite need of visiting teacher services, and one on which efficiency as well as extension depends to a considerable degree, is the establishment of reasonable uniformity in titles and functions assigned to visiting teachers, of standards in professional qualifications in both education and social work, and of standardized State and local certificates for visiting teachers designated as such and issued by regularly constituted certificating authorities. There is little evidence of uniformity in standards and practices concerned with these areas in the school systems reporting on visiting teacher staffs and services. Variety rather than desirable uniformity is characteristic. While this statement applies more to titles, qualifications, and certification than to functions expected of and assigned to visiting teachers, there is still considerable confusion in respect even to them as indicated in the preceding chapter.

In the few States in which provision for visiting teacher services has recently become a State policy, similar variations are apparent. The new legislation, in providing State aid to school districts for the employment of visiting teachers in Michigan, was motivated by the desire to reduce delinquency. Accordingly the chief function of visiting teachers so employed may be expected to be concerned with serious behavior problems. In Lotisiana, provision for visiting teachers on a State-wide basis was inspired chiefly by the need for improving attendance at school. That

[1]Mental Health Through Education. New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1938.

motive will probably govern the functions of visiting teachers at least to some extent and for some time. In Alabama, State-supervised services corresponding to those usually assumed by visiting teachers are available in a high percentage of the counties in the State (42 of 67) and in practically all cities. The staff members assuming the functions are known as attendance supervisors.

Lack of reasonable uniformity in standards and practices has many drawbacks from a professional standpoint. It means difficulty in collecting and using information, especially for comparative purposes, including checking and evaluating progress whether within a system or among systems. It retards progress in upgrading qualification standards for teachers and directors or supervisors, in provision for proper certification regulations, and in securing appropriate salary scales. Moreover, reasonable standardization can be expected to lead to better understanding of the objectives of visiting teacher services on the part of school patrons and consequent wider acceptance of such services as an essential and integral phase of school programs. Increased professional contacts and exchange of experiences among school systems would be facilitated by desirable uniformity in practices with all the advantages that accrue from such relationships and, finally, and of special importance, effective research and experimentation in this area might well be stimulated by it.

Lest the discussion be interpreted to imply overstandardization and unnecessary uniformity, it may be appropriate to consider the type of standardization which is considered desirable. A good example of standardization in principle without uniformity in practice may be cited in the issue of teaching certificates, the number and types of which as well as the qualifications on which each type is based vary widely among States, even among school systems within States. But there are widely accepted *minimum* standards for each major type, elementary, secondary, supervisory, administrative, for example, to which practically all certificating authorities, State or city, conform. With a basic minimum to work from there is ample opportunity among States and local systems to maintain high standards, provide for necessary adaptations to local needs and still preserve considerable unity in practice among school systems.

*Titles and their association.*—Titles are important because they are widely understood as designating individuals who have personal and professional qualifications which fit them to perform well-known functions, as in special areas of education, which contribute to a desirable program in some essential field of work.

Consider, for example, the several titles designating teachers, as, high-school teacher, elementary teacher, or supervisor or school administrator, each has a definite connotation of at least country-wide significance and understanding. But not so with the title "visiting teacher." Not alone

are many titles used to designate the individuals assuming visiting teacher responsibilities—at least 50 were reported from the cities responding to the questionnaire,[2] but many are so specifically associated with other fields of school work such as school nursing, home teaching, to cite but two examples, as to occasion considerable confusion in interpreting information in regard to what functions really are under way in the respective school systems. School administrators as well as visiting teachers realize the unsatisfactoriness of the situation. A State superintendent of education, in a State in which both counties and cities employ individuals who function as visiting teachers but carry the title of "attendance supervisors," comments on the situation after noting the number of different titles in common use, as follows:

> In an interpretation and solution of problems from these areas there is a professional job of high character. . . . It seems to me it would be well for educational leadership to reach a more uniformly understandable terminology for the service.

An appropriate name or title for workers in the visiting teacher area of school work has long been a subject of concern to those interested in it. As early as 1921 a study[3] made in the U. S. Bureau of Education (now U. S. Office of Education), attempting to find the number of visiting teachers employed at that time, reported the impossibility of doing so because of the varied titles used and the overlapping of duties of visiting teachers with those of other officials, attendance officers, vocational assistants or consultants, and teachers of special classes, particularly. Titles reported at that time include home teacher, visiting teacher, social worker, home and school visitor, room teacher, perambulant teacher, home visitor, even extension teacher.

Replies to the questionnaire from the cities canvassed indicate that the title used in 122 of the 266 cities is "visiting teacher," implying its rather wide acceptance in school systems, at least as compared to any other title reported. Only 8 of the 266 cities report the use of "school social worker" though the national association, in an effort to discover a more acceptable title, recently changed its name to American Association of School Social Workers and many of its officers and members are encouraging the use of the title "school social worker." It seems understandable that school superintendents generally, as well as those replying to the questionnaire, might prefer a title that implied a *school* relationship rather than a relationship to a nonschool agency. This consideration might well be of importance to a superintendent or an interested member of a school board seeking approval for the establishment or enlargement of

[2] See Appendix, table II.

[3] The Visiting Teacher, by Sophia C. Gleim. (U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1921, No. 10.)

visiting teacher services from patrons or school board committees. A "teacher," by whatever adjective modified, has a recognized place in a school program and the contribution her services make or are expected to make to the attainment of the school's objectives probably needs less explanation than that of a person called a social worker. The school superintendent may himself understand the significance of school social work and the place of a trained social worker in the school system, but school boards and patrons often do not. The disadvantages of the title "visiting teacher," because of its confusion with "home teacher," "home visitor," and others, should and probably would be overcome when and if a wider extension of the work as a school function is achieved. In the meantime, now that considerable attention has been drawn to the present confusion, a satisfactory solution should be possible in the near future.

*Certification and professional qualifications.*—Professional employees of public-school systems, in some States those in custodial service also, are required to be legally certificated by school authorities. While certification is, with few exceptions, Massachusetts, e.g., largely a State responsibility, many of the large cities certificate applicants for positions in their systems, generally in order to set up higher or more specialized standards in certain fields than those established by the State. In practice their requirements are usually in addition to the State minimum, often to the State maximum requirements.

As indicated in chapter III, 182 of the cities canvassed reported that certificates are required of visiting teachers, usually State teaching certificates; only 40 reported that "special" or "visiting teacher" certificates were held or required. This situation is probably accounted for at least in part by the lack of standardization in qualifications and functions referred to above, though some of it can be charged to the existing teacher shortage. It may be influenced somewhat by the fact that nonschool agencies sometimes make visiting teacher service available to schools; that school nurses, attendance officials, and others employed by the schools primarily trained for other fields often assume the functions of visiting teachers. Whether these practices are followed because of emergency situations, lack of adequate funds, or lack of understanding of the importance of professional specialization as prerequisite for visiting teacher service is not clear. No doubt each exerts an influence.

Experience as well as an examination of the reports from the cities canvassed concerning certification and qualifications of visiting teachers leaves little doubt that the establishment of certification requirements based on policies similar in principle to those followed in issuing certificates in the teaching, supervising, and administrative fields would have a stimulating and clarifying effect on visiting teacher programs. Another

probable result might well be the employment of better qualified staffs and extension of the services into additional school systems. At least three levels of certificates are indicated by present practice as desirable: (1) For positions in which assignment is by schools, one visiting teacher to each school or group of schools, dependent on size and location of school (in some systems the visiting teacher is a member of the particular school staff and responsible to the principal as well as to the central office director or supervisor); (2) for positions of a supervisory nature, as in systems in which several visiting teachers are employed and assigned to schools or regions directed by a head visiting teacher or supervisor who would probably correspond in the administrative organization of the system to an elementary or special subject supervisor; (3) for positions as director of a visiting teacher program involving administrative, supervisory, and consultative duties. No doubt other intermediate positions for which certificates are necessary and desirable should be developed later.

A preliminary canvass of State departments of education recently made in the U. S. Office of Education shows that in 28 States, certificates, usually teaching certificates, are issued and required of visiting teachers employed by school systems within the respective States. A number of other States reported "considering the matter," or "now working on it." Twelve States issue special types of certificates applicable to visiting teacher work. A few have not as yet encountered the certification problem for visiting teachers since none are employed in those States. For the country as a whole, however, certification of visiting teachers is recognized as a problem which needs immediate attack. At its meeting in December 1944, the Council of Chief State School Officers took cognizance of the problem in a two-part resolution, recommending (1) that visiting teachers, certified as such by the regular certificating body in each State, be employed whenever possible; and (2) that because of confusion concerning standards which should prevail as to the definition (or title) of the visiting teacher, as to purposes and objectives of the program, as to training and experience to be required, and as to certification of visiting teachers, a "careful study be made and a report . . . presented at the next annual convention." Another indication of the pertinence of the certification problem is the action of the American Association of School Social Workers in appointing a committee to study certification of visiting teachers in the 48 States and make recommendations on the basis of results.

It is important in considering certification to note that States which issue special visiting teacher certificates (see Appendix for examples), those which recently provided for establishing the service, and a number of cities (see chapter III), especially large ones with well-developed programs, recognize the need for specialized preparation and experience

in the two areas in which visiting teachers work, namely, education and social work.

At least three conclusions in regard to certification seem justified from recent experience and the canvass of cities on visiting teacher problems: (1) That certification by established school authorities based on the principles followed in other phases of school work is necessary to the satisfactory development of visiting teacher services in school systems; (2) that professional preparation in education and social work should be required for visiting teacher certificates, with minimum requirements for entering candidates and gradually increasing preparation and experience requirements for higher certificates and higher positions; (3) that the kinds and amounts of pre-service preparation in the two areas education and social work, for the several types of certificates to be issued, be agreed upon by schools of education and schools of social work and recommended to State certification authorities for immediate action pending the findings of the two studies referred to above.

*Salaries and salary scales.*—Salary scales for visiting teachers commensurate with the qualifications set up for preparation and experience should accompany certification standards. They will differ among States and localities as those of teachers and other professional workers do. Returns from the cities indicate a wide range in salaries, but the prevailing practice is a salary scale comparable to that paid teachers. In about one-third of the cities the salary is comparable to that paid principals or supervisors. When functions and satisfactory qualifications are better standardized, provision doubtless will be made for positions with different functions and responsibilities with salaries graded accordingly.

As visiting teacher work is now organized in many city systems, especially in large systems, a considerable number of the visiting teachers at work have been recruited from former classroom teachers. Many of them have training in social work on the graduate level, having previously met the requirements for teaching positions, usually college graduation or its equivalent. Many of these well-qualified visiting teachers, possibly the majority, hold positions which in responsibility and salary compare with school supervisors. Such positions are and will continue to be available in increasing numbers, as will this excellent route of entrance to visiting teacher service. But provision must be made also for other types of functions and responsibilities and for recruiting the ranks of visiting teachers having varying degrees of responsibility through preparation less exacting. It cannot be expected that *all* those aspiring to positions as visiting teachers as beginners will have had both graduate work and previous experience, desirable as both are. If the service is to have the healthy growth it deserves, many new positions should be established as well as those for supervisors or directors, necessitating that several

levels of certificates be provided. Certificates based on minimum qualifications should be available for beginners in these areas, possibly temporary in nature, with additional certificates based on additional preparation and successful experience on successively higher levels. Salary scales that recognize professional achievements, the responsibilities of the positions accepted, as well as type or level of certificate held, should be provided for now in long-term planning. Supervisors and directors of visiting teacher services will have, as many now have, a status in the administrative structure of school systems corresponding to that of supervisors and department directors in other phases of the school program.

Before defense and war programs disrupted education programs, an A.B. degree, including courses in education, was rapidly becoming a minimum standard for teachers in progressive school systems. The postwar years will probably re-establish that minimum in a high percentage of school systems for classroom as for visiting teachers. Supervisory and consultative positions, directorships, and the like, will continue to require graduate work and successful experience as a prerequisite.

*State programs for visiting teacher service.*—Leadership and supervision of visiting teacher work from State departments of education and, where it is in harmony with the State's system of financing schools, State aid for visiting teacher service should be sought as soon as feasible. Provisions in State departments of education corresponding to those made in other areas, elementary education, health, music, e.g., will add to the efficiency and the prestige of this service as integral parts of school programs. While visiting teacher service is not as yet fully established as a part of State programs of education, a beginning has been made in some phases of personnel work related to and usually included among visiting teacher functions. Pennsylvania has a large State staff of professionally qualified "home and school visitors." Maryland's State board of education has established high professional standards for county officials who assume many functions of the type usually associated with visiting teacher work. West Virginia has professionally prepared and State-certificated attendance officials in a high percentage of its counties. In Alabama, local attendance supervisors who perform the accepted functions of visiting teachers are supervised by a staff member of the State Department of Education. Michigan and Louisiana[4] are examples of more recent assumption of State responsibility for some phases of visiting teacher work. In both States there is a supervisor of the new programs on the staff of the State Department of Education.

*In-service programs for school staffs.*—Provision for the professional growth of teachers in service is a growing movement in education. The

[4]For a brief description of visiting teacher service in these States, see EDUCATION FOR VICTORY, vol. 3, no. 13, Jan. 3, 1945.

Philadelphia and New York school systems have recently been carrying on in-service training programs for their staffs in the visiting teacher service areas. The Philadelphia plan,[8] now approximately 3 years old, was inaugurated with the purpose of preparing experienced teachers for visiting teacher work rather than as an in-service program in the usual sense. It is, however, with modifications designed to fit the ends to be served, suggestive for and adaptable as an acceptable in-service training program for visiting teachers, for regular classroom teachers, or for both.

Two phases of in-service training would be conducive to the extension and efficiency of visiting teacher services as well as to the achievement of the objectives of school programs; one designed to promote in-service growth of the regular staff of visiting teachers; the other to promote wider understandings among regular classroom teachers of the values to be derived from cooperation in the wholesome development of children by the total school staffs and how better to achieve these values. Desirable in-service courses of the kind indicated are, of course, in addition to, not to substitute for, pre-service preparation which both classroom and visiting teachers have had (at least some) in each of the two fields education and social work. Rather they are intended to emphasize the desirability of continuing study in both fields, of familiarity with current research and with newer movements in education usually resulting from research and experimentation. Techniques in cooperative effort for the highest development of children's potentialities offer ever-present problems.

*Changes in school programs.*—Of special interest in the development of visiting teacher services are the activities under way in the reorganization of curricular and school organization programs in school systems the country over. Flexible programs and enriched curricula will facilitate adjustments to the special needs of individual children on an increasingly wider scale. Better school health programs, including mental health and physical and medical examinations of school children at strategic periods in their school life; school and community recreation and leisure-time programs and facilities now provided or contemplated as functions of State and local school systems, are a few of the newer movements which postwar planning should extend and expand. Extending the school program to include preschool and kindergarten age children will facilitate early adjustments and location of health and emotional problems in their incipient stages—an end devoutly to be hoped for in any good visiting teacher program.

The recent movement for an extended school day, especially for the children of working mothers for whom an education-leisure-time program is now set up in a number of communities, will probably be incor-

[8] See EDUCATION FOR VICTORY, vol. 3, no. 13, Jan. 3, 1945, for a description of the plan.

porated into the regular program in large numbers of school systems when normal conditions are re-established. And, last but not least, our understanding of children, their needs in early childhood and adolescence, and what can be done about them is constantly broadening as a result of research and experience. Planning now for education in the immediate future as well as for the postwar years should lead to better and more comprehensive programs for all children through the schools than have yet been provided even in the more favored communities.

# Appendix

Federal Security Agency
U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Washington 25
April 15, 1944

Budget Bureau
No. 51–4405
Approval Expires
October 1, 1944

## QUESTIONNAIRE IN REGARD TO THE VISITING TEACHER OR SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKER IN CITY PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEMS

City.....State.....Name of superintendent.....

This questionnaire is being sent out to superintendents of schools in cities of over 10,000 population in order to determine the number of school systems which employ persons as visiting teachers or school social workers. We hope, with this information, to clarify the field of the visiting teacher, the training qualifications, and the number of jobs available for people trained in this field. Such persons work under various titles: e.g., Visiting Counselor, School Social Worker, Visiting Teacher, or School Visitor. Kindly give the following information concerning this type of work in your school system. A penalty envelope, which requires no postage, is enclosed for returning the questionnaire.

1. Number of persons so employed: (a) Full time.....(b) Part time .....(c) Full-time equivalent of total number.....

2. Title used to designate them.....

3. Ratio of elementary and secondary pupils enrolled to each full-time equivalent person employed in this capacity.....

4. Range of salaries paid: Lowest, $.....Highest, $.....
   These salaries are comparable to those of which group? (Check) Teachers.... Supervisors.....Directors.....Principals.....

5. Cost of such services per pupil enrolled $.....(based on salary and travel allowance, if any).

6. Functions (underline those which apply): (a) Acting as attendance officers; (b) Working out problems causing nonattendance; (c) Assisting in adjustment of behavior problems; (d) Helping with home-school relationships; (e) Referral of appropriate problems to outside agencies; (f) Direct treatment of children's difficulties.

7. Qualifications required (underline or specify):
   (a) Education: (1) Degree: A.B.; A.M.; Other.....
   (2) Experience in teaching.....(years).
   (3) Certificate: State Teacher's; Special; Other.....
   (b) Social Work: (1) Professional training in an accredited school of social work: Less than 1 year; 1 year; 2 years.
   (2) Experience, if any.....

**Table I. Visiting teacher services provided in cities replying to questionnaire, by State in which located**

| State in which located | Number of cities reporting— | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Full or part-time visiting teacher service | No visiting teacher service | Some service provided by other than trained visiting teachers | Interest in or plans to provide visiting teacher service[1] |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Alabama | 3 | 2 | 2 | — |
| Arizona | — | 2 | — | 1 |
| Arkansas | 3 | 2 | 1 | — |
| California | 17 | 18 | 3 | — |
| Colorado | 5 | 3 | 1 | — |
| Connecticut | 3 | 8 | 1 | — |
| Delaware | 1 | — | — | — |
| District of Columbia | — | 1 | — | — |
| Georgia | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Idaho | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Illinois | 14 | 23 | 8 | 2 |
| Indiana | 13 | 7 | 5 | — |
| Iowa | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Kansas | 2 | 7 | 3 | — |
| Kentucky | 6 | 2 | 3 | — |
| Louisiana | 1 | 1 | 1 | — |
| Maine | — | 5 | — | — |
| Maryland | 1 | — | 1 | — |
| Massachusetts | 12 | 47 | 3 | 3 |
| Michigan | 15 | 18 | 3 | 8 |
| Minnesota | 3 | 6 | 5 | — |
| Mississippi | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Missouri | 5 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Montana | 2 | 2 | 1 | — |
| Nebraska | 2 | 1 | 2 | — |
| New Hampshire | — | 8 | 1 | — |
| New Jersey | 14 | 36 | 3 | 5 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 1 | — | — |
| New York | 16 | 31 | 10 | 1 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| North Dakota | 2 | — | — | — |
| Ohio | 28 | 16 | 7 | 3 |
| Oklahoma | 5 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| Oregon | 3 | 1 | 1 | — |
| Pennsylvania | 33 | 30 | 12 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 6 | — | — |
| South Carolina | 3 | 3 | 1 | — |
| South Dakota | — | 3 | 1 | — |
| Tennessee | 6 | 3 | — | — |
| Texas | 8 | 17 | 1 | 1 |
| Utah | 2 | 1 | — | — |
| Vermont | — | 2 | 1 | — |
| Virginia | 1 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Washington | 3 | 9 | — | 1 |
| Wisconsin | 10 | 13 | 3 | — |
| Wyoming | 1 | — | 1 | — |
| Total | 266 | 380 | 102 | 39 |

[1]Included in column 3.

**Table II. Titles of school employees performing visiting teacher functions reported, according to number of systems[2]**

| Titles used | Number of systems | Titles used | Number of systems |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adjustment service worker | 1 | Home or home-school counselor | 2 |
| Attendance and social worker | 1 | Home or home-school visitor | 24 |
| Attendance and welfare worker | 2 | Home-school visitor and nurse | 4 |
| Attendance counselor | 1 | Nurse, school nurse, or visiting nurse | 15 |
| Attendance officer | 53 | Nurse teacher | 4 |
| Attendance supervisor | 5 | Personnel worker | 1 |
| Attendance teacher | 1 | Principal | 2 |
| Attendance worker | 2 | Psychologist | 3 |
| Child consultant | 2 | Pupil adjustment teacher | 1 |
| Child study department | 1 | Pupil welfare | 1 |
| Coordinator | 5 | School phychiatric social worker | 1 |
| Counseling teacher | 2 | School social case worker | 1 |
| Counselor | 4 | School social worker | 8 |
| Dean | 4 | School visitor | 6 |
| Director | 1 | Special case worker | 1 |
| Director accounting | 1 | Special class teacher | 1 |
| Director attendance and guidance | 1 | Supervisor child welfare and attendance | 1 |
| Director child guidance clinic | 1 | Truant, probation officer, or school patrolman | 5 |
| Director individual guidance | 5 | Visiting and attendance officer or teacher | 4 |
| Director or supervisor student personnel | 4 | Visiting counselor | 5 |
| Director guidance and child accounting | 1 | Visiting teacher | 122 |
| Family life coordinator | 1 | Welfare director | 2 |
| Field worker | 1 | Welfare or child welfare worker | 3 |
| Guidance counselor | 4 | | |
| Home instruction teacher | 1 | | |

[1]In many cities, 2 or more titles were reported for persons performing visiting teacher functions.

**Table III.—Combinations of functions of visiting teachers by number of cities reporting**

| Five functions | | Four functions | | Three functions | | Two functions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of cities reporting | Functions | Number of cities reporting | Functions | Number of cities reporting | Functions | Number of cities reporting | Functions |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 40 | a, b, c, d, e[1] | 18 | a, b, d, e[1] | 6 | a, b, e[1] | 7 | a, b[1] |
| 36 | b, c, d, e, f | 17 | b, c, d, e | 6 | b, c, d | 2 | b, c |
| 1 | a, b, d, e, f | 9 | a, b, d, f | 5 | a, b, d | 1 | b, d |
| | | 8 | a, c, d, e | 2 | a, b, e | 1 | c, d |
| | | 4 | b, c, d, e | 1 | a, c, d | 1 | c, f |
| | | 1 | a, b, c, e | 1 | a, c, e | | |
| | | 1 | a, b, c, d | 1 | b, c, d | | |
| | | 1 | b, c, d, f | 1 | b, c, e | | |
| | | 1 | b, d, e, f | 1 | b, d, e | | |
| | | | | 1 | c, d, e | | |
| | | | | 1 | c, d, f | | |
| | | | | 1 | d, e, f | | |
| [2]77 | | [2]59 | | [2]26 | | [2]12 | |

[1]See page 25, table 5A for type of function represented.

[2]Read table thus: Of the 250 cities reporting on functions, 77 cities reported five functions performed, distributed in the manner indicated; 59 cities, four functions, etc. Two cities, not included in the table, reported on only one function each, i.e., home-school relationships, and direct treatment of children's difficulties. 74 cities reported all six functions as given on page 25.

**Table IV. Certificates required or held by visiting teachers, by State, number of cities, and type of certificate**

| State | Number of cities reporting | Type of certificate | | | | | None | No information |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Special | | Teachers | | | | |
| | | State visiting teachers | Other[1] | State teachers | Other[2] | Both teachers and special | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Alabama | 3 | | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| Arkansas | 3 | | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| California | 17 | | 4 | 8 | | 3 | | 2 |
| Colorado | 5 | 1 | | 2 | | | 3 | |
| Connecticut | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Delaware | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Georgia | 6 | | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | |
| Idaho | 2 | | | | | | 2 | |
| Illinois | 14 | | 1 | 7 | | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Indiana | 13 | | 5 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | |
| Iowa | 5 | | | 4 | | 1 | | |
| Kansas | 2 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Kentucky | 6 | | 2 | 3 | | 1 | | |
| Louisiana | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Maryland | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Massachusetts | 12 | | | | | | 12 | |
| Michigan | 15 | | 2 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 3 | |
| Mississippi | 2 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Missouri | 5 | | | 4 | | | 1 | |
| Montana | 2 | | | 2 | | | | |
| Nebraska | 2 | | | 2 | | | | |
| New Jersey | 14 | 4 | | 2 | | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| New Mexico | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| New York | 16 | | 5 | 5 | | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| North Carolina | 4 | | | | | | 4 | |
| North Dakota | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Ohio | 28 | | 3 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 6 | |
| Oklahoma | 5 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 |
| Oregon | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Pennsylvania | 33 | | 6 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| Rhode Island | 2 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| South Carolina | 3 | | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Tennessee | 6 | | | 3 | | | 2 | 1 |
| Texas | 8 | | | 3 | | | 5 | |
| Utah | 2 | | 2 | | | | | |
| Virginia | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| Washington | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Wisconsin | 10 | | | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | |
| Wyoming | 1 | | | | | 1 | | |
| Total | 266 | 5 | 35 | 103 | 15 | 24 | 73 | 11 |

[1]Includes "special," "special attendance," "child welfare and attendance," "special school-nurse-teacher certificate," "visiting teacher certificate."
[2]Includes "regular," "teaching certificate," "normal diploma," "college permanent," "standard."

# EXAMPLES OF STATE CERTIFICATION OF VISITING TEACHERS

*California.*—The Child Welfare and Supervision of Attendance Credential is the authorization upon which a county board of education may issue a certificate to supervise child welfare and attendance and act as a visiting teacher in the county. An applicant for this credential shall comply with the prescribed procedure of application and shall have completed a program including the following minimum requirements:

A. Possession of a valid California teacher's certificate, credential, or life diploma of general elementary or general secondary grade.

B. Two years of successful teaching experience, or 1 year of successful teaching experience and 1 year of successful social service experience.

C. Completion of a standard college course, with the bachelor's degree, including: (1) Six semester units, or the equivalent, with emphasis upon laws relating to children, including the Compulsory Education Law, Child Labor Law, and other State and Federal laws relating to children; methods and procedures in child welfare and attendance, including practice in method and procedures of social investigation related to the child in home, school, and community life. (2) Nine semester units, or the equivalent, distributed among at least three of the following fields: (*a*) Child development, including developmental psychology, child growth, and child development; (*b*) sociology or social economics, including standards of living and budgeting, housing problems, recreation, treatment of delinquency, labor regulations, social security, hours and wages, and child welfare services; (*c*) guidance, including tests and measurements, vocational guidance, and occupational studies; (*d*) field work with children; (*e*) education of exceptional children.

*Connecticut.*[1]—To qualify for a certificate to serve as a visiting teacher or pupil adjustment teacher, an applicant shall comply with the general requirements for all certificates and present as minimum qualifications:

1. A Limited Elemenatry or Limited Secondary Certificate of the current issue and 2 years' public teaching experience.

2. Evidence of completion of at least 1 year of a course in accredited training school for social work, including satisfactory courses in mental hygiene, child psychology, mental tests and measurements and social case work.

3. Evidence of at least 9 months' experience in practical case work with children in an accredited social agency; the said practical case work may have been performed concurrently with these requirements of the year's course in the school of social work, provided the said social agency shall have been approved by the said school of social work.

This special certificate to serve as visiting teacher is issued for a 3-year period, at the expiration of which, upon presenting evidence of 3 years' successful experience as a visiting teacher in Connecticut the same may be made permanent.

*Michigan.*[2]—In connection with the recently enacted law for a State program of

[1] Rules and Regulations Concerning State Teachers Certificate, 1941. Hartford, Conn., State Department of Education, 1941. (Connecticut School Document No. 2—1941-1942.)

[2] A State Program for Visiting Teachers. Lansing, Mich., State Department of Public Instruction, 1944. (Bulletin No. 3042.)

visiting teacher work, educational requirements have been established. For full approval, evidence of the following must be submitted to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

*Experience:* Appropriate experience, some of which must be as a teacher, preferably on the elementary level. A minimum of 3 years as teacher, principal, supervisor, guidance worker, social worker, child welfare worker, clinician, visiting teacher, or equivalent, is necessary. Varied experience in several fields are desirable.

*Personality:* A record of exceptional success with respect to social sensitivity, insight into behavior motivation, and in stimulating cooperation . . . highly respected as a person, and accepted by teachers, parents, pupils, and other public and private child welfare organizations in the community.

*Certificate:* Have or be eligible for a Michigan life, provisional, permanent teacher's certificate or other certificate approved by the State Board of Education.

*Education:* A.B. degree. An M.A. degree is desirable. At least 30 semester hours of credits in designated subjects are required.

If no fully qualified teacher can be secured, one who is partially qualified may be appointed on a year to year basis if first approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

*New Jersey.*—The "visiting teacher certificate" authorizes the holder to serve as visiting teacher in any school district of the State. Requirements include:

*Education:* (1) Graduation from an approved college, and (2) 16 additional credits in approved courses with an emphasis on the psychiatric social field, including 10 weeks of supervised field practice in visiting teacher service in schools.

*Experience:* Three years successful teaching experience. For 1 year of teaching experience a year of approved social work experience may be substituted.

*Permanent certificate:* Evidence of 3 years of successful visiting teacher experience in public schools in New Jersey subsequent to the issuance of the limited visiting teacher's certificate.

*Visiting teachers now in service:* Any person who was employed as a visiting teacher in New Jersey public schools prior to November 4, 1939, and who holds a valid New Jersey teacher's certificate, will upon application receive a limited visiting teacher's certificate. Such application must be made and filed prior to February 1, 1941.

*Pennsylvania.*—A certificate of standard grade (College Provisional or Permanent Temporary or Permanent Standard, Normal School Certificate or Diploma) may be validated authorizing the holder to act as *Home and School Visitor* on the completion of 6 semester hours in approved courses of college grade selected from the following list, or equivalent approved courses:

Applied Sociology; Sociology of Educational Problems; Principles of Family Social Work; Problems of Poverty; Social Problems of the Family; Social Control; Social Hygiene; Social Maladjustment; Social Psychology; Methods of Social Investigation; Society and the Child; Principles and Problems of Child Welfare; School Administration including Records and Reports and School Law.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1945—647363