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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Public school speech correction programs have existed for many years throughout the United States. Most of these programs have been involved in one or more of the following experiences: expansion, enrichment, curtailment, and withdrawal.

I. THE STUDY

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this study (1) to investigate the historical development of the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District; (2) to determine the major factors that influenced the direction of the development of the program; and (3) to ascertain the positive determinants of improvement in the further development of the San Francisco public school speech correction program.

Importance of the study. A basic requirement in the study of any professional discipline is a consideration of the history of that discipline. This basic need has not been met in the area of the early history of the first public school speech correction program in California. Mrs. Mabel Farrington Gifford, who began the first public school...
speech correction program in California, has in her personal files many important papers and materials which are essential to a study of the history of the San Francisco public school speech correction program. Mrs. Gifford was very interested in this study and graciously made her personal files accessible to the writer of this thesis. If the history of the San Francisco public school speech correction program were not completed in her lifetime, much of the material used in this thesis could not have been verified. The writer of this thesis could find no recorded study presenting a definitive history of the development of the speech correction program in the public schools in San Francisco.

Plan of the study. This thesis will present the following aspects of the history of the development of the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District from 1915 to 1956:

1. Organization of the program.
2. Administration of the program.
3. Professional requirements of the speech correction staff.
4. Statistical factors of the program.
5. Finance of the program.

II. PRELIMINARY HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

Special education for handicapped children. Provision for the special needs of handicapped children has
developed very slowly throughout the history of civilization. Care and education for those who deviate significantly in mental and physical conditions were not accepted as a public responsibility in the United States until the nineteenth century, when institutions for the blind and deaf began to appear in the eastern United States.¹

The California Bureau of Special Education states that special education in California began in 1860, when, by direct appropriation of the Legislature and the appointment of a board of directors, a residential school for the deaf was established in San Francisco. In 1865, similar contributions were made for the blind children. More than thirty years later, in 1897, the city of Los Angeles pioneered special education as an integral part of the local school program in California, when a public day class for deaf children was opened.²

**Special education for speech handicapped school children.** Recognition of the need for special education for school children with speech handicaps was first made in Potsdam, Germany, in 1886. The first public school class

---


² Ibid.
in speech correction in the United States was organized in New York City in 1908. The speech correction program in San Francisco was initiated only eight years later.

Special education programs were being developed in public education in California for fifty-six years before the first public school speech correction program was initiated in 1916. It was established under the direction of Mrs. Mabel Farrington Gifford as an integral part of the San Francisco public schools program. Biographical information concerning Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford is located in Appendix A, page 107. The problems of speech handicapped school children were a matter for public concern only after the more obvious handicaps of deafness and blindness were recognized and accepted.

In order to evaluate her new program and to acquire more information concerning concepts and techniques of speech correction, Mrs. Gifford traveled across the United States in 1917, observing public school speech correction programs. She found public school programs in speech correction in Minneapolis, Saint Paul, Detroit, Chicago, Boston, Newark, and New York City. These programs were conducted by from two to eleven special teachers in speech

---

4 Ibid.
correction and were very similar to one another in their organization and development. From the notes of Mrs. Gifford's trip, it was evident that most of these programs had been developed within the previous six years. The San Francisco public school speech correction program was among the early pioneer programs for speech handicapped school children in the United States.

III. SOURCES OF INVESTIGATION

The sources for the information used in this thesis consist of: articles on the subject found in professional journals, records and pamphlets from the California State Department of Education, and reports of the Superintendents of Schools, the Department of Speech Correction, and the Department of Physically Handicapped of the San Francisco Unified School District.

Other sources which are used in the study of the early years of speech correction in San Francisco consisted of original materials and manuscripts which were found in the personal files of Mrs. Mabel Farrington Gifford. These original materials and manuscripts are very old, not recently organized, unclassified, and included many official papers as well as many that are extraneous and personal.

Notes from the personal files of Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford, ca. 1917. (Typewritten.)
CHAPTER II

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM,
1915 - 1917

The initial program. The Department of Speech Correction in the San Francisco Public Schools was first opened as a speech clinic in the Pediatric Department of the University of California Hospital at the Affiliated Colleges in San Francisco in 1915. The clinic, under the direction of Mrs. Mabel Farrington Gifford, was held on Saturday mornings for the accommodation of school children who were diagnosed and placed in these classifications:

1. Psychopathic type.
2. Neurotic, organic, or sluggish articulation of the elements of language.
3. Sluggish enunciation due to careless use of the jaw and lips, including cases of disagreeable voices.
4. Aphasia and aphonia mutism.

In September of 1915 the Education Committee of the Panama-Pacific Exposition requested that Mrs. Gifford give demonstrations of speech correction techniques at the San Francisco fair grounds in the Palace of Education. After having studied reports of her work at the Exposition, the San Francisco Board of Education appointed Mrs. Gifford in

---

1916 to organize the speech correction program in the San Francisco Public Schools. ²

The public school speech correction program. Under the supervision of Mrs. Mabel Gifford, who was assigned one assistant, a special survey was made in September, 1916, in the following manner. The Superintendent of Schools sent a notice to each school in the city, through the regular school bulletin, asking for a listing of all students with speech defects. These lists produced an enrollment of 1,486 pupils with speech defects. ³

The city schools were then divided into five districts for the speech correction program, one central school being chosen as the center for each district. The pupils with speech defects assembled in these centers one half day each week. This plan accommodated almost all of the schools in the city in one week.⁴

²Leta W. Timberlake, "An Overview of the Program of Speech Correction in the State of California." (Paper read at the International Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Oakland, California, April 19, 1952.)


⁴Ibid.
A typical schedule of the speech correction centers follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
<td>Primary, stutterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
<td>Primary, articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Grammar Grade, stutterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Grammar Grade, articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>High School Students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nervous speech disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulation defects and foreign mispronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The speech classes were divided into two groups, Class I and Class II. Class I consisted of cases described by Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford as having nervous speech disturbance; under which she listed stammerers, stutterers, and clutterers. Class II consisted of cases Mrs. Gifford described as having articulatory defects; such as, lisp, infantile speech, faulty articulation, and enunciation.6

Each school which sent speech handicapped pupils to the centers assigned one teacher to accompany them. The teacher attended the center with the pupils each week, observed the corrective lesson, and received mimeographed instructions for the purpose of accurately following up the instruction given by the supervisor. The teacher would then assemble the speech handicapped group from her school

---

5 Ibid.

each day for one-half hour. The time allotted to this aspect of the speech work varied from forty minutes to one hour a day, maintaining the separation of the two groups, Class I and Class II.7

The following description of the lessons given by Mrs. Gifford in 1919 indicates that they involved considerably more than what was generally practiced at that time in other cities:

Model lessons were given Class I in the physiological and psychological training for stammerers and stutterers, with exercises for the development and control of the outer speech mechanism. Methods were employed for the training of the central mechanism by intensifying the visual and auditory images and for the establishment of confidence and emotional control by the formation of new mental associations.

For Class II, tongue, mouth, and vocal gymnastics and special drills in phonetics and voice development were clearly outlined and the schedule arranged for home practice. These drills were all arranged in steps of progression from the simple elementary sounds of language to the difficult consonant combinations.

A complete record is kept for each pupil, consisting of conditions before and during correction.8

Summary. At its inception, the speech correction program in San Francisco was attempting to find and to help

7Gifford, loc. cit., "Speech Correction Work in the San Francisco Public Schools."

8Gifford, loc. cit., "Speech Defects."
all school children who had speech handicaps. Information from the related fields of psychoanalysis, psychiatry, and neurology was incorporated into the methodology used in the San Francisco speech correction program. Knowledge and training in speech pathology, a very underdeveloped subject at that time, were also evident in the treatment of speech handicapped children in San Francisco.
CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM,
1915-1956

The placement and operation of the speech correction program at the administrative level will be discussed in this chapter. The chapter is organized into five chronological periods of time, selected on the basis of significant administrative changes.

1915-1920. In 1915 there were five deputy superintendents of equal status. The Superintendents in charge of Elementary and of Secondary Schools were the two who related more specifically to the supervisors of special education.1 The San Francisco Unified School District in 1915 reportedly had special education services in only two schools: the Ungraded School for the mentally retarded, and the Ethan Allen School, a disciplinary school for delinquent boys.2

In the following year, 1916, when the speech correction program was officially introduced into the school system, Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford was in charge as Supervisor

---

1 Directory of the San Francisco Public Schools, 1915.
2 Ibid.
of Speech Correction with one assistant assigned to help her. Mrs. Gifford worked directly under and with the Superintendent of Schools and the two Deputy Superintendents in charge of elementary and secondary schools. Because the program involved the elementary school children primarily, Mrs. Gifford was probably working more directly with the Deputy Superintendent in charge of Elementary Schools.

1920-1925. By 1920 the special education services had expanded to consist of: the Ethan Allen School for delinquent boys, the Ungraded School (primary classes), the atypical classes for the mentally retarded located in normal elementary schools throughout the city, speech correction, oral deaf classes, Children's Hospital class, and the Juvenile Detention Home class. All of these programs were under the supervision of the Deputy Superintendent in charge of Elementary Education, with the exception of some cases in which the age and grade of the pupil indicated consideration at the secondary level.

By 1920 Mrs. Gifford enjoyed a titular advancement from Supervisor to Director of Speech Correction. Her program had expanded by 1925 to include two assistants, Miss...
Read and Miss Belvel, and twelve speech correction centers which were located in various schools throughout the city. In addition to the two assistants there were, by 1925, approximately sixty part-time teachers who accompanied the children to the centers and reviewed the corrective speech lessons with those children during the week in their respective schools.\(^5\)

The children who attended the speech correction centers were selected on the basis of referrals. Referral of speech handicapped children to the special speech correction classes was made either by the classroom teacher, or after a school survey by the Director of Speech Correction, or by one of her two assistants.\(^6\) No further evidence of direct surveys by the speech correction administrators between 1916 and 1925 could be found by the investigator.

An additional responsibility of the administrators of speech correction was the inauguration and supervision of a speech improvement program in which classroom teacher in the school system devoted five minutes a day to articulation drill.\(^7\) This work began circa 1920. Samples of the


\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)Ibid.
articulation drill cards and oral gymnastics used by the classroom teachers are located in Appendix D, pages 124-129.

1925-1930. In 1925 the position of Deputy Superintendent in charge of Special Schools and Classes was created in San Francisco. The responsibilities of the additional deputy involved supervision and co-ordination of these special services: speech correction, conservation of sight, attendance, evening schools, Gough School for the Deaf, Ungraded School, physical defectives, the Ethan Allen School for habitual truants, the Lilienthal School for juvenile delinquents, and the Juvenile Detention Home. A brief consideration of Figure 1, page 15, will indicate that, with the exception of the conservation of sight and the physical defectives programs, there was an administrator for each of these special programs who was responsible to the Deputy Superintendent of Special Schools and Classes. 8

Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford resigned from the San Francisco School Department in 1925 to create a Bureau of Speech Correction in the California State Department of Education. With the creation of this Bureau, California became the first state in the Union to initiate a state-wide program for the correction of speech defects with adequate state

---

8 Directory, 1925, op. cit.
FIGURE 1
ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION, 1925
aid. By 1927 the Bureau became part of the newly established Division of Special Education in the State Department of Education. This Division was later reorganized as the Commission for Special Education, and, in 1947, was replaced by a Bureau of Special Education and made a unit of the Division of Instruction.

When Mrs. Gifford resigned in 1925 from the San Francisco School Department, Miss Edna Cotrel was appointed Supervisor of Speech Correction and taught corrective speech classes two mornings a week. The two assistant supervisors were replaced by three rotating teachers who had been teaching as part-time teachers of speech correction and had been attending the speech clinic program at the University of California Hospital. Within the following two years, 1926-1928, the centers were gradually closed, the rotating teachers spending most of their time in schools having no part-time teachers and assisting part-time teachers who had little or no training.

---


11 Speech Correction Summary Report to the Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco, 1928. (Typewritten.)
In the annual report for the school year, 1929-1930, is a statement of speech surveys conducted in nine schools at the request of the principals. These surveys were conducted by means of individual speech examinations given to each child by the speech correction teacher. No further record of a speech survey is indicated in any future annual reports, except for one survey of Glen Park School in January of 1933.

The annual reports of the speech correction supervisor of the San Francisco Unified School District for the years 1928 to 1929 state that there were six circulating teachers of speech correction, and sixty part-time teachers working in their own schools. Speech correction classes were conducted in eighty-seven elementary schools, six junior high schools, and six senior high schools. The Department was continuing to provide material for the use of speech classes in the form of correction steps, dialogues, plays, and poems.

An interesting development reported in the annual speech correction summary for the school year, 1928-1929, was the contribution by the Speech Correction Department of prepared lessons for general speech improvement work to be given by the classroom teachers. These lessons were requested by many principals and were designed to fit the particular needs of each school in which they were to be
used. The speech improvement work which began circa 1920 and in which each classroom teacher in the school system devoted five minutes a day to articulation drill was continued.

**1930-1934.** An Assistant Supervisor of the Physically Handicapped was created in 1930 to assist Mrs. Mary M. Fitz-Gerald, the Deputy Superintendent of Special Schools and Classes. The classes for the physically handicapped had expanded by this time to include: open air classes, speech correction, lip reading, a visiting teacher to the homes of the crippled children unable to attend classes, conservation of sight classes, a school of oral classes for deafened children, Sunshine School for crippled children, and hospital classes.\(^{12}\) Figure 2 indicates the placement and extent of the Department of the Physically Handicapped in 1930. The growth of the Department of the Physically Handicapped from 1925 to 1930 can be observed by comparing Figure 1, page 15, with Figure 2.

Administrators working under Miss Katharine Inglis, the Assistant Supervisor for the Physically Handicapped, included: a supervisor of speech correction, a teacher-in-charge of lip reading, a teacher-in-charge of the school for

\(^{12}\) Directory, 1930, *op. cit.*
FIGURE 2
PLACEMENT AND EXTENT OF THE PROGRAM OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, 1930
deafened children, and a teacher-in-charge of the Sunshine School for crippled children. Full-time teaching obligations limited considerably the administrative responsibilities of each teacher-in-charge. With no other administrative assistance, Miss Inglis directly supervised the remaining eighteen of the forty teachers of the special classes in the program for the physically handicapped. Miss Inglis also assisted in the supervision of the adult evening schools and the Ethan Allen disciplinary school.

According to the annual report of the Speech Correction Department for 1930, there were six rotating teachers and sixty-two part-time teachers, in addition to the Supervisor of Speech Correction. The speech correction classes were conducted in seventy-seven elementary schools, nine junior high schools, and seven high schools. In addition to the speech correction work, the Department continued its speech improvement program with the classroom teachers.

The annual report of the Speech Correction Supervisor in 1932 indicates that it was because of the national economic crisis of the early 1930's that the San Francisco Board of Education found it necessary to curtail the speech correction program for the following year. Only two speech correction teachers were to be retained in addition to the Supervisor of Speech Correction. The curtailment of the
program resulted in the limitation of speech correction classes to the elementary schools.

An important change in the administrative structure of the special education program in San Francisco occurred in 1932, when Mrs. Mary Fitz-Gerald, Deputy Superintendent of Special Schools and Classes, retired and was not replaced. Miss Inglis then worked directly with the Deputy Superintendents in charge of Elementary and Secondary Schools. Because most of the program for the physically handicapped involved elementary school children, Miss Inglis worked primarily with the Deputy Superintendent in charge of Elementary Schools. Her additional responsibilities of assisting in the supervision of adult evening classes and the school for delinquents ceased with the retirement of Mrs. Fitz-Gerald.13

In 1933, the Supervisor of Speech Correction, Miss Edna Cotrel, retired before the end of the school year. She was not replaced. Miss Inglis continued Miss Cotrel's speech classes and absorbed the functions of the Supervisor of Speech Correction in addition to her other duties. A teacher of speech correction was employed the following term to relieve Miss Inglis of her teaching responsibili-

13Speech Correction Report, 1932, op. cit.
ties in speech correction.\footnote{14}

1934-1944. Two contact classes for the severely
hard of hearing had been initiated by 1934 and included in
the Department of the Physically Handicapped. The open air
classes were re-classified as health classes. Significant
growth occurred in the program of visiting teaching, which expanded from one teacher in 1930 to twenty-five teachers in 1934. A total of sixty-three full-time teachers, augmented by forty-two part-time teachers of speech correction, were under the direct supervision of Miss Katharine Inglis by 1934.\footnote{15} They were teaching in the nine separate educational programs conducted by the Department of the Physically Handicapped, as shown in Figure 3.

Administrative assistance was provided Miss Inglis through two teachers-in-charge, each of whom had her own full-time teaching assignment. One teacher-in-charge assisted Miss Inglis at the Sunshine School, which employed five other teachers; the second teacher-in-charge assisted Miss Inglis at the Gough School for the Deaf, which employed five other teachers.\footnote{16}

\footnote{14}Speech Correction Report, 1933, \textit{op. cit.}\footnote{15}Directory, 1934, \textit{op. cit.}\footnote{16}Ibid.
Department of Physically Handicapped

1 Supervisor

Speech Correction
3 Teachers
42 Part-time Teachers

Lip Reading
2 Teachers

Contact Class for Severely Hard of Hearing
2 Teachers in 2 Schools

Gough School for Deaf
1 Teacher-in-charge
5 Teachers

Conservation of Sight
3 Teachers in 3 Schools

Sunshine School
1 Teacher-in-charge
5 Teachers

Health Classes
11 Teachers in 4 Schools

Hospital Classes
5 Teachers in 3 Hospitals

Visiting Teaching
25 Teachers

FIGURE 3

THE NINE SEPARATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED INDICATING ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE AND SIZE OF THE PROGRAM IN 1934
Although the Department of the Physically Handicapped was permitted to continue its expansion of services in various fields, the Board of Education elected to curtail the speech correction program for reasons of economy. The investigator could find no further evidence to explain this apparent incongruity.

A significant change occurred in the speech correction program in San Francisco in 1936 when the California State Department of Education notified the local school district that State reimbursement would be made only for the speech correction classes taught by teachers holding the special credential for the correction of speech defects. ¹⁷

In order to qualify for the State reimbursement, San Francisco terminated all speech correction classes taught by teachers not holding the special credential. Four part-time teachers of speech correction, who were properly certificated, were transferred at this time to become full-time rotating teachers of speech correction, resulting in a total of eight full-time rotating teachers of speech correction.¹⁸ The following year there were seven full-time rotating teachers, this number remaining constant until 1945.¹⁹

¹⁷Speech Correction Report, 1936, op. cit.
¹⁸Ibid.
¹⁹Speech Correction Reports, 1936-1945, op. cit.
The total number of part-time teachers in the speech correction program was reduced to four who were fully certified in speech correction. This number was increased to six in 1937, varying in subsequent years between four and seven until 1945. 20

In the spring of 1938 rotating teachers of speech correction in San Francisco were given one afternoon each week, in place of teaching time, for conferences with parents, teachers, and principals. They also made home calls during these conference afternoons. This practice has been constant since that time. 21

From 1934 until the present time there is no mention in the annual speech correction reports of the speech improvement work previously discussed on page 17 for which the Speech Correction Department contributed prepared lessons for general speech improvement work to be given by the classroom teacher. Because of the severe curtailment of personnel, this program was abandoned, as well as any further regular departmental development in the acquisition and expansion of speech correction materials and aids for the schools.

According to the annual reports in speech correction,

---

20 Ibid.

21 Speech Correction Reports, 1938-1956, op. cit.
speech handicapped children in San Francisco continued to be referred to the teacher of speech correction by the classroom teachers, the principals, and the school nurses. No evidence of a direct survey conducted by the speech correction teachers was found by the investigator from 1933 to the present time.

1945-1956. In 1945 the Superintendent of Schools was assisted by two Associate Superintendents. Under the Associate Superintendent of Instruction were the three Assistant Superintendents and several co-ordinators, one of whom was John L. Roberts, the Co-ordinator of the Department of Child Welfare.22

In this new administrative structure the Department of Child Welfare consisted of the Bureau of Research, the Court Schools, Child Guidance Services, Counselling and Guidance (Elementary Schools), Bureau of Attendance, Atypical Classes (mentally retarded), and the Department of the Physically Handicapped. Each of these areas was under the direct administration of a supervisor who was responsible to the Co-ordinator of the Department of Child Welfare.23

---

22 Directory, 1945, op. cit.
23 Ibid.
By 1945 the Department of the Physically Handicapped had expanded to include 114 teachers in nine fields of education for the physically handicapped, six of whom were full-time rotating speech correction teachers, augmented by four part-time teachers of speech correction. Mrs. Katharine Inglis Sutter, Supervisor of this department, had administrative assistance at Sunshine School, which had a principal, and the Gough School for the Deaf, which had a teacher-in-charge. The only administrative change from 1945 to 1956 was a titular one in 1946, which advanced the position of Supervisor of the Physically Handicapped to that of Director. The Department of the Physically Handicapped grew from 114 teachers in nine fields of the physically handicapped in 1945 to 121 teachers in twelve fields of the physically handicapped in 1955.24 Figure 4 indicates the size of this department in 1955 with the additional educational fields represented.

It is interesting to note that with the considerable expansion in the Department of the Physically Handicapped from 1933 to 1955, Mrs. Sutter continued her administration with only one clerk and no departmental administrative assistant.

24 Ibid.
FIGURE 4
THE TWELVE SEPARATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED INDICATING ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE AND SIZE OF THE PROGRAM IN 1955
The speech correction program grew from six teachers in 1945 to fourteen teachers in 1955, augmented by one part-time teacher.\(^{25}\)

Referrals of speech handicapped children continued to be through the classroom teachers, the principals, and the school nurses.

**Summary.** The speech correction program initially experienced an identity of its own, with its administration and operation relating directly to the Superintendent of Schools and to the deputy superintendents. As the programs of special education expanded, the speech correction program was required to share its identity with all of those special programs involving the education of the physically handicapped.

The Department of the Physically Handicapped had experienced a facile and direct relationship with the elementary and secondary administrators, as well as with other related agencies. With the placement of the Department of the Physically Handicapped under the Department of Child Welfare, the relationship experienced an additional channeling agent.

The administrative responsibility in special educa-

---

\(^{25}\) *Directory, 1955, op. cit.*
tion in general and speech correction in particular was greatly increased in terms of the teacher-administrator ratio. The teacher-administrator ratio in 1930 of six full-time speech corrections teachers and 62 part-time speech correction teachers to one speech correction supervisor, changed by 1955 to 121 teachers of the physically handicapped, of whom fourteen were speech correction teachers, to one director of the physically handicapped.

As this ratio change gradually occurred, the services of the speech correction department were necessarily and significantly altered. The alteration of speech correction services involved the curtailment of significant activities. Further school surveys for case-finding after 1933 were terminated. The speech improvement program was ended at approximately the same time.

With the State policy of reimbursement only for work done by properly certificated teachers of speech correction, the professional status of the work of the speech correction teacher was established.
CHAPTER IV
THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
FOR THE SPEECH CORRECTION STAFF, 1915-1956

Three areas of development are considered in the subdivisions of this chapter: descriptions of courses offered in speech correction, certification requirements in speech correction, and in-service training for teachers of speech correction in the San Francisco Unified School District.

Courses of study. The speech clinic which opened in San Francisco in the Pediatric Department of the University of California Hospital at the Affiliated Colleges in 1915 was used as the first speech correction teacher training center the following year. Classroom teachers, opportunity teachers (special teachers who taught reading and arithmetic to children having difficulty in these subjects in the regular classroom), and assistant principals attended the clinic on Saturday mornings in order to observe the teaching of speech correction, to practice teaching speech correction under the direct supervision of Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford, director of the clinic, and to take the lecture classes given there at the end of each of the clinic sessions. The lectures were given by a number of the
physicians of the Medical School staff and included such related subjects as: anatomy, physiology, pathology, and abnormal psychology. The course, as originally planned, covered a period of eighteen months.\(^1\)

In 1916 the first summer training session for speech correction was given at the University of California in Berkeley by Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford with a clinic of forty children. The San Francisco State Teachers College inaugurated its first summer session for speech correction training, conducted by Mrs. Gifford, during the following year.\(^2\)

An additional speech correction course was introduced for student teachers in July, 1919, at the San Francisco State Teachers College, all other courses in speech correction having been designed for teachers in service in the San Francisco School Department.\(^3\)

Three interlocking courses were planned for the summer sessions. They were:

---

\(^1\)Mabel F. Gifford, "Speech Correction Work in the San Francisco Public Schools" (original manuscript), published in Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 11:377-81, November, 1925. Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford.

\(^2\)Mabel F. Gifford, Notes on talk given by Mrs. Gifford to the International Council for Exceptional Children at Philadelphia, 1930. Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford. (Handwritten.)

\(^3\)Gifford, loc. cit., "Speech Correction Work in the San Francisco Public Schools."
1. The science of normal speech; phonetics; and the correction of articulation defects, infantile and foreign; retarded speech; enunciation defects.

2. Mental hygiene and clinical psychology with emotional adjustment and full treatment for both teacher and child.

3. The correction of nervous speech disorders. 4

Lesson plans of Miss Edna Cotrel for the first three weeks of the summer session in 1931 were found in the personal files of Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford. The plans were for an introductory course in speech correction and for an advanced course in nervous speech disorders.

According to the lesson plans, the introductory course included the study of the historical background of speech defects and treatment; theories of the unconscious mind; organic inferiority and fear; types of speech defects and disorders, including delayed speech, baby talk, stammering, and cleft palate; classification of organic and non-organic articulatory defects, and a considerable amount of time studying case histories and family relationships. Authors referred to included Mabel F. Gifford, Appelt, Fletcher, Adler, and Morton. The plans did not indicate the first names of these authors. There were lectures and discussions on parental cooperation, home visits, school conferences, and Parent-Teacher Association talks. Students

---

in the class were assigned the task of preparing three outlines for talks before P.T.A. groups. They were asked to write one complete case history and received information on school surveys, organization of classes, how to visit a home, checking progress, equipment and arrangement of rooms, and computation of attendance.

Miss Cotrel's lesson plans indicate that the advanced class studying nervous speech disorders did considerable study in reading and writing case histories. Other subjects discussed in the advanced class were: family constellations, suggestion and auto-suggestion, and personality structure. Authors studied in this class were Appelt, Baudouin, Richardson, Adler, Zachery, and Gifford. Once again, only last names were referred to in the plans. The lesson plans indicated that all of this study was for three of the six weeks of summer session.

Advanced courses at San Francisco State Teachers College in 1934 included: Personality in Teaching, which involved consideration of the value of poised personality, re-education methods involved, mental and emotional control, elimination of destructive attitudes, and cultivation of potential superior powers; The Correlation of Speech with the Elementary Curriculum, which involved a discussion of possible integrated units, phonetics, minor speech defects,
and materials available for integrating speech with the elementary curriculum; *Speech and Voice and Methods of Correction*, which specialized in the diagnosis and classification of non-organic phonetic defects; *Mental Hygiene Problems of Childhood and Adolescence*; and *Adult Mental Hygiene Problems*. The two mental hygiene courses were taught by a psychologist. 5

The speech correction course offerings at San Francisco State Teachers College, at the University of California Medical School in San Francisco, and at the University of California at Berkeley, served as the training centers for most of the speech correction teachers employed by the San Francisco Unified School District. These teachers were not limited to the San Francisco area, however, for special training in speech correction. According to the 1931 quarterly reports in Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford's personal files, Elsie Parker, State Field Assistant in Speech Correction for Southern California, indicated that the University of California at Los Angeles offered teacher training for speech correction as early as 1930. The same source indicates that Fresno State Teachers College inaugurated a similar teacher training program in 1931.

---

5 Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects and Disorders, California State Department of Education, *Bulletin No. 2*, March, 1934. (Mimeographed.)
By 1952 there were thirteen teacher training institutions in California offering the special credential in the correction of speech defects. There were more than two hundred fully qualified speech therapists at that time and approximately fifteen working on an emergency basis. Of these two hundred fully qualified speech therapists in 1952, only fifteen were employed by the San Francisco Unified School District. Of these fifteen San Francisco speech therapists, almost half received all or some of their special training outside of the San Francisco and Berkeley areas.

**Speech correction certification.** The annual San Francisco speech correction reports indicate that from the beginning of the speech correction program to the present time, all full-time speech correction teachers in San Francisco have been properly certificated in speech correction. A brief history of State certification in speech correction is located in Appendix B, pages 114-118.

The speech correction teaching of those part-time teachers who were not properly certificated in speech was inadequate according to the annual reports of the supervisor of speech correction in San Francisco. The Annual Report

---

6Leta W. Timberlake, "An Overview of the Program of Speech Correction in the State of California" (paper read at the International Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Oakland, California, April 19, 1952.)
for 1930 states that of the sixty part-time teachers of speech correction, ten had no special training courses, forty-two had five training courses or fewer, and eight were certificated in speech correction. However, all but four of these part-time teachers had the experience of attending the centers conducted by Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford. The Annual Speech Correction Report for 1929 indicates that the part-time speech correction teachers had many other duties in addition to teaching speech correction classes; therefore, it was impossible to insist that they take the training necessary to make them qualified speech teachers.

In-service training for speech correction teachers.

The earliest report of in-service training that could be found by the investigator was given in the Annual Speech Correction Report of 1929. In this report it is stated that six meetings were held for all of the speech teachers. Most of these meetings were conducted by Mrs. Mabel Gifford. She spoke at one meeting on the use of auto-suggestion in the therapy of speech correction. At another meeting she discussed the procedure to be followed in the correction of articulation defects, giving a new type of lesson so that the correction might become a part of the unconscious mechanism and so function in all life situations. Other points taken up at subsequent meetings were the use of
tongue gymnastics, the use of plaster teeth and the plast-cine tongue.

In-service training experience continued by means of further work on case studies, according to annual reports and booklets on file in the Department of the Physically Handicapped, San Francisco Unified School District. Because of the limitations of time and the teaching schedules, each speech teacher completed only one complete case study each term. This apparently continued for several years.

The Annual Report of 1929 indicated that all six full-time teachers of speech correction attended the course in lip reading given during the summer, and that four of them attended the summer session courses in speech correction given at the University of California in Berkeley.

There is no specific statement regarding in-service training in the annual reports subsequent to 1935. There is ample evidence through personal and informal interviews that the San Francisco speech correction teachers have received additional instruction since 1935 by means of afternoon courses in speech correction offered by San Francisco State College. Materials are on file in the Department of the Physically Handicapped of the San Francisco Unified School District which indicate that the San Francisco speech correction teachers have, through in-service experi-
ences, developed some educational materials in the area of articulation activities for speech correction classes and in the area of child development.

**Summary.** In the initial program for the training of teachers of speech correction, from 1916 to 1924, the study of anatomy, physiology, and pathology seemed to be a very basic and significant element. A definite trend seemed to follow which removed these fields of study from the basic speech correction training, reserving them for the more advanced courses. They were not mentioned specifically in any of the certification requirements from 1925 to 1956.

Certification requirements for speech correction in California have been expressed in terms of previous teaching experience, units or hours of instruction in speech correction, units or hours of directed teaching in speech correction, and personal characteristics necessary for successful work with handicapped children. These requirements have experienced very minimal change from 1915 to the present day.

Appendix B, page 114, indicates that the developing importance of the speech correction program in the general field of teacher training was made evident by 1955 with the inclusion of speech correction or speech improvement training as a requisite to authorization to teach exceptional
children in any of the special areas of instruction. This additional requirement has aided the speech correction program in San Francisco through increased understanding of speech handicaps by the San Francisco teachers of exceptional children.
CHAPTER V

STATISTICAL FACTORS OF THE
SPEECH CORRECTION PROGRAM

The purpose of this chapter is to study the available statistical data which may be significant to the discovery of the various elements which contributed to the development of the speech correction program in the San Francisco Public Schools from 1916 to 1956, and which may clarify the relationship of this program to the San Francisco Unified School District.

The chapter is organized into two divisions in addition to the introduction and the summary. In the first division of this chapter, enrollment statistics have been selected and presented on the basis of school years following those years of significant change in the administration and/or the organization of the speech correction program. In the second division of the chapter, consideration is given to certain statistical recommendations made by a speech correction supervisor of the San Francisco Public Schools. These recommendations are compared to those given by the speech correction consultants of the California State Department of Education and are discussed in relation to the speech correction program in San Francisco. The
major reference source used in connection with this part of the investigation was the files of annual reports of the Speech Correction Department of the San Francisco Public Schools.

The following terms are defined as they are used in this chapter. The term, Class I, refers to the group of nervous speech disorders which have been classified in the San Francisco annual speech correction reports as stuttering, stammering, nervous hesitation, and cluttering.

Class II refers to all speech defects and disorders of articulation. Part-time teachers of speech correction are those teachers who taught speech correction classes in their schools in addition to other teaching or administrative duties. These teachers included classroom teachers of kindergarten and primary grades whose classes were dismissed before the end of the scheduled school day, opportunity teachers, assistant principals, and, in a few instances, principals.¹ The term, case load, represents the average number of speech handicapped school children taught by each full-time teacher of speech correction in one year. This number includes children who, for any reason, were dismissed from speech classes during the year, as well as chil-

¹Report of the Department of Speech Correction, San Francisco Public Schools, 1916-1917. Personal files of Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford. (Typewritten.)
dren who left the speech classes because they transferred out of the school district during the school year. Consequently, the average weekly case load of each full-time speech correction teacher would be smaller than the average annual case load. The term "corrected" was defined in the Annual Speech Correction Report of 1930 as "having speech as good or better than that of the average child of the same age."

The statistical data in this chapter should be considered in terms of the following limitations. Prior to 1937, according to the statistical reports of the Superintendent of Schools to the San Francisco Board of Education, the annual San Francisco figures for total pupil enrollment included all pupils enrolled during a school year in a public school in San Francisco; however, these figures included junior and senior high school pupils who were enrolled in elementary schools and promoted to the high schools during the fiscal year, and whose enrollments were recorded at each level during the same year. The total pupil enrollments, therefore, included some pupils who had been counted twice. Annual San Francisco enrollment figures for the school year, 1937-1938, according to the annual statistical reports of the Superintendent of Schools, and continuing until the present time, include all pupils entering a class for the first time, who have attended no other class in a public
school in San Francisco during the school year. The elementary school enrollments include children enrolled in kindergartens. Part-time High School, Continuation High School, and John O'Connell Vocational High School have been excluded from as many of the statistics as possible because there was no record of speech correction services ever having been provided for them. The figures available indicating the number of teachers employed by the San Francisco Unified School District include the administrators of the schools. The total number of schools used in this report includes the four special schools for the physically and mentally handicapped.

I. PRESENTATION OF STATISTICS

1916-1925. The years, 1916-1925, were selected by the investigator for consideration because they include the period of time during which the program of the speech correction centers was in existence. Although the speech correction centers were active from 1916 to 1925, reports were discovered only for the school years, 1916-1917 and 1923-1924. The annual report for the latter school year indicates that it includes only the period from January to June,

2Ibid.
Some of the data reflecting the size of the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District during the first year of the program, 1916-1917, is shown in Table I, page 47. These data are compared with data for the school year, 1923-1924, the next year for which speech correction statistics were available, and show the considerable expansion of the San Francisco speech correction program between these school years. The approximate size of the San Francisco Unified School District is shown on Table I in terms of numbers of elementary schools, high schools, teachers, and pupils. These data were found in the annual reports of the superintendent of schools to the Board of Education for these years. The approximate size of the speech correction program is shown on Table I in terms of numbers of speech correction teachers, speech correction centers, pupils enrolled in speech correction classes, and the percentage of the total school enrollment that was taught in speech correction classes. Although it has been reported that there were 1,486 pupils enrolled in the speech correction classes for the school year, 1916-1917, the report of the speech correction supervisor to the superintendent of schools accounts for 1,115 pupils enrolled.

---

3Mabel F. Gifford, "History of the Speech Correction Work in the San Francisco Schools" (January 15, 1925.) Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford. (Typewritten copy.)
The writer of this thesis has chosen the latter number for statistical consideration.

The speech handicapped school children enrolled in the San Francisco speech correction program from 1916 to 1925 received one speech correction lesson each week from the supervisor of speech correction or her assistants at the speech correction centers. In almost all cases, these children also received daily lessons from the part-time teachers who accompanied them to the centers, according to the annual speech correction reports for the two school years, 1916-1917 and 1923-1924.

The annual speech correction report for the school year, 1916-1917, indicated that approximately 5.11 per cent of the pupils enrolled in speech correction classes at that time were dismissed as corrected. The annual report for the school year, 1923-1924, reported approximately 29 per cent of the speech correction enrollment dismissed as corrected.

A comparison between the school years, 1916-1917 and 1923-1924, of the number of pupils enrolled in the speech correction program and the number of pupils reported dismissed as corrected is shown in Figure 5, page 49. The comparison shows a considerable increase in the speech correction enrollment and in the number of pupils corrected.
TABLE I


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1916-1917</th>
<th>1923-1924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Elementary Schools</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of High Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment (pupils)</td>
<td>46,466</td>
<td>57,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Speech Correction Centers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Correction Enrollment (pupils)</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>2,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of School Enrollment in Speech Correction Classes</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Speech Correction Enrollment Dismissed as Corrected</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between the two school years shown in Figure 5, only one speech correction teacher had been added. Within this same period of time, summer sessions for the study of speech correction were inaugurated at the University of California in Berkeley, California, at the San Francisco State Teachers College, and at the first teacher training center which was established in the Pediatric Department of the University of California Hospital in San Francisco. 4

1928-1933. The earliest complete annual speech correction report on file in the San Francisco Unified School District is for the school year, 1928-1929. Between 1928 and 1933 the Department of Speech Correction conducted the only speech correction surveys, by means of individual pupil examinations, that have been recorded in the San Francisco Public Schools. Because the largest number of surveys was conducted during the school year, 1929-1930, the annual report for the following year was investigated in order to observe any statistical effect of these surveys. The last recorded survey took place in 1933 in the Glen Park School.

By 1928 the speech correction centers had been

---

4 Mabel F. Gifford, Notes on talk given by Mrs. Gifford to the International Council for Exceptional Children at Philadelphia, 1930. Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford. (Handwritten.)
NOTE: Speech correction classes during these two years were conducted in speech correction centers.

FIGURE 5
closed, the full-time speech correction teachers spending most of their time in schools having no part-time teachers and assisting part-time teachers who had little or no training in speech correction. The full-time teachers were described as rotating teachers of speech correction. The supervisor of speech correction taught only a few mornings each week.5

Between the school years, 1928-1929, and 1930-1931, the number of part-time speech correction teachers decreased from sixty to fifty-one, and the number of full-time teachers increased from seven to eight. This change of personnel indicates that nine of the part-time speech correction teachers were replaced by one full-time rotating speech correction teacher between these two years. The effect of this replacement on the average annual case load of each full-time rotating teacher and on the percentage of pupils corrected by them may be seen as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Annual Case Load for Each Full-Time Rotating Teacher</th>
<th>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928-1929</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>40.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1931</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>40.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5Speech Correction Summary Report to the Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco, California, 1928. (Typewritten.)
These figures indicate that the addition of twenty-five pupils to the average annual case load for each of the rotating speech correction teachers showed no effect on the percentage of pupils reported dismissed as corrected.  

According to the annual speech correction reports, the total speech correction enrollment was 2,940 pupils for the 1928-1929 school year, and 2,878 pupils for the 1930-1931 school year, indicating a slight decrease between these two school years. This slight decrease in the speech correction enrollment between 1928 and 1931 does not reflect a decrease in the need for speech correction services at that time. The report of the following surveys indicates that a considerable increase in the speech correction enrollment and in the need for speech correction services should have occurred.

Speech correction surveys which were conducted by the speech correction supervisor during the school year, 1929-1930, were requested at this time by the principals of nine schools. One of these schools was the Sunshine School for children with cerebral palsy and orthopedic handicaps. Of the total enrollment of this school, 20.90 per cent were found to have speech defects and disorders requiring the

---

6Speech Correction Reports, 1929, 1931, op. cit.
services of the speech correction department. Of the remaining eight schools that were surveyed, it was found that from 4.96 per cent to 14.20 per cent of the pupil enrollments had speech handicaps. The incidence of speech handicaps in these eight schools represented a mean of 8.28 per cent of their school enrollments. The survey conducted at Glen Park School in 1933 produced similar results. Over one-half of the schools which were not surveyed during the school year, 1929-1930, reported that less than 5 per cent of the pupil enrollments were being taught in speech correction classes.  

Although these surveys indicate the presence of a greater number of speech handicapped pupils in the San Francisco Public Schools than were being taught, the annual report for the following year, 1930-1931, showed no increase in the total speech correction enrollment. In fact, the total speech correction enrollment was decreased by sixty-two pupils between the school years, 1928-1929 and 1930-1931.  

A comparison of the percentage of the elementary school enrollment being taught in speech correction classes before and after the surveys is shown in Figure 6.

---

7 Speech Correction Report, 1930, op. cit.
8 Speech Correction Reports, 1929, 1931, op. cit.
Results of Surveys of Eight Elementary Schools

1928-1929: 4.58
1929-1930: 8.28
1930-1931: 4.25

FIGURE 6
A COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGE OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT BEING TAUGHT IN SPEECH CORRECTION CLASSES BEFORE AND AFTER THE SURVEYS CONDUCTED IN EIGHT SCHOOLS DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR, 1929-1930
No further surveys, after 1933, were indicated in any future annual speech correction reports.

1934-1935. The school year, 1934-1935, was selected for investigation because it will reflect the effects of the severe curtailment of the speech correction staff and services which occurred in 1932. According to the speech correction supervisor in the Annual Speech Correction Report for 1932, this curtailment was caused by the national economic crisis at that time. One of the results of the curtailment was the withdrawal of the position of Supervisor of Speech Correction at the end of the following year. By 1933 the administrative responsibilities of the Supervisor of Speech Correction had been assimilated by the Supervisor of the Physically Handicapped. The administrative structure of the Department of the Physically Handicapped at that time, including speech correction, is shown in Figure 3, page 23.

Between the school years, 1930-1931 and 1934-1935, the San Francisco Unified School District experienced a marked decrease in the numbers of schools, teachers, and pupil enrollments. Between these two school years the speech correction department experienced a considerable curtailment in the numbers of speech correction teachers and a consequent decrease in the numbers of pupils enrolled
in speech correction classes. The extent of these decreases in the San Francisco Unified School District in general, and in the speech correction department in particular, between the school years, 1930-1931 and 1934-1935, is shown in Table II. Table II also shows a considerable difference between the percentages of decrease in the speech correction program and those given for the San Francisco Unified School District. 9

Because of the curtailment in the number of speech correction teachers, speech correction services were limited to the elementary schools during the school year, 1934-1935. No speech correction services were available to the 29,913 pupils enrolled in the sixteen secondary schools in San Francisco. Consequently, the percentage of the total school enrollment taught in speech correction classes during this school year was only 1.80 per cent compared to 3.10 per cent reported during the school year, 1930-1931. The curtailment in the number of speech correction teachers also increased the number of schools reported as having no speech correction classes from five schools during the 1930-1931 school year, to thirty-five schools during the 1934-1935 school year. 10

---

9 *Speech Correction Reports, 1931, 1935, op. cit.*

TABLE II


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1930-1931</th>
<th>1934-1935</th>
<th>Percentage of Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment</td>
<td>82,370</td>
<td>80,075</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Part-time Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-time Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>50.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison between the school years, 1930-1931 and 1934-1935, of the average annual case load and the percentage of pupils enrolled in speech correction classes who were reported dismissed as corrected is shown in Figure 7. The comparison shows a considerable increase in the average annual case load and a significant decrease in the percentage of pupils dismissed as corrected. The average annual case load for the 1934-1935 school year, shown in Figure 7, represents an increase of 31.72 per cent compared to the school year, 1930-1931. The average number of schools assigned each rotating teacher of speech correction was increased from six schools during the 1930-1931 school year to eight schools during the 1934-1935 school year.\(^\text{11}\)

It may be concluded that, during the 1934-1935 school year, as a result of the curtailment of the speech correction staff, each of the three rotating speech correction teachers attempted to serve more schools and more pupils than were served during the 1930-1931 school year. At the same time, the percentage of the speech correction enrollment dismissed as corrected by the rotating speech correction teachers in 1934-1935 was markedly lower than that given for the school year, 1930-1931.

\(^{11}\)Ibid.
AVERAGE AVERAGE ANNUAL ANNUAL CASE LOAD CASE LOAD
182 Pupils 267 Pupils

PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS CORRECTED

1930-1931 1934-1935

FIGURE 7

CORRECTED    NOT CORRECTED
1937-1938. The school year, 1937-1938, was selected for investigation and presentation because it will indicate some of the statistical effects of the termination, at the completion of the school year, 1935-1936, of all speech correction classes taught by teachers not holding the special credential for the correction of speech defects. It will also reflect the results of the consequent reorganization of speech correction personnel which occurred during the school year, 1936-1937. The foregoing changes were made by the San Francisco Unified School District in order to continue to qualify for state reimbursement. The California State Department of Education had notified the San Francisco Unified School District in 1936 that it would receive state reimbursement only for those classes taught by teachers holding the special secondary credential for the correction of speech defects. Consequently, the following school year, 1936-1937, began with a properly certificated staff of full-time and part-time speech correction teachers.12

The San Francisco speech correction program during the school year, 1937-1938, continued to function only in the elementary schools. During this school year, no speech correction services were available to the 32,267 pupils

12 *Speech Correction Report, 1936*, op. cit.
enrolled in the eighteen secondary schools in San Francisco. Consequently, only 2.57 per cent of the total school enrollment, or 4.39 per cent of the elementary school enrollment, were taught in speech correction classes during that school year.\textsuperscript{13}

The termination of all speech correction classes taught by teachers not holding the special credential for the correction of speech defects resulted in a considerable decrease in the number of part-time teachers. The decrease in the number of part-time teachers of speech correction resulted in a decrease in the number of pupils and in the percentage of the total speech correction enrollment taught by them.\textsuperscript{14} The extent of these reductions is shown in Table III, Section A, page 62.

There were six remaining part-time teachers of speech correction during the school year, 1937-1938. Two were teachers at the Sunshine School, a special school for children with orthopedic handicaps, with health problems, and/or with cerebral palsy. The part-time speech correction teachers at Sunshine School worked primarily with the children who had cerebral palsy. The speech handicaps associated with cerebral palsy can rarely be described as having

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Speech Correction Report}, 1938, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}
been "corrected", as defined in the introduction of this chapter, page 43. The number of pupils taught by part-time teachers represents a maximum of 5.59 per cent of the total speech correction enrollment during the school year, 1937-1938, and decreases consistently throughout the remaining years of this study. The number of part-time speech correction teachers also decreases consistently during the same period of time. These decreases are shown from 1928 to 1956 in Table IX, Appendix C, page 120. Therefore, any further reference to the part-time teachers or their pupils will be considered only parenthetically when discussing the statistical data of the speech correction program from 1938 until 1956.

With the decrease in the number of part-time speech correction teachers, there was an increase in the number of full-time speech correction teachers. At the same time there was an increase in the average number of schools assigned each full-time teacher. That these increases had no significant effect on the average annual case load or on the percentage of pupils reported dismissed as corrected, is shown in Table III, Section B.

The reorganization of speech correction personnel resulted in a considerable increase in the total speech correction enrollment and a decrease in the number of schools
### TABLE III

**A COMPARISON OF SPEECH CORRECTION DATA FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS BEFORE AND AFTER THE REORGANIZATION OF SPEECH CORRECTION PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1934-1935</th>
<th>1937-1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Part-Time Teachers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pupils Taught by Part-Time Teachers</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Speech Correction Enrollment Taught by Part-Time Teachers</td>
<td>44.03</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-Time Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Schools Assigned Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Case Load for Each Teacher</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>32.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools Having No Speech Correction Classes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported as having no speech correction classes. The extent of these changes is shown in Table III, Section C.

It may be concluded that the reorganization of speech correction personnel which occurred during the school year, 1936-1937, had little effect on the average annual case load of the full-time rotating speech correction teachers or on the percentage of pupils dismissed as corrected from the speech correction classes conducted by them. Individual full-time rotating speech correction teachers experienced an increase in the average number of schools assigned to them. The reorganization of speech correction personnel permitted the expansion of speech correction services to approximately fourteen additional elementary schools and to approximately 570 additional speech handicapped school children.

1938-1939. The school year, 1938-1939, follows the year during which an important change was made in the speech correction program in San Francisco. During the spring term of the school year, 1937-1938, according to the annual speech correction report for that year, one afternoon each week was established, in place of teaching time, for each rotating teacher of speech correction to confer with the parents of speech handicapped school children. These conference afternoons had been requested in
the annual speech correction reports to the Superintendent of Schools as early as 1928. It was also indicated in the same report for the year, 1937-1938, that although the conference afternoon was intended primarily for parent conferences related to nervous speech disorders, it might also be used for conferring with teachers and principals, and include speech problems other than nervous speech disorders. The parent conferences were conducted in the homes of the parents and were inaugurated in order that the speech correction teachers might acquire more complete and significant case histories of the children enrolled in their classes.15 A sample of the case history forms used from that time until the present is located in Appendix D, page 130.

Because the conference afternoon was primarily intended for parent conferences related to nervous speech disorders, the number of pupils enrolled in Class I for the school year, 1938-1939, should be considered at this time. The following statistical data from the Annual Speech Correction Report for the school year, 1938-1939, indicates that, in one school year, all of the parents of pupils enrolled in the classes for nervous speech disorders could not receive the benefits of a conference with

---

15 *Speech Correction Report, 1938, op. cit.*
the speech correction teacher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>1938-1939</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-Time Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pupils Enrolled in Class I</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Class I Pupils Assigned Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Number of Conference Afternoons in One School Year</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the speech correction teacher used the conference afternoon for consultations with teachers and principals, or for consultations about other kinds of speech handicaps, fewer of the parents of children with nervous speech problems could be accommodated.

A comparison of the data given in the Annual Speech Correction Report for the school year, 1938-1939, with the data given for the school year, 1937-1938, in Table IV, shows that there was a decrease of ninety-two pupils enrolled in classes taught by full-time teachers of speech correction, reflecting a corresponding decrease of thirteen pupils in the average annual case load for each of these teachers. The number of pupils reported dismissed as corrected by the full-time speech correction teachers for the school year, 1938-1939, showed a decrease of ninety-nine pupils, or 3.91 per cent, compared to the previous year.
# TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF SPEECH CORRECTION DATA FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS BEFORE AND AFTER THE INAUGURATION OF CONFERENCE AFTERNOONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1937-1938</th>
<th>1938-1939</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-Time Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Case Load</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>28.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the conference afternoons was not to affect the numbers of pupils enrolled in speech correction classes or the numbers reported as corrected, but to provide the rotating speech correction teacher some time, not previously available, in which to give further help to those children who had more serious speech handicaps.

1946-1947. An important change in the speech correction services of the San Francisco Unified School District occurred in 1945, when the number of speech correction lessons received by elementary school pupils of the full-time rotating teachers of speech correction was reduced from two to one lesson each week. A comparison of the statistical data given in the annual speech correction report for the following school year, 1946-1947, with the data given in the annual report for the school year, 1938-1939, will indicate some of the causes and some of the effects of the reduction in the number of speech correction lessons received by elementary school pupils.

The reduction in the number of speech correction lessons received by elementary school pupils seems closely related to an increased total elementary school enrollment of 4,550 pupils over the school year, 1938-1939, as shown in Table V, and to an increased speech correction enrollment of 290 pupils in classes taught by the full-time
### TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF SPEECH CORRECTION DATA BEFORE AND AFTER THE REDUCTION IN THE WEEKLY NUMBER OF SPEECH CORRECTION LESSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1938-1939</th>
<th>1946-1947</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Elementary School</td>
<td>43,122</td>
<td>47,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Speech Correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, Full-Time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Full-Time Teachers</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>2,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Case Load for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Weekly Lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Pupil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>22.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Schools Having No   |            |           |
| Speech Correction Classes     | 28         | 35        |
| Percentage of Elementary      |            |           |
| School Enrollment in          |            |           |
| Speech Correction Classes     | 4.36       | 4.53      |
rotating teachers. The increased speech correction enrollment resulted in an average annual case load increase of forty-one pupils for each speech correction teacher. The increased case load is the probable reason for the reduction in the weekly number of speech correction lessons received by elementary school pupils, the rotating speech correction teachers being unable to accommodate all of the additional pupils twice each week. With the increased case load and the reduction in the weekly number of speech correction lessons, Table V indicates that the percentage of enrolled pupils who were dismissed as corrected decreased 6.23 per cent between the school years, 1938-1939 and 1946-1947.

A further comparison of the two school years, 1938-1939 and 1946-1947, in Table V, shows that fewer schools were receiving speech correction services during the latter school year. A similar comparison shows an increase in the percentage of the total elementary school enrollment being taught in speech correction classes. Evidently, an increasing number of speech handicapped school children in San Francisco were being referred by school personnel for speech correction services.

It may be concluded that, in an effort to accommodate the increased numbers of speech handicapped school children, the rotating teachers of speech correction
reduced the number of lessons for pupils enrolled in their classes, increased the average annual case load, and experienced a reduction in the percentage of pupils reported dismissed as corrected.

1951-1952. The school year, 1951-1952, will reflect the effects of a considerable increase in the number of full-time rotating teachers of speech correction during the previous two years. Between the school years, 1946-1947 and 1951-1952, the number of full-time speech correction teachers was increased from seven to thirteen. Two of the six additional full-time teachers were added for the school year, 1948-1949, and four were added for the following school year, 1949-1950. The school year, 1951-1952, will also reflect the effects of the extension of limited speech correction services during the school year, 1949-1950, into the secondary schools for the first time since the school year, 1932-1933, a period of sixteen years. Almost every year since 1933, the Supervisor of the Physically Handicapped, in her annual speech correction reports, had recommended this extension of services with the additional personnel to implement it. Data is given for the school year, 1951-1952, allowing two school years for organizational adjustments of the program and orientation of the additional personnel. A comparison of the data
given in the Annual Speech Correction Report for the school
year, 1951-1952, and the data given in the annual report
for the school year, 1946-1947, will indicate the particu-
lar areas of the speech correction program which were
affected by the increase in the number of speech correction
personnel and by the extension of the speech correction
program into the secondary schools.

A comparison of the two school years, 1946-1947 and
1951-1952, in Table VI, Section A, shows that there was an
increased elementary school enrollment of 4,112 pupils, or
an increased elementary school enrollment of 8,662 pupils
since the school year, 1938-1939, shown in Table V, page 68.
During the school year, 1951-1952, the enrollment of pupils
in the secondary schools was at its lowest since the school
year, 1937-1938.16

The increase in the number of full-time rotating
speech correction teachers affected many areas of the
speech correction program. The additional speech correc-
tion teachers permitted the speech correction department to
expand its services by means of establishing classes for
pupils with nervous speech disorders in the secondary
schools. Some of the Class I pupils in the elementary
schools were permitted two lessons each week. Table VI,

16Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools
to the San Francisco Board of Education, 1938-1952.
### TABLE VI

**A COMPARISON OF SPEECH CORRECTION DATA BEFORE AND AFTER THE INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SPEECH CORRECTION TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1946-1947</th>
<th>1951-1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Enrollment</td>
<td>47,672</td>
<td>51,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Enrollment</td>
<td>28,820</td>
<td>27,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-Time Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total School Enrollment in Speech Correction Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>3,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>3,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools Having No Speech Correction Classes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Schools Assigned Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Case Load for Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B, shows that the increase in the number of speech correction teachers also permitted an increase in the percentage of total school enrollment taught in speech correction classes, and a considerable increase in the total speech correction enrollment. There was also a definite increase in the numbers of schools receiving speech correction services.

The average number of schools assigned each speech correction teacher was decreased. The average annual case load was decreased by fifty-one pupils. Yet, the percentage of pupils reported dismissed as corrected by the full-time rotating teachers continued to decrease. These decreases are shown in Table VI, Section C.

The increase in the number of full-time speech correction teachers, then, permitted the extension of limited speech correction services into the secondary schools, the enrollment of many more speech handicapped school children in the speech correction classes, and a considerable reduction in the number of schools having no speech correction classes. Although the speech correction teachers experienced a decrease in the average number of schools assigned to each of them and in their average annual case loads, they also had to adapt their teaching techniques to include the secondary level.
1955-1956. The school year, 1955-1956, has been selected for discussion because it is the final year included in this investigation. By this time speech correction services had expanded to include the provision of speech correction classes for secondary school pupils who had articulatory speech handicaps. These classes were in addition to the secondary school classes already established for pupils who were classified as having nervous speech disorders.17

A comparison of the school year, 1955-1956, with the 1951-1952 school year in Table VII, Section A, shows an elementary school enrollment decrease of 2,963 pupils and a secondary school enrollment increase of 2,551 pupils, a total decrease of only 412 pupils. The number of full-time teachers of speech correction fluctuated between thirteen and fifteen between the school years, 1951-1952, and 1955-1956, because of illnesses, resignations, and leaves of absence. Table VII, Section B, shows that the percentage of the total school enrollment in speech correction classes was greatly increased, and also shows a considerable increase in the number of pupils enrolled in speech correction classes. The number of schools not having speech correction services was the lowest of the years investigated.

17Speech Correction Reports, 1953-1956, op. cit.
TABLE VII


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1951-1952</th>
<th>1955-1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Enrollment</td>
<td>51,784</td>
<td>48,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Enrollment</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>29,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full-Time Speech Correction Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total School Enrollment in Speech Correction Classes</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>5,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>4,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools Having No Speech Correction Classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Schools Assigned Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Case Load for Each Full-Time Teacher</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to accommodate the increased speech correction enrollment, each full-time speech correction teacher carried an average annual case load of 371 pupils, as is shown in Table VII, Section C. Each speech handicapped pupil continued to receive one lesson each week. Table VII, Section C, shows that the percentage of pupils reported dismissed as corrected decreased slightly between the school years, 1951-1952 and 1955-1956. 18

It may be concluded that the speech correction department of the San Francisco Public Schools, for the school year, 1955-1956, was giving major consideration to the provision of speech correction services to the maximum number of public schools. It may also be concluded that the speech correction department was attempting to provide speech correction services for the maximum number of speech handicapped school children.

II. STATISTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The earliest complete annual speech correction report, located in the files of the San Francisco Unified School District, indicates that the effectiveness of the San Francisco speech correction program was closely related to the size of the case load of each full-time rotating speech

18 Ibid.
correction teacher. The Supervisor of Speech Correction at that time wrote:

The rotating teachers can take care of 100 to 125 pupils per week, allowing twelve minutes per child each week. It is impossible to do satisfactory work if less time per pupil is allowed. Miss McKenzie of the State Teachers College recommends fifteen minutes twice a week as a minimum amount of time allowed for the correction of articulation defects. Such time allotment would be difficult to administer in a large public school system, and we find that satisfactory results can be obtained by allowing about twelve minutes per child per week for a longer period, if the teacher is thoroughly trained in the technique and psychological background for her work.

The Annual Speech Correction Report for the school year, 1928-1929, indicates that the average annual case load of each rotating speech correction teacher approximated the recommendations of the Supervisor of Speech Correction.

Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford, State Speech Correction Consultant, California State Department of Education, 1925-1952, substantiated the fact that weekly operating case loads should be limited, when she reported in 1949 that "some of the teachers take as many as 200 children, but we have to break it down smaller as we get the teachers." This fact was further supported in 1959 by the Bureau of

---

19 Speech Correction Report, 1929, op. cit.

Special Education, California State Department of Education, when it stated in a bulletin:

The weekly operating remedial case load in elementary schools should not exceed 125 . . .

In a situation where the specialist provides services for both elementary and secondary schools, it is generally recommended that the weekly case load be limited to 115 or fewer. . . . 21

In almost all of the annual speech correction reports from 1932 to 1956 the Supervisor of the Physically Handicapped, Mrs. Katharine L. Sutter, requested additional speech correction personnel. The requests were rarely granted. Because of the limited number of rotating speech correction teachers, the speech correction program was compelled to take one of two alternatives: (1) to maintain a reasonable average case load which would permit a greater reliability in diagnosis, treatment, and reporting of results, and (2) to provide speech correction services to all schools and pupils in San Francisco. The first alternative would necessitate the withdrawal of speech correction services from many schools and pupils needing this help. The second alternative would necessitate considerable increase in case loads and decreases in teaching time.

---

per pupil. This would tend to require superficial diagnosis and treatment, as well as insufficient time for the reliable preparation of speech correction reports by the rotating teachers. The second alternative was chosen from 1931 to 1956.

III. SUMMARY

Throughout the development of the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District, from 1916 to 1956, primary consideration was given to the provision of speech correction services to all of the public elementary schools in San Francisco. When the curtailment in speech correction personnel occurred at the end of the school year, 1932-1933, speech correction services were completely withdrawn from the secondary schools. At that time each rotating speech correction teacher extended her program to include more elementary schools and more pupils. When additional speech correction personnel was provided in 1937, each rotating speech correction teacher added even more elementary schools and more pupils to her program. Not until 1949, when the number of rotating speech correction teachers was almost doubled, did the secondary schools again receive speech correction services.
A progressively greater number of pupils were being taught in speech correction classes each year throughout the development of the speech correction program in San Francisco. Figure 8, Appendix C, page 121, indicates the percentages of school enrollments being taught in speech correction classes during the years investigated in this chapter. The percentage of pupil enrollment found to be speech handicapped was 8.28 per cent in direct surveys conducted by speech correction personnel in eight San Francisco elementary schools during the 1929-1930 school year, discussed on page 51 of this chapter. Figure 8 also shows that not until more than twenty years later was a similar percentage of total elementary school enrollment being taught in speech correction classes.

The statistical data presented throughout this chapter indicate that maximum effort was made in providing speech correction services for the increasing number of pupils with speech handicaps. The two major elements most affected by this effort were the average annual case loads, which increased considerably for each rotating speech correction teacher, and the number of lessons per pupil each week, which were decreased from two lessons to one lesson each week. As the average annual case loads increased and the number of weekly lessons for each pupil decreased, the percentage of pupils reported dismissed as corrected also
decreased. Figure 9, Appendix C, page 122, shows a comparison of the average annual case load of the rotating speech correction teachers and the percentage of their pupils reported dismissed as corrected. Table X, Appendix C, page 123, is a statistical summary of this chapter.

The purpose of the establishment of the program of conference afternoons in 1938 was to provide the speech correction teachers with at least a minimal amount of time for conferences concerning the more individual problems of speech handicapped children. Even though this conference time was substituted for teaching time, the average annual case loads increased, and the percentage of corrections decreased.
CHAPTER VI

FINANCE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO SPEECH CORRECTION PROGRAM,
1915-1956

This chapter is organized into three divisions. In the first division, limited discussion is given to the financial structure of the speech correction program in San Francisco from 1915 to 1925. The discussion is limited because of lack of available information for these years. In the second division of the chapter information is presented pertaining to the contributions of the State of California to speech correction programs conducted by the local school districts in California from 1925 to 1956. In the third division of the chapter the costs of the speech correction program in San Francisco are presented for the years immediately following increases in state aid for the speech correction programs conducted by local school districts in California.

I. 1915-1925

When the Department of Speech Correction first opened as a speech clinic in the Pediatric Department of the University of California Hospital in 1915, the program received all of its financial support from the University
of California. During the following year, when the San Francisco Board of Education appointed Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford to organize the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District, it assumed the financial responsibility for the program. The cost of the program was probably paid from the same general fund which supported the music, art, industrial arts, and similar special subjects programs. The State of California during the years, 1915 to 1925, had no special financial structure applicable to the specific financial needs of the speech correction program.

II. 1925-1956

Initial state aid. According to Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford, who became California's first Chief of the Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects and Disorders in 1925, the State program in speech correction was established in the following manner:

In 1925 through the financial assistance contributed to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of a grateful man who had been corrected of stammering, the department was finally


2 Leta W. Timberlake, "An Overview of the Program of Speech Correction in the State of California" (paper read at the International Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Oakland, California, April 19, 1952.)
launched as a State project, followed in 1926 by a State biennial appropriation of $30,000. This was to be used partly for educational and demonstration work and partly for aiding counties to pay Speech Teachers.\(^3\)

The grateful man was Mr. S. Waldo Coleman, who had received help in the control of his stuttering from Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford.\(^4\)

In 1927 the program of special education in the public schools, with the exception of speech correction, was given impetus through an act of the State Legislature. The chief provision of this act was for reimbursement to local school districts for the excess cost of educating physically handicapped children.\(^5\)

Two years later, in 1929, speech correction programs were aided with the issuance of the following statement by the California State Department of Education:

... Speech defective children should be considered as physically handicapped, and excess cost reimbursement may be claimed for their instruction, the total cost of such special instruction being

\(^3\)Mabel F. Gifford, Notes on Talk given to the International Council for Exceptional Children at Philadelphia, 1930. Personal files of Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford. (Handwritten.)


considered as "excess cost."6

The inclusion of speech correction as part of the State program for the physically handicapped was more specifically described as follows:

Remedial instruction in special classes attended by pupils who are excused from regular classes for part of a period only, or at infrequent intervals for a full period, in order to receive instruction for the purpose of remedying physical defects constitutes the fourth general type of provision for the education of physically handicapped pupils. Pupils given such remedial instruction continue as members of the regular classes. Their attendance upon the special remedial classes does not reduce the expense of the regular classes materially. The entire cost of the remedial instruction is therefore in addition to the ordinary cost of the schools.7

Excess cost. The total cost of the speech correction programs in the local school districts is considered by the California State Department of Education as "excess cost." The following definition of excess cost, published in 1939, has been operative throughout the years during which a speech correction program has been functioning on

---


Excess cost is defined as including the total current expenditures incurred for remedial classes and for individual instruction, plus the excess amount of the current expenditures of the district made for the education of all other physically handicapped pupils over and above the amount expended for current expenditures for an equal number of units of average daily attendance of pupils not classified as physically handicapped pupils. The apportionment of the excess cost of the education of physically handicapped minors was explained as follows:

The average daily attendance of physically handicapped pupils shall be included in the total average daily attendance of the district for purposes of the usual state and county apportionments on average daily attendance and teacher units. In addition to the above apportionments the state and county will reimburse the district for the amount of the excess cost of educating physically handicapped children when the cost is more than the average cost of educating a normal child in said district. Such reimbursement however cannot exceed $100 each from the state and the county for each unit of average daily attendance of physically handicapped children.

According to the annual San Francisco speech correction report for the school year, 1930-1931, the State reimbursed the local district up to the limit of $100 per unit of average daily attendance. By 1939 the limit of reimbursement was increased to $200 per unit of average daily attendance.

---

8Morgan, op. cit., p. 13.

9California State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, op. cit., p. 4.
In 1949 the Bureau of Special Education of the California State Department of Education issued a statement that the growth of the programs of special education was made possible at that time by several legal provisions, one of which was an increase of excess cost reimbursements to school districts conducting special classes from $200 to $400 per unit of average daily attendance.\textsuperscript{11} State reimbursement not in excess of $400 per unit of average daily attendance was operative throughout the remaining years of this investigation, 1949 to 1956.

**Average daily attendance.** A definition of the term, average daily attendance, is indicated by the following statement:

The attendance of all physically handicapped pupils given individual instruction or instructed in special classes of elementary or secondary grade in school districts must be computed by allowing one day of attendance for each four clock hours of pupil attendance. Average daily attendance of physically handicapped pupils in a school district is computed by dividing the aggregate number of days of attendance of such pupils during the entire school year by the number of days school was taught in the regular schools of the district.\textsuperscript{12} [italics in the original]

\textsuperscript{10} Morgan, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

\textsuperscript{11} Bureau of Special Education, op. cit., p. 3.

\textsuperscript{12} Morgan, op. cit., p. 7.
Between 1939 and 1954 individual instruction of physically handicapped pupils was given impetus through Education Code §6851. This regulation allowed one clock hour of teaching time devoted to individual instruction of physically handicapped pupils to be counted as one day of attendance. The allowance of one day of attendance for each four clock hours of pupil attendance in remedial classes stated in 1939 had been differentiated by 1954. The following statement refers to remedial classes for physically handicapped pupils, including speech correction classes:

A conversion from minutes to days shall be made at the foot of each Monthly Attendance Record on the same basis as for pupils in regular classes . . . that is, 180 minutes in kindergarten, 200 minutes in grades one through three, and 240 minutes in grades four through eight.

III. THE COST OF THE SPEECH CORRECTION PROGRAM

The cost of the speech correction program to the San Francisco Unified School District will be presented for the

---


years immediately following increases in the limit of state reimbursement. The earliest record of the cost of the San Francisco speech correction program on file in the Department of the Physically Handicapped is for the school year, 1929-1930, at which time the limit of state reimbursement for each unit of average daily attendance was $100. This limit was increased to $200 for the school year, 1934-1935. The last available financial record on file in the Department of the Physically Handicapped containing figures with the $200 per unit of average daily attendance reimbursement is for the school year, 1946-1947, which will be presented here. The next available financial record on file is for the school year, 1951-1952, by which time the state limit of reimbursement had been increased to $400 per unit of average daily attendance. The financial record for the 1951-1952 school year and the final school year included in this investigation, 1955-1956, will also be presented.

The figures listed under the total cost of operation for the San Francisco speech correction program include salaries of the speech correction teachers, transportation of speech correction teachers, materials, and portions of salaries of administrative personnel directly and indirectly involved with the speech correction program. To ascertain the cost of each unit of average daily attendance, the
total cost of operation of the San Francisco speech correction program is divided by the average daily attendance for speech correction. The average daily attendance for speech correction is expressed as A.D.A. The cost of each unit of A.D.A. is expressed as unit cost. Table VIII shows the A.D.A., the unit cost, and the total cost of operation, as well as the State limits of reimbursement for the years presented in the foregoing paragraph.

Table VIII indicates that State reimbursements for the San Francisco speech correction program throughout the years of this investigation have consistently been considerably less than the excess cost of the program. The approximate percentages of the total cost of the speech correction program in San Francisco which are reimbursed by the State Department of Education for the years indicated on Table VIII are between thirty and forty per cent, with the exception of the 1929-1930 school year which was only fifteen per cent.

Two additional factors must be considered in the computations for State reimbursement. The first factor is that the State reimbursement includes, in addition to excess cost reimbursement, an equal number of units of A.D.A. of pupils not classified as physically handicapped. The second factor is that the reimbursement is computed on
### TABLE VIII

**COMPARISON OF THE COST OF THE SAN FRANCISCO SPEECH CORRECTION PROGRAM AND THE LIMIT OF STATE REIMBURSEMENT FOR EXCESS COST OF THE PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A.D.A.</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929-1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>59.89</td>
<td>$646.68</td>
<td>$38,729.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>$646.68</td>
<td>$11,924.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>$646.68</td>
<td>$50,654.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($100.00)*</td>
<td>($7,833.00)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>36.53</td>
<td>$517.85</td>
<td>$18,917.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($200.00)*</td>
<td>($7,306.00)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>46.24</td>
<td>$661.45</td>
<td>$30,585.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($200.00)*</td>
<td>($9,248.00)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td>$972.45</td>
<td>$84,116.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>1,137.00</td>
<td>7,265.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92.89</td>
<td>$983.77</td>
<td>$91,382.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($400.00)*</td>
<td>($37,156.00)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>$1,175.33</td>
<td>$106,414.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>1,721.86</td>
<td>15,617.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.61</td>
<td>$1,225.10</td>
<td>$122,032.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($400.00)*</td>
<td>($39,844.00)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Limit of State reimbursement per unit of average daily attendance.

**Total State reimbursement for speech correction program.
the basis of the entire local program for the physically handicapped, so that frequently the cost of the speech correction program is absorbed by other less expensive special education programs.

IV. SUMMARY

The San Francisco speech correction program received financial assistance from the State Department of Education by means of State reimbursements for the excess cost of the program. These reimbursements increased from $100 for each unit of average daily attendance in 1929 to $400 by 1949. Further financial assistance was given by the State through its allowance of one hour of individual instruction to constitute one day of attendance and by allowing fewer minutes to constitute one day of attendance in the kindergarten and primary grades. The San Francisco speech correction program has also been aided financially by its inclusion in the total financial structure of the program of the physically handicapped.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study of the historical development of the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District has attempted to determine some of the major factors that have influenced the direction of the development of the program. Positive determinants have been identified for the improvement of the further development of the San Francisco public school speech correction program.

Summary. This historical study indicates that, of all the special education programs for the handicapped in California, the speech correction programs, in many cases, are among the last to be developed. However, the San Francisco speech correction program was preceded only by the programs for the mentally retarded and for delinquent boys. The program for speech handicapped school children, established in 1916 in San Francisco, was among the pioneer speech correction programs in the United States.

The identification and classification of speech defects occurred early in the history of speech correction in San Francisco. The classification of speech defects as early as 1915 reflects a medically oriented program. Mrs.
Mabel F. Gifford's considerable interest and activity in the treatment of stuttering and other nervous speech disorders emphasized the psychological aspects of the treatment of speech handicapped school children. The medical and psychological orientation of the San Francisco program of speech correction is evident throughout the years included in this investigation.

The development of high standards in the training of speech correction teachers was a constant goal of Mrs. Mabel F. Gifford's from the inception of the teacher training programs in speech correction in 1916. Although the names of the courses leading toward State certification changed very little from 1915 to 1956, the contents of these courses have evolved to include recent developments in the field of speech correction.

The full-time speech correction teachers in the San Francisco Unified School District were all properly certificated throughout the history of the speech correction program. A minority of the part-time teachers was properly certificated in speech correction until 1936, when only those teachers holding the special credential in the correction of speech defects were permitted to teach speech handicapped school children. Prior to 1936, however, almost all of the part-time teachers had some prepa-
ration in speech correction. The in-service training of teachers of speech correction in San Francisco contributed greatly to the early development of therapy which involved much more than simple drills for children with articulatory defects.

The findings of surveys conducted between 1928 and 1933 in nine of the San Francisco public schools indicated the existence of a considerably higher percentage of speech handicapped school children than were being taught. In 1933 the San Francisco Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools curtailed the speech correction program by diminishing the number of speech correction teachers. Additional full-time speech correction teachers were added in 1937, in 1948, and in 1949.

During the earliest years of the speech correction program in San Francisco there was a definite effort to serve all of the schools in the system. Although this was a constant effort on the part of the Speech Correction Department, the Board of Education and/or the Superintendents did not implement the effort with the necessary additional personnel. Additional personnel was requested in most of the annual speech correction reports from 1928 to 1956. The lack of implementation by the San Francisco Board of Education did not alter the efforts of the Speech Correction Department to serve all of the schools.
A weekly operating case load maximum of 125 pupils was recommended by the San Francisco speech correction supervisor in 1929, and substantiated by the State consultants in speech correction in 1949 and in 1959, as necessary for the maintenance of a satisfactory level of operation. This recommended case load was approximated only during the 1928-1929 school year. By the 1955-1956 school year the average annual case load for each San Francisco speech correction teacher had risen to 371 pupils. This reflected the efforts of the Speech Correction Department to serve all schools.

Mrs. Katharine Inglis Sutter, Director of the Department of Physically Handicapped, experienced a considerable increase in responsibility from the beginning of her administration in 1930 until the final year of this study, 1956. Figure 3, page 23, shows that, in 1934, Mrs. Sutter supervised approximately sixty-three full-time teachers in nine educational programs for the physically handicapped in addition to forty-two part-time teachers of speech correction. There were two teachers-in-charge of specific programs at that time. Figure 4, page 28, shows that, by 1955, the Department of Physically Handicapped had expanded to include 121 full-time teachers in twelve separate educational programs for the physically handi-
capped, including the class for severely emotionally disturbed children at Langley Porter Hospital in San Francisco. At that time there was only one principal in the program and there were no teachers-in-charge. Mrs. Sutter supervised the Department of the Physically Handicapped from 1930 to 1956 with no other administrative assistance.

In 1915 the Supervisor of Speech Correction was directly responsible to the Superintendent of Schools in San Francisco. By 1955 the Director of Physically Handicapped, who also supervised the speech correction program as one of the twelve programs under her administration, was directly responsible to the Co-ordinator of the Division of Child Welfare.

From 1933 until the final school year of this study, 1955-1956, there has been no special supervisor of speech correction. The speech correction program had expanded by the 1955-1956 school year to involve in its operation fourteen full-time speech correction teachers, a speech correction enrollment of 5,234 pupils, and an operating cost of approximately $122,000.

The San Francisco speech correction program has not been able to pay for itself through excess cost State reimbursements. It has received financial assistance by its inclusion in the total State apportionments to the San Francisco Department of the Physically Handicapped.
Conclusions. No apparent rationale or formula in terms of student population, numbers of schools, or numbers of classroom teachers was indicated to effect the curtailment, in 1933, and subsequent expansions, in 1937, 1948, and in 1949, of speech correction services in San Francisco.

The considerable increase in the average annual case load for each speech correction teacher did not occur in order to obtain increased State reimbursement to the program. This fact is indicated by the following considerations. Table VII, page 75, shows that only one speech correction teacher was added between the 1951-1952 and the 1955-1956 school years, and that the total speech correction enrollment was increased by 1,964 pupils, increasing the average annual case load by 124 pupils. Table VIII, page 91, shows that, between these two school years, the A.D.A. was increased by only 6.72 units, from 92.89 for the 1951-1952 school year to 99.61 for the 1955-1956 school year. The A.D.A. increase appears to be more closely related to the additional teacher time than to the increase in the number of pupils enrolled.

A dual problem has existed in San Francisco in terms of the efforts made to provide speech correction services to all of the San Francisco public schools with
an inadequate number of speech correction teachers, and the efforts made to maintain an acceptable level of professional standards reflected by reasonable case loads. This problem has not been entirely solved.

The following areas, which are included in the Department of Physically Handicapped in San Francisco, are widely recognized as separate and distinct disciplines, each having numerous subdivisions:

1. Speech and hearing rehabilitation.
2. Education for the deaf.
3. Education for the blind and partially seeing.
4. Education for children with cerebral palsy and orthopedic and health handicaps.

That such a wide and varied program for physically handicapped children not only was sustained but expanded under the leadership of one person, with no administrative assistants, attests to the unique ability, understanding, and knowledge of its director, Mrs. Katharine Inglis Sutter. Biographical information concerning Mrs. Sutter is located in Appendix A, page 110.

The fact that the speech correction program cannot pay for itself through excess cost reimbursements, while other programs for the physically handicapped can, reflects upon the inadequacy of the reimbursement program for speech correction at the State level. The speech correc-
tion program must rely on other programs for the physically handicapped to support it adequately. This indicates that, financially, one of the pioneer programs of special education in the State of California, the speech correction program, has not yet been given its much-needed financial stability.

**Recommendations.** The following recommendations are based on the findings of this study and on the conclusions stated in this chapter:

1. There is a critical need for the establishment of a rationale or formula, utilizing total school enrollment figures, to ascertain the required number of speech correction teachers.

2. The establishment of criteria on the local level to determine the weekly operating case load for each speech correction teacher is strongly recommended.

3. A reconsideration of administrative responsibility in the Department of Physically Handicapped is indicated. The areas described on page 99 should be used for reference. With the developing scope and depth of research and literature in each of these areas, and with an increasing school population, an increase in the number of administrative personnel in the San Francisco Department of Physically Handicapped is warranted.

4. The implications and the volume of research and literature developing in the field of Speech and Hearing Rehabilitation, as well as the increasing numbers of children needing this service, indicate the need for establishing the position of Supervisor of Speech and Hearing Rehabilitation.
5. State legislation providing for more substantial financial support of speech correction programs should establish a greater degree of stability and should permit a much more effective speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District.
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APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL RESUMES
Mrs. Mabel Farrington Gifford graduated from Pomona High School, Pomona, California, in 1900.

From 1901 to 1903 she studied at the Natural Instruction Institute, also known as the Corrective Speech Institute, which was "a school for the permanent cure of stammering and all speech impediments," located in Buffalo, New York. She overcame much of her own stuttering problem there and acquired training in the teaching of speech correction.

In 1903 she opened a branch of that school in Los Angeles.

In Los Angeles she studied for one year under a Dr. H. G. Brainerd, neurologist, who specialized in problems of mental retardation. She taught those clients of his who had defective speech.

In 1914 and 1915 she worked with a state psychologist as an instructor in speech correction at the Minnesota School for the Feeble-Minded. While there she also studied with teachers at the State School for the Deaf in Minnesota where her work with articulatory problems was intensified.

In 1915 she took a course in stuttering from Mrs. Mae Scripture, who had a speech clinic in conjunction with the Medical School at Columbia University in New York.

From 1915 to 1928 she was Chief of the Speech Clinic Out-Patient Department at the University of California Medical School in San Francisco.

From 1918 to 1940 she was an assistant instructor in Pediatrics and Neuropsychiatry at the University of California Medical School in San Francisco.

1Mabel F. Gifford's personal files.
Mrs. Gifford organized and supervised the speech correction program in the San Francisco Unified School District from 1916 to 1925.

She took leaves of absence from the San Francisco Unified School District in 1918 and 1923 for the purpose of surveying speech correction centers and studying psychotherapy in France, Austria, Belgium, Italy, and England. In the spring of 1923 Mrs. Gifford studied experimental and comparative phonetics at the University of London in England.

In 1925 she was declared a Fellow in the American Speech and Hearing Association in recognition of outstanding achievement.

She was appointed as the first Chief of the Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects and Disorders, California State Department of Education, in 1925, and continued in that position until her retirement in 1952.

In 1929 she returned to the University of London for six weeks of further study, and revisited the speech correction centers and psychotherapy clinics previously mentioned.

In 1935 Mrs. Gifford took a leave of absence to survey speech correction centers and psychotherapy clinics around the world, including England, Austria, Holland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Switzerland.

Other teaching positions held by Mrs. Gifford (on a part-time basis) in addition to the above were:

Instructor in speech correction, San Francisco State College, 1926 to 1952.

Instructor of Speech, Oakland Kindergarten Training School, 1926 to 1927.

Lecturer, University Extension, University of California, 1925 to 1952.

Lecturer and Director, Summer Session program for speech defects and disorders, University of California, 1925 to 1952.
Instructor in speech correction,
San Diego State College, 1938 to 1952.

Instructor in speech correction,
San Quentin State Prison, 1928 to 1935.

Lecturer, Adult Education Program for
Parent Education and Child Study,
Contra Costa County, 1950 to 1952.

Mrs. Gifford holds the Honorary Bachelor of Education degree from San Francisco State College, conferred in 1938.

She also holds the Honorary Bachelor of Arts degree from San Francisco State College, conferred in 1945.
MRS. KATHARINE INGLIS SUTTER

BIOGRAPHICAL RESUME

Mrs. Katharine Inglis Sutter graduated from Girls High School, San Francisco, California, in 1913.

In 1915 Mrs. Sutter graduated from San Francisco State Normal School.

Mrs. Sutter began her teaching career at John Swett Elementary School, San Francisco, in July, 1915, as a Second Grade teacher.

In 1916 Mrs. Sutter accompanied speech handicapped children from her school to the speech correction center conducted by Mrs. Mabel Farrington Gifford, and also attended the Saturday morning classes at the University of California Medical School speech clinic.

From 1917 until 1947 Mrs. Sutter taught speech handicapped school children at the University of California Medical School speech clinic on Saturday mornings.

From 1928 until 1947 Mrs. Sutter was the Director of the speech clinic at the University of California Medical School. The speech clinic was terminated in 1947.

In 1936 Mrs. Sutter was appointed Assistant in Pediatrics at the University of California Medical School.

Mrs. Sutter taught at John Swett Elementary School in San Francisco from 1915 to 1927. She became an Opportunity Teacher during this time, teaching children with learning problems in various school subjects. She taught all of the speech handicapped children at that school.

In 1926 Mrs. Sutter added to her teaching schedule at John Swett the teaching of lip reading to children with hearing losses. She also was Acting Vice-Principal for that year.

---

1Personal files of Mrs. Katharine Inglis Sutter.
John Swett Elementary School became a junior high school in 1927. Mrs. Sutter remained at the school and was Acting Vice-Principal again in 1929.

In 1930 Mrs. Sutter was promoted to the position of Supervisor for Physically Handicapped and Assistant to the Deputy Superintendent in charge of Special Schools and Classes. She became Director of Physically Handicapped in 1946.

Mrs. Sutter studied lip reading for hard of hearing children at University of California Extension in 1926, 1927, and 1928. Instructors were Miss Coralie Kenfield, Mrs. Poindexter, and Miss Agnes Stowall.

In 1930 Mrs. Sutter studied education for the deaf with Miss Lila B. McKenzie. She also studied education for the deaf with Miss Buell of the Clark School for the Deaf.

Mrs. Sutter received the Bachelor of Education degree from San Francisco State College in 1942.

Since 1947 Mrs. Sutter has received thirty-eight units of work in exceptional children from San Francisco State College.

Mrs. Sutter holds the following credentials:

1. General Teaching Credential, 1915.
3. Teaching of Special Classes in Citizenship, 1921.
4. General Elementary Administration and Supervision, 1927.
5. Mental Testing (Research Department, San Francisco School Department), 1928.
7. Special Supervision of Correction of Speech Defects, 1930.


Mrs. Sutter has worked with the following organizations:


2. California Council for Exceptional Children, San Francisco Chapter. Board of Directors, five years; President, one year.


5. San Francisco Society for the Hard of Hearing. Board of Directors, 1952-.

6. Aid to Visually Handicapped. San Francisco Board of Directors, three years; National Board of Directors, one year.

7. Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, San Francisco Chapter. Board of Directors, five years; President, one year.

8. San Francisco Epileptic Society. Vice-President, five years.

10. San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association, since 1915.

11. California Teachers Association, since 1915.


13. Parent-Teachers Associations, since 1915.
APPENDIX B

A HISTORY OF STATE CERTIFICATION

REQUIREMENTS IN SPEECH CORRECTION
From 1916 to 1925 State certification in speech correction was granted by the State Board of Education for teachers who had taken the practical and theoretical background lectures, and had had two or more years of experience in the successful handling of speech defects in the public schools. These lectures could be taken for eighteen months in Saturday classes at the University of California Medical School Speech Clinic, or the equivalent, which was for two complete summer sessions at the University of California Extension, or at the San Francisco State Teachers' College.

The two or more years of experience in the successful handling of speech defects required for certification after 1916 was replaced after 1925 by the more general requirement of two or more years of experience in a successful teaching situation, not specifically in speech correction. By 1929 all of the speech correction credential requirements were established in terms of hours. In addition to at least one hundred hours of practice teaching in speech correction, 180 hours of instruction in speech correction were needed. By 1930 the 180 hours of instruction in speech correction were restated in terms of an equivalent.

---

twelve units taken in two summer sessions. The one hundred hours of practice teaching in addition to two years of classroom teaching experience remained a constant requirement for several years.²

By 1944 the credential requirements had changed to create a choice of either the verification of two years of successful teaching experience or four semester hours of superior directed teaching in an approved teacher training institution. A valid California teacher's certificate, credential, or life diploma of elementary or secondary grade was still required. From the beginning another requirement was the possession of personal characteristics necessary for successful work with handicapped children.³ The subject areas had been more specifically stated by this time to include in the total twelve semester hours:

1. Technique of normal speech.
2. Mental hygiene.
3. Speech defects and disorders.
4. Speech correction.
5. Problems in the teaching of speech correction.
6. Directed teaching in speech correction.⁴

²Mabel F. Gifford, Notes on talk given by Mrs. Gifford to the International Council for Exceptional Children at Philadelphia, 1930. Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford. (Handwritten.)

³Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects, Biennial Report, 1944-46, p. 5. Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford. (Typewritten.)

⁴Ibid.
Two years later, in 1946, the Commission for Special Education restated its preference for at least two years of successful classroom teaching, and particular preparation in the field of mental hygiene. These credential requirements remained unchanged until 1955.

In July, 1955, the California State Department of Education adopted the Credential to Teach Exceptional Children, which is designed to include authorization to teach in one or more of the fields of the mentally and physically handicapped. In this credential authorization for instruction in speech correction and in lip reading are combined. Prior to July, 1955, separate credentials were issued for each of these two fields. There are general and special requirements which must be met in order to obtain the new Credential to Teach Exceptional Children. The general requirements include a survey course in the education of exceptional children, one in counseling and guidance for the handicapped, and one in speech correction or speech development, regardless of the area of specialization. The special requirements include the speech correction courses listed on page 116 in addition to courses

---

5 Mabel F. Gifford, copy of talk given in Hollywood, California, April, 1946. Personal files of Mabel F. Gifford. (Handwritten.)
previously required for the lip reading credential. \textsuperscript{6}

APPENDIX C

STATISTICAL DATA
TABLE IX
DECREASE IN THE PROGRAM OF PART-TIME
TEACHERS OF SPEECH CORRECTION
1928 - 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1937*</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1955</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Part-Time Teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pupils Taught</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Speech Correction Enrollment</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td>49.34</td>
<td>44.03</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pupils Corrected</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>28.53</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lessons Each Week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All part-time teachers were certificated in speech correction from 1937 to 1956.
NOTE: Speech Correction services were withdrawn from the secondary schools from 1934 to 1948.

FIGURE 8
PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL POPULATION ENROLLED IN SPEECH CORRECTION CLASSES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1916-1956
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Case Load</th>
<th>Average Annual Case Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928-1929</td>
<td>40.57%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1931</td>
<td>40.54%</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-1935</td>
<td>33.92%</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-1938</td>
<td>32.22%</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-1939</td>
<td>28.31%</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1947</td>
<td>22.08%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td>21.09%</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of Case Load**

**NOTE:** Elementary school pupils received two lessons each week from 1928 to 1945, and one lesson each week from 1946 to 1956.

**FIGURE 9**

Comparison of the average annual case load of the full-time rotating teachers and the percentage of pupils corrected, 1928-1956.
APPENDIX D

SAMPLES OF SPEECH MATERIALS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total School Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>46,466</td>
<td>57,237</td>
<td>82,261</td>
<td>80,075</td>
<td>77,848</td>
<td>75,542</td>
<td>76,492</td>
<td>79,184</td>
<td>78,772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>42,105</td>
<td>46,457</td>
<td>56,738</td>
<td>50,126</td>
<td>45,581</td>
<td>43,122</td>
<td>47,672</td>
<td>51,784</td>
<td>48,821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>25,523</td>
<td>29,913</td>
<td>32,267</td>
<td>32,420</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>29,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of teachers</strong></td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total speech correction enrollment</strong></td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td>343</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of total school enrollment in speech correction classes</strong></td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>4.58%</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of schools without speech correction classes</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Time Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of part-time teachers</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of pupils taught</strong></td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of speech correction enrollment</strong></td>
<td>67.89%</td>
<td>49.34%</td>
<td>44.03%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of pupils corrected</strong></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of pupils corrected</strong></td>
<td>29.06%</td>
<td>29.44%</td>
<td>28.53%</td>
<td>29.46%</td>
<td>28.05%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of lessons each week</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Rotating Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of full-time teachers</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of pupils taught</strong></td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>5,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of speech correction enrollment</strong></td>
<td>67.89%</td>
<td>49.34%</td>
<td>44.03%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of pupils corrected</strong></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of pupils corrected</strong></td>
<td>29.06%</td>
<td>29.44%</td>
<td>28.53%</td>
<td>29.46%</td>
<td>28.05%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number corrected</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of lessons per teacher</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Corrected San Francisco Enrollment*
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SPEECH CORRECTION
Gymnastics for the Muscles of the Speech Mechanism

I. JAW.

1. UP AND DOWN.
   Tip back the head. Open the jaw wide and close it 12 times.

2. SIDE TO SIDE.
   Swing the lower jaw alternately from right to left 12 times.

3. THRUST.
   Thrust the lower jaw forward and alternately draw it back to position 12 times.

4. BITING UPPER LIP.
   Draw down the upper lip and cover the red portion with the lower teeth. Alternate with relaxation 12 times.

5. BITING LOWER LIP.
   Place upper teeth over the red portion of the lower lip. Alternate with relaxation 12 times.

6. BITING LOWER AND UPPER LIPS.
   Bite first the upper and then the lower lip. Repeat 12 times and gradually increase the speed.

II. LIPS.

1. OO—EE—AH—AW.
   To produce flexibility of the lips, the following series of exaggerated vowel positions are given in succession: pucker the lips for oo, expand them on ee, drop the jaw and stretch them on ah, and finish with aw. Then begin again with oo and repeat the series 12 times. First practice slowly, then gradually increase the speed.

2. LIP THRUST.
   Stretch the lips forward, as for oo, as far as possible. Then bring them back tight against the teeth. Alternate the movements 12 times.

3. LIP TENSION.
   Set the lips firmly together and force the breath against them, without allowing any to escape. 12 times.

4. LIP STRETCH.
   Draw down the upper lip until it covers the edge of the upper teeth and folds under. Stretch and release 12 times.

5. LIP CURL.
   Curl the upper lip upward, without moving the nose. 12 times.

6. Alternate STRETCH AND CURL 12 times.

7. AH—M—AH—OO.
   Stretch the lips well on ah. Give this with a soft breathing tone.

III. TONGUE.

Note: In the following tongue exercises, do not open and close the mouth with each tongue movement, but keep the jaw fixed and mouth wide open during most of the exercises.

1. EXTENSION.
   Open the mouth wide, extend the tongue in a straight line, avoiding contact with the teeth or lips. Hold in this position without any movement for 12 counts.
III. TONGUE (Continued).

2. THRUST.
Open the mouth wide. Pull the tongue back in the throat and thrust it forward alternately, 12 times, without touching the lips or teeth.

3. TIP UP AND DOWN.
Open the mouth wide. Raise tip of tongue to the hard palate behind the teeth, drop it to the base of the lower teeth. 12 times.

4. TIP FLOP.
Open the mouth wide, scrape the under side of the tip of the tongue against edge of the upper front teeth. Repeat slowly and increase the speed.

5. SWEEP THE PALATE.
Place the tip of the tongue on the edge of the upper front teeth. Sweep it back along the palate as far as the tongue will permit. Then sweep it forward again to first position. Repeat 12 times.

6. DOT THE PALATE.
Take the same position as for sweeping the palate. Make a dotted line with the tip on the palate from the teeth to the uvula and return, about 6 dots in each direction. Repeat 6 times.

7. DIAMOND SHAPE.
Open the mouth wide, curl the tip of the tongue to the middle of the upper lip and the middle of the lower lip. Repeat 12 times. Next move the tip to the opposite corners rapidly. Then start tip of tongue at the right corner of the mouth; touch middle of upper lip; left corner; middle of lower lip and return to right corner. Repeat 12 times.

8. TIP TO CHEEKS.
Place tip of tongue against the middle of the right cheek. Swing it to the middle of the left. Repeat 12 times, keeping the tongue from rolling around.

9. RAISE SIDES TO UPPER TEETH.
Open the mouth wide, tongue resting in the bottom of the mouth as in the sound ah. Raise the sides of the tongue until they touch the upper side teeth. Think of the sound of ee. Raise and drop 12 times.

10. THICK AND THIN.
Open mouth wide. Thrust tongue out. Place thumb under the tongue and the first finger on top of the tongue. Thicken the tongue so that it pushes against both thumb and finger. After gaining control of these vertical muscles, expand it in the mouth cavity, without the aid of the thumb and finger. The top of the tongue should touch the dome of the palate.

11. FLATTEN TONGUE.
Open mouth wide. Tip of tongue touching base of lower teeth. Flatten the tongue by thinking of the sound of aw.

12. MIDDLE OF TONGUE UP AND DOWN.
Open mouth wide. Place tip of tongue back of the lower teeth. Keep it pressed here. Elevate the center of the tongue by thinking of the a sound. Raise and lower 12 times.

13. BACK OF TONGUE UP AND DOWN.
Open mouth wide. Raise back of tongue to the soft palate and lower 12 times. The sound ng alternating with ah will assist. Increase the speed.

14. ROLL SIDES UPWARD.
Make a deep channel lengthwise by folding the sides until they meet against the hard palate.

(ah) ay ey ea ow

This is the vowel scale. These may be prefixed and suffixed by the various consonant sounds.

REVERSE SIDE OF SPEECH IMPROVEMENT CARD
DEScribing GYMNASTICS FOR THE MUSCLES OF THE SPEECH MECHANISM
TONGUE EXERCISES
For Correction of Speech Defects

1. a. Open the mouth wide, using a mirror to see that the soft palate is raised. (If the pupil has any difficulty lifting the soft palate, suggest drawing in a short quick breath.)
   b. Slowly thrust the tongue outward as far as possible without straining the root, and without touching the teeth or lower lip. Tense the muscles of the tip only. Think of pushing the tongue out as far as possible. Do not curl the tip upward.
   c. Relax the tongue without moving the lower jaw.
   d. Close the mouth. Repeat this exercise several times. If the pupil cannot keep the tongue off the lower teeth, place the end of a tongue depressor on the edge of the lower teeth and suggest that the pupil keep his tongue from touching the stick.

2. a. Open the mouth wide. See that the soft palate is lifted.
   b. Slowly lift the tip of the tongue until it touches the teeth ridge (the hard palate just back of the upper teeth). Do not lift the back of the tongue. Do not move the lower jaw.
   c. Press the tensed tip of the tongue against the teeth ridge.
   d. Drop the tongue to the normal position without moving the lower jaw.
   e. Close the mouth. Repeat this exercise several times.

3. a. Drop the lower jaw. Do not open the mouth wide. Lift the soft palate.
   b. Slowly lift the tip of the tongue until it touches the soft palate. Do not attempt to press the tip against the soft palate.
   c. Drop the tongue to the normal position without moving the lower jaw.
   d. Close the mouth. Repeat the exercise several times.

4. a. Drop the lower jaw to the normal position. Keep the soft palate raised.
   b. Slowly lift the tip of the tongue until it touches the teeth ridge.
   c. Press the tip against the teeth ridge.
   d. Relax the tongue to the normal position without moving the lower jaw.
   e. Now slowly lift the tip of the tongue until it touches the soft palate.
   f. Relax the tongue to the normal position without moving the lower jaw. Repeat the alternate touching of the teeth ridge and the soft palate with the tip of the tongue several times before closing the mouth.

5. a. Open the mouth wide. See that the soft palate is raised.
   b. Place the front edge of the tongue behind the lower front teeth.
   c. Roll the body of the tongue as far outward and over the lower teeth as possible without straining. Do not let the side muscles of the tongue touch the upper side teeth. Keep the middle (dorsum) of the tongue relaxed—grooved.
   d. Relax the tongue to the normal position.
   e. Close the mouth. Repeat this exercise several times.

SPEECH IMPROVEMENT CARD USED BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS DESCRIBING TONGUE EXERCISES (ca. 1920-1933)
6. a. Drop the lower jaw. Do not open the mouth wide.
   b. Raise the tip of the tongue to the teeth ridge.
   c. While holding the tip pressed against the teeth ridge, spread the tongue until the side muscles are pressing against the upper side teeth. Hold the tongue in this position pressing the upper side teeth for a few seconds.
   d. Relax the tongue to the normal position.
   e. Close the mouth. Repeat this exercise several times. This exercise develops the speech mechanism for the production of the consonant "th."

7. a. Repeat a, b, and c of Exercise 6 and while holding the side muscles of the tongue pressed against the upper side teeth, drop the front edge of the tongue. Raise the front edge of the tongue to the teeth ridge again. Continue this alternate lowering and raising of the front edge of the tongue for several seconds. Be sure to keep the side muscles pressed against the upper side teeth. Also see that the dorsum of the tongue is completely relaxed while the front edge is being lowered and raised. If necessary, run a very thin applicator between the top of the tongue and the hard palate. It should be possible to insert an applicator between the top of the tongue and the hard palate; if not, the tongue is not in the correct position. Keep the whole tongue thin. Do not square the edge since this will have a tendency to thicken the tongue and cause the dorsum to raise.
   b. Drop the tongue to the normal position.
   c. Close the mouth. Repeat this exercise several times. This exercise develops the speech mechanism for the production of "s."

8. a. Repeat a, b and c of Exercise 6 and while holding the front edge of the tongue pressed against the teeth ridge, lower and raise the side muscles of the tongue several times before relaxing the tongue to the normal position and closing the mouth. Be sure that the back of the tongue is completely relaxed. This can be tested by passing a very thin applicator between the upper side teeth and the lowered sides of the tongue from side to side. The lips should be held off the upper teeth so that they will not interfere with the applicator entering the space between the upper side teeth and the sides of the tongue and passing through this same space on the other side of the mouth.
   b. Relax the tongue to the normal position.
   c. Close the mouth.
   d. Repeat this exercise several times. An excellent exercise for the development of the consonant "l."

9. a. Repeat a, b, and c of Exercise 6 and while holding the side muscles of the tongue in position against the upper side teeth allow the body of the tongue to slide back slightly and curl the front edge of the tongue toward the arch of the palate.
   b. Relax the tongue to the normal position without moving the jaw.
   c. Close the mouth.
   d. Repeat this exercise several times. This exercise develops the speech mechanism for the production of "r."

It is unwise to refer to a certain tongue exercise as the "th" exercise or the "s" exercise. These exercises are exaggerated positions and should never be associated in the mind of the pupil with the consonant being developed.

From the book on "Speech Correction" by Lilla B. McKenzie

REVERSE SIDE OF SPEECH IMPROVEMENT CARD
USED BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS
DESCRIBING TONGUE EXERCISES
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Department of Speech Improvement

ARTICULATION

I. AIMS: Acquisition of skills necessary for correct articulation of
1. Vowel sounds
2. Lip-teeth and tip-of-tongue-teeth sounds

II. HELPS: (To be done 12 times each)

Jaw exercises
1. Drop Sec. 1-1
2. Thrust 1-3
3. Swing 1-2
4. Alternate 1-6

Tip of tongue
1. Thrust 111-2
2. Extension 111-1
3. Swinging 111-9
4. Rolling sides 111-8

Lip and jaw exercises
1. Bite upper lip 1-4
2. Bite lower lip 1-5
3. Alternate 1-6
4. Raising sides 111-9
5. Rolling sides up and down 111-8

III. MATERIAL: Any syllable combination of vowel sounds with F, V, th' (thin), Th' (that)

IV. APPLICATION TO LIFE SITUATION:

I. Class poems
2. Dramatics, oral reading
3. Class discussions
4. Conversation

(Speech Improvement Cards Used by Classroom Teachers indicating Lessons for Specific Speech Sounds (ca. 1920-1933))
## DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION OF SPEECH DEFECTS
### CASE HISTORY SUMMARY

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>C.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td>I.Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMINER</td>
<td>COMPLAINT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. FINDINGS OF PHYSICAL EXAMINATION - PHYSICIAN

### 2. HEREDITY

### 3. FAMILY

### 4. (a) Date of Birth | (f) Muscular Strength
| (b) Place of Birth | (g) Muscular Coordination
| (c) Age of Talking | (h) Initiative
| (d) Age of Walking | (i) Will
| (e) Manual Dexterity |

### 5. ONSET OF DIFFICULTY

### 6. PATIENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS HIS COMPLAINT (own words)

### 7. SLEEPING HABITS

### 8. EATING HABITS

### 9. PLAY

### 10. RESPONSIBILITIES

### 11. EMOTIONAL ATTITUDES

### 12. FINDINGS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION

### 13. SCHOOL RECORD

### 14. HOME DUTIES - WEEKLY ALLOWANCE

### 15. DIAGNOSIS

---

CASE HISTORY SUMMARY FORM (8-1/2"x11") USED BY FULL-TIME SPEECH CORRECTION TEACHERS, PRIMARILY FOR CHILDREN HAVING NERVOUS SPEECH PROBLEMS (Begun ca. 1928 and still in use)