The Council of Social Work Education's 2022 accreditation standards require that "programs recognize the pervasive impact of white supremacy" (CSWE, 2022, p. 9). This requirement is particularly relevant for school social work (SSW), a specialization that has been historically and continues to be dominated by White women and critiqued for its lack of inclusion and use of western, race-neutral models to guide practice (Villarreal Sosa, 2022). In light of this criticism, it is crucial to gain deeper insight into the history of SSW and its impact on current perspectives and practice methods. As a first step toward this goal, a scoping review was completed to identify common themes in scholarly articles that describe SSW history, if and how racism and white supremacy are discussed, and other potential gaps in the literature.

In this review, a structured overview of published papers that discuss SSW history is provided. The aim of this paper is not to complete a systemic review and assess the quality of studies (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005) or calculate "the direction and/or magnitude of an effect across all relevant studies," something typically completed in a meta-analysis (Wilson, 2014, para 1). Instead, this scoping review aims to provide a more concentrated and detailed snapshot of the key themes and omissions in scholarly articles that discuss SSW history, including the discussion of race, racism, and white supremacy.

Methods

This scoping review followed the steps outlined by Arksey & O'Malley (2005): 1. identify the research question; 2. identify relevant papers; 3. paper selection; 4. chart the data; 5. collate, summarize, and report the results. The following research questions guide this scoping review: 1. What are the common themes and gaps in the literature related to SSW history? 2. How are race, racism, and white supremacy discussed when describing SSW history?

Relevant papers were identified through database searches of Social Work Abstracts and Social Service Abstracts on December 12, 2022. Key words used in each search included "school social work" AND "histor*" in abstract.

A total of 77 papers were identified from the initial database search before 11 duplicates were then removed. The titles and abstracts of the remaining papers were assessed for relevance (i.e., to verify they referenced SSW history). Forty-one papers were excluded at this stage because they did not include information relevant to SSW history. One additional paper was excluded because it was a short book chapter and the only paper not published in a scholarly journal. Ultimately, 24 papers were found to meet the inclusion criteria. However, only 23

of these papers could be accessed through the uiversity database. These 23 papers were read in full to further assess their relevance during the charting process.

Arksey & O'Malley (2005) describe charting as a way to synthesize and interpret qualitative data that includes "sifting, charting and sorting material according to key issues and themes…[by]…applying a common analytical framework to all the primary research reports and collecting standard information on each study" (pp. 15-16). To do this, the researcher followed Braun and Clark's (2006) thematic analysis framework: 1. familiarize yourself with the data; 2. generate initial codes; 3. search for themes; 4. review themes; 5. define and name themes; and 6. produce the report.

To become familiar with the data, the researcher scanned each paper. Key themes and other details related to each paper were entered into a Word document, including the APA citation and key information pertaining to the aim of the paper, any unique theoretical framework applied, and overall relevance (or lack thereof) to the topic.

Next, the author began the coding process. Twenty-one papers were uploaded to atlas.ti for reading and analysis. Two papers were reviewed manually because their formatting did not allow for analysis in atlas.ti. Throughout this process, initial codes were applied to all text segments related to SSW history. The codes were generated based on the core meaning of each data segment. Example codes include: "Visiting Teachers," "activism, advocacy, calls for reform," "clinical focus on individual children," "SSW funds, associations, and conferences," "SSW origins," "ecological perspective/systems theory," "mention of race," and "bias, racism, segregation or social change."

After the initial round of coding, six of the 23 articles were omitted from further analysis because they did not include sufficient information about SSW history. For example, one paper that explored the history of children in foster care contained recommendations for SSW, but no information about SSW history. Another paper only contained historical information in the form of a quiz and its answer key. Ultimately, 17 articles were included in the final sample of this scoping review and the subsequent round of coding.

Before beginning the second coding round, the researcher reviewed all codes and identified those that were most and least common, codes that needed to be combined, and emerging themes within the data. During the second round of coding, specific attention was given to codes related to the research questions to ensure that all the text was coded accurately. After the second round of coding,

the author collated the codes, further refined the themes, and generated the results section (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Braun & Clarke, 2005).

Results

The results component of this paper is divided into two parts. First, the author provides a descriptive overview of the 17 papers included in the scoping review. Second, the overarching themes and omissions found within this body of literature are outlined.

Descriptive Overview of the Literature

The 17 papers were published in the United States from 1979 through 2019. The paper published in the 1970s (n=1) was a reprint from 1944. Five papers were published in the 1980s, two papers were published in the 1990s, four in the 2000s, and five in the 2010s.

All 17 papers were published in scholarly journals. *School Social Work Journal* contained the majority of these articles (n=9), followed by *Children & Schools* (n=4). The four additional articles were published in the following journals: *Social Work in Education, Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, Journal of School Social Work,* and *Social Service Review.*

These 17 articles addressed SSW history in a variety of ways. Two articles provide a larger overview of SSW history from its beginnings in 1906 to the date of publication (Allen-Meares, 2006; Stuart, 1986). Three articles, all analyzing primary sources, describe specific periods of time in SSW history related to the Visiting Teacher Movement (Charles & Stone, 2019; McCullagh, 2002; Sugrue, 2017). Three articles focus on specific aspects of SSW history, including social work consultation (Zischka & Fox, 1985), the development of professional social work associations (Fisher, 1993), and the evolution of school-community partnerships (Franklin & Gerlach, 2006). Two articles utilize specific theoretical frameworks in their analysis of SSW history, including intentional emergence theory (Phillippo & Blosser, 2013) and the policy window lens (Gherardi, 2017). Two articles highlight specific aspects of SSW practice, including clinical factors (Fisher, 1988) and practice with students who are developmentally disabled (DeWeaver & Rose, 1987). The remaining articles all included a description of SSW history while exploring the following topics: influences on the functions of school social workers (Sherman, 2016), approaches to teaching policy to SSW students (Essex & Massat, 2005), the growth of SSW in Iowa (Clark, 1986), the inclusion and exclusion of biological sketches of key SSW figures in the Year

Books and Encyclopedia of Social Work (McCullagh, 1998), and clarification of the role of school social workers for school administrators (Smalley, 1979).

Substantive Overview of the Literature

The most common themes found throughout SSW history literature include a discussion of: 1. the Visiting Teachers Movement (VTM), 2. the influence of key figures, private agencies, and legislation on SSW practice, and 3. guiding models for SSW practice. Identified gaps in the literature include: 4. a critical analysis of and critiques of SSW history and 5. meaningful discussion of the impact of bias, racism, and white supremacy on the profession. These five themes are discussed in the sub-sections that follow.

Visiting Teachers Movement (VTM)

A description of the Visiting Teachers Movement (VTM) and the role of visiting teachers was the most common thread present throughout the literature. In fact, all but one article (DeWeaver & Rose, 1987) mentioned "visiting teachers" at least once. The literature included in this review consistently documents the VTM as the start of what is today known as SSW. With its beginnings in East Coast cities in the early 1900s, the VTM spurred from the realization that students' educational needs were not being met for a variety of reasons (e.g., urbanization, poverty, immigration, growing class sizes, individual student needs, etc.) (Allen-Meares, 2006; Fisher, 1988; Sugrue, 2017).

The VTM was often described as a response to the needs of urban centers after the implementation of compulsory schooling and changing social conditions (Allen Meares, 2006; Charles & Stone, 2019; Clark, 1986; 2019; Fisher, 1988; Franklin & Gerlach, 2006; Sherman, 2016; Smalley, 1979; Sugrue, 2017). Subsequently, the early focus of visiting teachers often included linking the school to the community (Charles & Stone, 2019; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013; Sugrue, 2017), assisting psychologists in capturing students' social histories (Allen-Meares, 2006), preventing delinquency (including poor attendance and behavior) (Fisher, 1988; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013), and providing instruction to teachers to improve their understanding students' ecological contexts (i.e., the impact of students' home environment on their school performance) (Sugrue, 2017).

Early visiting teachers were described as reformers and activists whose approach to intervention was grounded in an ecological perspective (Charles & Stone, 2019; Gherardi, 2017; Sherman, 2016). Common roles of early visiting teachers included linking the home and school (Clark, 1986; Essex & Massat,

2005; Fisher, 1988; Franklin & Gerlach, 2006; Sherman, 2016; Sugrue, 2017), addressing juvenile delinquency, student behavioral issues and truancy (Fisher, 1988; Sherman, 2016), gathering social histories of students to aid psychologists in creating treatment plans (Allen-Meares, 2006), providing support to students and families by encouraging the use of social and medical services (Phillippo & Blosser, 2013), providing direct services to students and their families (Fisher, 1988), and enforcing child labor and attendance laws (Clark, 1986), which included explaining compulsory attendance laws and the expectations of U.S. public schools to immigrant parents (Fisher, 1988; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013).

Although there was little critical analysis of the VTM across the literature, one paper offered critiques that remain relevant today (Charles & Stone, 2019). Charles & Stone (2019) explained that some visiting teachers echoed the biases (e.g., acceptance of paternalism and pathologizing immigrant homes) of supporters of compulsory attendance laws. Charles & Stone also critiqued visiting teachers' participation in the surveilling and pathologizing of the students' households (i.e., home visits) and taking punitive action against families as it relates to compulsory education (Charles & Stone, 2019). Finally, Charles & Stone noted that an "unforeseen consequence of the visiting teacher movement was that it enlarged the educational system, and therefore the power of the state, by creating a new subdivision of educational experts whom the state could call upon to bolster claims that children and families were not adequately meeting the demands of the system" (Charles & Stone, 2019, p. 846).

Influence of Key Figures, Private Agencies, and Legislation

Numerous articles included the names of foundational SSW figures (Allen-Meares, 2006; Charles & Stone, 2019; Essex & Massat, 2005; Fisher, 1988; Gherardi, 2017; McCullagh, 2002; Sugrue, 2017) and discussed the influence of private agencies (i.e., settlement houses, charitable organizations, professional organizations, and professional associations) on the field of school social work (Allen-Meares, 2006; Charles & Stone, 2019; Fisher, 1988; McCullagh, 2002; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013; Sherman, 2016; Sugrue, 2017; Zischka & Fox, 1985). For example, Jane Culbert, an early visiting teacher and leader of the VTM who brought national attention to school social work during the 1910s and 1920s, was quoted within the literature (Charles & Stone, 2019; McCullagh,1998; Sugrue, 2017). Bertha Reynolds, also acknowledged as a leader in the profession (in the 1930s), was highlighted for recognizing that problems arise not only because of an individual child's deficits, but also due to deficits within the school environment (Allen-Meares, 2006; Essex & Massat, 2005). Entering much later in SSW history (late 1960s), Lela Costin's critiques of SSW's

clinical focus influenced the direction of SSW practice, including the importance of group work and systems theories (Fisher, 1988; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013).

Various articles also highlighted key legislation across time that has shaped the SSW specialization throughout its own history, beginning with child labor laws, attendance laws, and compulsory education in the early 20th century (Allen-Meares, 2006; Charles & Stone, 2019; Clark, 1986; Gherardi, 2017; Sherman, 2016; Sugrue, 2017). Compulsory attendance laws were put in place in the colonial period and by 1918 every state in the United States had passed school compulsory attendance laws for children (Allen-Meares, 2006; Clark; 1986; Sugrue, 2017). These laws compelled thousands of working-class, poor, and immigrant children to participate in the public school system, creating demands on the public education system that could not be met and ultimately generating the need for visiting teachers (Allen-Meares, 2006; Charles & Stone, 2019; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013; Sugrue, 2017).

Beyond legislation during the early years of the VTM, SSW literature typically highlights educational legislation that impacted the functioning of school social workers. For example, the Community Mental Health Center Act of 1963 was highlighted for drawing attention to the consultation role of school mental health workers (Zischka & Fox, 1985). While the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1972 gave non-school social workers (i.e., community non-profits) the power to serve low-income youth (Phillippo & Blosser, 2013), the 1972 Emergency School Aid Act provided funding for school-based counseling services, and the 1974 Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act further expanded the responsibilities of school social workers (Phillippo & Blosser, 2013).

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EAHCA) protected the rights of students with disabilities and created a category for emotional disability, providing support for the clinical intervention model of SSW practice (Gherardi, 2017; Sherman, 2016). EAHCA was described as a "game changer" for SSW (Sherman, 2016, p. 148). Not only was the act the first documented occurrence of federal requirements defining school social work, but it also fundamentally changed schools' infrastructure to include school social workers (Gherardi, 2017; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013; Sherman, 2016). Although SSW structuration continued during the 1980s, federal support for social services and education was drastically reduced during the Reagan administration (Phillippo & Blosser, 2013).

Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) in 2004 further shaped the field of SSW by mandating "the use of positive behavior supports for students with emotional-behavioral disabilities" (Gherardi, 2017, p. 47). Gherardi (2017) asserted the mandate began to shift the largely clinical focus of SSW in relation to special education intervention to incorporate more ecological approaches, "resulting in the emergence of what might be understood as an integrated model of school social work" (p. 47).

Guiding Models of SSW Practice

The literature indicates when the SSW profession—via the VTM—emerged, it included a heavy ecological perspective reflected in the common goals to both change the school and community environment and to create a link between school and home environments (Essex & Massat, 2005; Gherardi, 2017; Sherman, 2016). However, despite the SSW profession's early focus, over time, the profession became increasingly focused on direct practice servicing individual students (Zischka & Fox, 1985). In fact, the role of the mental hygiene movement on the SSW profession's shift from community-oriented, ecologically driven perspectives to a clinical or case management approach was discussed throughout the literature (Allen-Meares, 2006; Essex & Massat, 2005; Fisher, 1988; Gherardi, 2017; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013; Sherman, 2016; Sugrue, 2017).

Although the mental hygiene movement was not clearly defined, nor its history described in the literature, its impact on the SSW profession was discussed in detail. For example, the literature suggests although school social workers continued to assume the role of liaison between the family, community, and schools through the 1920s (Essex & Massat, 2005), the mental hygiene movement's focus on the diagnosis and treatment of difficult children shifted the focus of school social workers to treating individual students and preventing maladjustment (Allen-Meares, 2006; Essex & Massat, 2005; Gherardi, 2017). The literature further indicates that by the 1940s and 50s, the SSW profession had transitioned to being primarily comprised of case work or a clinical focus (i.e., focused on addressing the needs of individual students (Essex & Massat, 2005; Gherardi, 2017; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013; Sherman, 2016).

In addition to the mental hygiene movement, policy reform in the 1970s (e.g., 1975 Education for all Handicapped Children Act [EAHCA]) solidified SSW's clinical focus (Gherardi, 2017; Sherman, 2016). Gherardi (2017) explained that as school social workers gained access to schools and their positions became increasingly "funded (at least in part) through EAHCA (and

later reauthorizations known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA]), social workers were more closely tied to three core functions in supporting students with disabilities: assessment, intervention, and case management…represent[ing] a highly individual or case-oriented approach to practice." (Gherardi, 2017, pp. 44-45). Although a perspective not widely shared when discussing recent legislation, Gherardi (2017) asserted the reauthorization of IDEA in 2004, which requires the implementation of positive behavior supports for children with emotional-behavioral difficulties, spurred a more integrated approach to SSW practice, combining both clinical and ecological models.

Critiques of SSW

The literature contained little critical discussion about SSW history. By far, the most common critique of the SSW profession across the 17 articles is that its focus has moved away from its roots in advocacy and community action to clinical (or case management) practice (Charles & Stone, 2019; Fisher, 1988; Phillippo & Blosser; Sherman, 2016). In fact, various authors cite Lela Costin's report (cerca 1969) which critiqued the profession's focus on clinical work (Fisher, 1988; Phillippo & Blosser, 2013). This critique, shared by multiple scholars, has continued into more recent times (Charles & Stone, 2019; Sherman, 2016). For example, Sherman (2016) explained the compartmentalization of school social workers as case managers minimizes their ability to serve the larger school community. Further, specializing in special education makes school social workers less available to students in general education settings.

Other critiques that are less common across the literature concern early school social work practices during the VTM as well as more current issues. For example, as previously noted, visiting teachers were critiqued for echoing the biases (e.g., acceptance of paternalism and pathologizing immigrant homes) of supporters of compulsory attendance laws (Charles & Stone, 2019). Visiting teachers were specifically critiqued for their participation in the surveillance of families (via home visits) as well as their pathologizing of and punitive action against families as it relates to compulsory education (Charles & Stone, 2019). The VTM was also critiqued in the literature for what was perceived as the unintended consequence of enlarging "the educational system, and therefore the power of the state, by creating a new subdivision of educational experts whom the state could call upon to bolster claims that children and families were not adequately meeting the demands of the system" (Charles & Stone, 2019, p. 486).

More contemporary critiques that were also not found across the literature include critical examination of current licensing gaps and inconsistencies for

school social workers (Sherman, 2016) and the lack of definition for SSW consultation (Zischka & Fox, 1985). Other critiques noted many school social workers work in relative isolation (i.e., are often the sole school social worker at their site) and that there is little dialogue that currently occurs across the SSW specialization (Sugrue, 2017).

Discussion of Bias, Racism, Segregation, and Social Change

Although, for the most part, there is consensus regarding key aspects of SSW history, a glaring omission is the critical analysis of SSW history throughout most of the literature, particularly the influence of bias, racism, and related factors on the development of SSW profession and SSW practice. In fact, only one article mentioned the race of school social workers. Charles & Stone (2019) briefly addressed the racial idenitites of early school social workers by stating, "Developed and nurtured by a group of predominantly educated, white, urban women in the Northeast and Midwest, the movement had many similarities to other progressive social movements of the time…" (p. 834). Charles & Stone also asserted that compulsory attendance laws reflected White, middle-class views of the poor, and that visiting teachers often carried the very same biases of those who created the compulsory attendance laws. Additionally, although not specific to school social work, Charles & Stone (2019) identified parallels between the VTM and current social work practice as they relate to immigration. More specifically, Charles & Stone indicated that current organizational structures do not adequately respond to the new emotional, physical, and legal needs of immigrants during the Trump era. Although Charles & Stone offer a critical perspective that was missing in most of the articles included in this review, they discuss immigration broadly without placing it within the racialized and racist context of the United States.

Even when discussing bias, racism, disproportionalities, and social change, including during the Civil Rights era (Allen-Meares, 2006; Charles & Stone, 2019; Essex & Massat, 2005; Fisher, 1988; Gherardi, 2017), the articles included in this review took an ostensibly color-evasive approach in their presentation of history. Color-evasiveness is "the refusal to address race, and its corollary racism" (Annamma et al., 2017, p. 156).

Color-evasive perspectives limit the ability to analyze how race, racism, and white supremacy continue to impact the development of the profession and our understanding of SSW history. For example, some literature briefly discussed issues facing the public school system during the Civil Rights era, but did not specifically relate this history to SSW (Allen-Meares, 2006; Fisher, 1988; Gherardi, 2017). Notably, Allen-Meares (2006) and Gherardi (2017) both briefly

discussed the Civil Rights era, highlighting the 1968 Kerner Report that placed blame for racial violence on schools' failure to adequately educate minoritized students and called for the end of racial segregation in schools. However, neither author discussed the way that school social workers addressed (or did not address) racism, racial violence, and racial segregation during this period. Any additional mention of the Civil Rights Movement throughout the literature was brief, with no discussion of how school social workers addressed the racial injustices during this time period.

Other literature briefly addressed racial justice issues such as disproportionalities in the educational outcomes of minoritized communities, but lacked depth and detail. For example, Essex & Massat (2005) noted the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 renewed attention to addressing disproportionalities that impacted minoritized communities, but did not specifically relate their critique of this legislation to SSW beyond noting that school social workers are well-positioned to work toward school reform to address systemic barriers to educating students (Essex & Massat, 2005). Notably, color-evasive language was used by the authors who never directly address the impact of racism on educational disparities or school social workers' role in addressing systemic racism.

Discussing more contemporary issues, Allen-Meares (2006) recommended that in response to the United States becoming more racially and ethnically diverse, the SSW profession must improve its knowledge base to more effectively practice within a more diverse student body. Although necessary, this recommendation is limited as it does not address existing racism and bias experienced by Communities of Color in the United States. Ultimately, the limited material that addressed bias, racism, segregation, the civil rights era, and social change was brief and did not include a thorough analysis of these topics or the relationship to the development of the SSW profession and SSW practice.

Discussion

This scoping review uncovered common topics about SSW history found in the literature, including descriptions of the Visiting Teachers Movement, the influence of key figures, private agencies, and legislation on SSW practice, as well as guiding models (e.g., ecological model and clinical model) for SSW practice. This review also revealed that although the literature includes some critiques of the VTM and SSW practice, most descriptions of SSW history lack critical analysis, particularly an analysis of the impact of bias, racism, and white supremacy on school social work practice.

To this author's knowledge, to date, no school social work (SSW) researcher has traced the influence of white supremacy on SSW practice, nor is the impact of racism and white supremacy included in the literature's descriptions of SSW history. To address this gap, future descriptions of SSW history should include a more critical analysis, particularly of how issues relating to race and racism continue to impact the profession's understanding of school social work history, school social workers' understanding of the problems they sought to address, and school social workers' responses to the identified problems within the K-12 education system.

As noted in the finding sections, the articles included in this review utilized a color-evasive perspective and did not delve into detail regarding the racial identities of the school social workers (visiting teachers) and how the social location of early school social workers (visiting teachers) and the social context (i.e., societal trends of addressing, disregarding, or antagonizing racism, classism, segregation, desegregation, etc.) throughout different historical periods impacted the development of the profession. In fact, of the 17 articles reviewed, none discussed racism within the profession, and only one article mentioned the racial identity of visiting teachers and bias within the VTM (Charles & Stone, 2019). Although various articles provided historical context during the Civil Rights Movement—including critiques of the public education system from that time (e.g., segregation, poorer educational outcomes for students of color, etc.) (Allen-Meares, 2006; Gherardi, 2017), brief mention of social work shifting to address "societal issues such as race relations" (Fisher, 1988, p. 16), and a description of post-Civil Rights legislation meant to address disproportionalities and disparities in the education system (e.g., No Child Left Behind) (Essex & Massat, 2005)— these discussions were extremely limited.

Although Allen-Meares (2006) and Gherardi (2017) briefly discussed the Civil Rights era, there was no discussion of the role of school social workers in addressing racism, racial violence, and racial segregation. Given the current racial violence that continues to plague U.S. society, it would be beneficial if not essential to better understand school social workers' responses (or lack thereof) to racial violence and segregation during the Civil Rights era to gain better understanding of school social workers' (in)action to continued racism and racial violence today.

Ultimately, this review reveals that SSW literature takes an ostensibly color-evasive approach and lacks essential historical context regarding the impact of white supremacy and racism—including its influence on the laws, policies, and

practices that guide the profession, the societal context and understanding of the problems that SSW intended to address, and SSW's own understanding of the profession. As the SSW profession continues to grow, it is necessary for SSW researchers to apply critical theoretical lenses to better understand school social work history, particularly the influence of race, gender, and class on the professional. This type of analysis would enable researchers to critically understand the way problems have been defined in the field, how the client (i.e., student, family, or school) has been perceived, as well as how the social identities of school social workers might have impacted their perceptions of the identified problems and the corresponding interventions to address those problems.

Conclusion

SSW scholars and practitioners alike have yet to "recognize the pervasive impact of white supremacy" (CSWE, 2022, p. 9). This would require SSW scholars to not only move away from the western, race-neutral models that have guided SSW practice, but to also center critical theories as we reflect on past, present, and future directions of this field (Villarreal Sosa, 2022). Further, we must not be complacent with simply recognizing the impact of white supremacy and racism on the field, and take active steps to teach, practice, and engage in scholarshipfrom anti-racist perspectives.

References

Annamma, S. A., Jackson, D. D., & Morrison, D. (2017). Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: Using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. Race Ethnicity and Education, 20(2), 147–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248837

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8*(1), 19-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616

Allen-Meares, P. (2006). One hundred years: A historical analysis of social work services in schools. *School Social Work Journal,* 24–43.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Charles, J., & Stone, S. (2019). Revisiting the visiting teacher: Relearning the lessons of the whole-child approach. *Social Service Review*, *93*(4), 833-861. https://doi.org/10.1086/706788

Clark, J. P. (1986). School Social Work in Iowa: Past, Present and Future. *Journal of School Social Work, 1*(1), 11-18.

Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) (2022). 2022 EPAS: Educational policy and accreditation standards for Baccalaureate and Master's Social Work Program. *Council on Social Work Education: Washington, DC, USA*.

DeWeaver, K. L., & Rose, S. R. (1987). School social work with developmentally disabled pupils: Past, present, and future. *School Social Work Journal*, *11*, 47-58.

Essex, E. L., & Massat, C. R. (2005). Preparing school social workers for their wider role: policy as practice. *School Social Work Journal, 29*(2), 25–39.

Fisher, R. A. (1988). Clinical aspects of school social work. *School Social Work Journal, 13*(1), 13–22.

Fisher, R. A. (1993). The future of professional school social work organizations: An inside perspective. *School Social Work Journal*, *17*(2), 31-44.

Franklin, C., & Gerlach, B. (2006). One hundred years of linking schools with communities: Current models and opportunities. *School Social Work Journal*, *31*(3), 44-62.

Gherardi, S. A. (2017). Policy windows in school social work: History, practice implications, and new directions. *School Social Work Journal*, *42*(1), 37-54.

McCullagh, J. G. (1998). Early school social work leaders: Women forgotten by the profession. *Children & Schools, 20*(1), 55-63. doi:10.1093/cs/20.1.55

McCullagh, J. G. (2002). School social work in Hartford, Connecticut: correcting the historical record. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *29(2)*, 93-103.

Phillippo, K. L., & Blosser, A. (2013). Specialty practice or interstitial practice? A reconsideration of school social work's past and present. *Children & Schools, 35*(1), 19-31. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cds039

Sherman, M. C. (2016). The school social worker: A marginalized commodity within the school ecosystem. *Children & Schools*, *38*(3), 147-151. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdw016

Smalley, R. E. (1979). School social work as a part of the school program. *School Social Work Journal*, *4*(1), 37–40.

Stuart, P. (1986). School social work as a professional segment: Continuity in transitional times. *Social Work in Education, 8*(3), 141–153.

Sugrue, E. P. (2017). The professional legitimation of early school social work: A historical analysis. *School Social Work Journal*, *42*(1), 16-36.

Villarreal Sosa, L. (2022). School Social Work: Challenges and Opportunities. *Children & Schools*, *44*(2), 67-69. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdac005

Wilson, L. C. (2014). Introduction to meta-analysis: A guide for the novice. *APS Observer,* 27.

Zischka, P. C., & Fox, R. (1985). Consultation as a function of school social work. *Children & Schools*, *7*(2), 69-79. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/7.2.69