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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is threefold: (1) to determine whether the sick leave policies and practices differ significantly between school districts of different sizes; (2) to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the number of days of sick leave allowed and the number of days taken by teachers; and (3) to determine whether significant trends in sick leave policies and practices can be detected between the years 1957 and 1960.

Sources of Data

As a basis for research in the study in 1957, questionnaires concerning sick leave practices were sent to superintendents of schools in 354 independent school districts in Texas. The areas of study covered in the questionnaires included: length of annual sick leave with full pay provided; size of the school district; length of annual sick leave with partial pay provided; percentage of pay deducted in partial pay plans; types of absences other than personal illness covered by the policies; length of time allowed annually for other types of absences; annual accumulation of sick leave provided; maximum accumulation
allowed; the percentage of teachers having absences annually; the average annual absence per teacher; the average annual absence per teacher based only on those teachers having absences; length of absence for which a doctor's statement is required; grants of bonuses to teachers having perfect attendance records; and types of bonuses granted to teachers having perfect attendance records.

Data for 1960 were taken from a study by the Texas State Teachers Association Research Division. The 1960 study included the following areas of study: length of annual sick leave with full pay provided; the maximum accumulation of sick leave time allowed; and types of absences other than personal illness covered by sick leave policies.

Method of Procedure

The 354 districts to which questionnaires were sent were selected in the following manner:

The first independent school district listed under each county in the 1956-57 Texas Public School Directory was placed on the mailing list. Five exceptions were made: Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio were chosen without regard to the first listed method so that the large cities could be included in the study. This

1Elizabeth Little, "How Much Sick Leave Is Enough?" The Texas Outlook, XLIV (April, 1960), 33-35.

procedure constituted the first step in the selection and netted 240 districts. The discrepancy in the number of counties in Texas (254) and the number of districts selected (240) is accounted for by the following facts:

1. Twelve counties listed no independent school districts.  

2. Loving Independent School District in Mentone, Loving County, Texas, was eliminated because no superintendent of schools was listed for the district.

3. Claude Independent School District in Claude, Armstrong County, Texas, was inadvertently overlooked during compilation of the mailing list.

The second-listed independent school districts in the first and succeeding alternate counties were selected in the second step. Four exceptions were made to the second procedure: the first district in each of the counties having one of the five large cities named in step one was selected, with the exception of Dallas County which was not included in the second step because it was listed between alternate counties. The second step accounted for the listing of 114 additional districts. The discrepancy between 114 and half the counties listed in the directory (127) is accounted for by a combination of the counties with no independent districts.

The twelve districts listed as having no independent school districts are Bandera, Baylor, Crockett, Culberson, Deaf Smith, Kenedy, Kent, King, McMullen, Schleicher, Stonewall and Terrell.
and those listing only one independent district. In instances in which the alternate county had no independent districts or only one such district, the county immediately following in the listing was used.

The 240 districts selected in step one and the 114 districts selected in step two comprise the 354 districts receiving questionnaires. This number is 38.7 per cent of the 915 independent school districts listed in the directory.

Responding were 198 of the original 354; however, 60 of the forms had to be eliminated because of contradictory answers and incomplete information. Thus, information obtained from 138 independent school districts, or 15.1 per cent of the 915 such districts in Texas, was used in the study.

The questionnaire, a copy of which is included in the appendix, sought information concerning the areas of study listed under Sources of Data.

The completed questionnaires were divided into six groups, according to district size as based on the number of teachers employed. The divisions were as follows: 6-20 teachers; 21-50 teachers; 51-100 teachers; 101-500 teachers; 501-1,000 teachers; and more than 1,000 teachers.

Statistical data in fourteen areas of study were tabulated for each of the six groups, and comparisons were made thereof. The areas of study included: length of annual sick leave with full pay provided; size of the school district; length of annual sick leave with partial pay provided;
percentage of pay deducted in partial pay plans; types of absence other than personal illness covered by the policies; length of time allowed annually for other types of absence; annual accumulation of sick leave time provided; maximum accumulation allowed; the percentage of teachers having absences annually; the average annual absence per teacher; the average annual absence per teacher based only on those teachers having absences; length of absence for which a doctor's statement is required; grants of bonuses to teachers having perfect attendance records; and types of bonuses granted in such cases.

A comparison of two areas (amount of sick leave without pay deduction, and maximum days of sick leave accumulative) was made of the 1957 statistics and those tabulated from a 1960 study by the Texas State Teachers Association.

Limitations of the Study

The 1957 study is limited to 138 independent school districts of various sizes in Texas. With the exception of five large districts specifically selected, no certain school sizes were chosen to receive the questionnaire; however, answers were grouped into six size classifications.

The 1960 study by the Texas State Teachers Association is limited to 507 school administrators in districts ranging from the one-teacher school to the largest system in the state with 4,200 teachers. Answers were grouped into three size classifications.
Organization

This study is composed of five chapters. Chapter I states the problem, indicates the sources of data, explains the method of procedure, gives the limitations of the study, and presents the plan of organization.

Chapter II gives background material gleaned from related studies of sick leave practices.

Chapter III includes statistics on sick leave practices by independent school districts in Texas in 1957, according to information obtained from the questionnaires. It states, also, the rate of absenteeism of Texas teachers. The statistics are also presented in graphical form for better comprehension.

Chapter IV consists of findings of the 1957 study and a comparison of these findings with those of the 1960 study made by Texas State Teachers Association.

Chapter V gives the summary, conclusions, and recommendations based on the comparison of the statistical results of this study.
Although sick leave for teachers has had a relatively short life, sick leave practices have become a subject of interest among educational writers and researchers. According to the National Education Association, the first recorded instance of sick leave for teachers was a mere thirty-five years ago. ¹

In 1926 the National Education Association Representative Assembly voted a resolution endorsing the policy of allowing leave because...

...the efficiency of our schools depends upon the health and intellectual vigor of teachers, and the public can make no better investment than to adopt those measures which will insure the maximum fitness of all members of the profession. ²

One of the earliest studies of sick leave practices was undertaken by the National Education Association Research Division with a study of personnel practices in city school systems for the year 1927-28. ³

The facts indicated:

Of 1,532 city systems reporting (53 per cent of all city systems at that time), 91 per cent granted sick leave with some salary. Nearly 58 per cent allowed full salary; 33 per

² Ibid., p. 170.
³ Ibid., p. 170.
cent allowed less than full salary; 8 per cent gave no salary. Typical practice in cities over 10,000 in population was twelve days at full pay; under 10,000, nine days with full pay. Only about 7 per cent of the cities had a cumulative sick leave plan.

In 1930-31, and again in 1940-41, the National Education Association Research Division obtained facts on sick leave provisions. These studies indicate a steady advance toward better working conditions and more consideration of the health of classroom teachers.

The first survey of personnel practices made since World War II showed that in 1950-51, 95 per cent of the urban systems provided full pay for sick leave, a gain of 37 per cent since 1927-28. Three per cent of the cities gave partial pay; only 2 per cent had no sick leave plan.

The more recent study disclosed that in cities over 10,000 population, the typical sick leave ranged from eleven to twelve days; in cities under 10,000, nine to ten days. The study also indicated that since 1927-28, the smaller towns have brought their practices close to those in the largest cities. The study also showed that 84 per cent of the cities had cumulative leave plans, a 77 per cent gain over 1927-28.

---

4Ibid., p. 171.

5Ibid., p. 171.
A keener awareness of teacher health on the part of local school systems is indicated by the health services now being provided without cost to teachers. In 1950-51, 64 per cent of the city systems offered a cooperative hospitalization plan; the services of the school nurse were offered by 47 per cent; group insurance was made available to 42 per cent. Thirty per cent provided periodic health examinations; and an advisory service by school physicians was made available by 12 per cent.

Plans for cumulative sick leave were slower in forming. But in 1944 the National Education Association officially recommended such planning. The recommendation read:

"In order that the highest efficiency may be maintained in the classrooms, the National Education Association recommends that the states provide cumulative sick leave for all teachers."

Because state education associations have worked toward effective sick leave legislation, twenty-five units (including the District of Columbia) now provide sick leave by statute or by rule of the state board of education. The minimum amount of sick leave which must be given is the main concern of most legal provisions. Although they may prescribe amounts for an annual five to nine days, the most common statute calls for a ten-day annual allowance. Some leave the amount up to the local board. Most require that a specified

\[\text{Ibid., p. 171.}\]
amount of time will be with full pay, and many require a plan for accumulating sick leave over a period of time.

Although a number of other states have interpreted laws authorizing local school authorities to contract for employment of teachers as implying the power to grant sick leave, a specific law is valuable in insuring a minimum period of sick leave.

What benefits accrue from teachers' sick leave other than the immediate financial help given to the teacher himself? Health of the student is one of the major concerns involved. Sick leave practices prevent sick teachers from spreading disease. Then, too, a teacher who is ill cannot function to his best potential, and, consequently, is not best fulfilling his obligations to his students. Sick leave makes the assumption that those teaching at a given time are in good physical and mental health. Psychological factors of morale, as well as physical health, must be considered along with other recognized intangibles when considering the cost of administration.

Elsbree and Reutter found that practices allow excused absences for the following reasons:

1. Reasons of health (Studies show that teachers enjoy slightly better health than does the average person.)

2. Maternity

---

3. Personal reasons; e.g., death in family

4. Professional reasons

Practices vary in the planning and administration of sick leave. Many districts have a specified number of days with full pay. Others have a number of days with full pay plus a number with partial pay. The partial payments are usually one half or full pay less the cost of a substitute. A few districts which allow no full pay sick leave use a partial pay plan with the numbers allowed usually very high. For example, in 1951 Los Angeles allowed 100 days at one half pay, while Boston, during the same year, gave a full year at one half pay.

A more common method of caring for extended absences is the cumulative plan. These plans usually set a maximum number of days that may be accumulated, and a few set an annual maximum that may be used.

Certain disadvantages have been found in the cumulative plan. Persons tend to "save" it during minor illnesses, thus defeating the purpose of sick leave, which is to keep the ill teacher from the classroom. In plans in which leave is lost if not used within a certain period the misuse of the leave becomes more of a temptation.

Among a number of methods designed for the prevention of sick leave abuses, a statement from the doctor of the teacher

---

is the most frequently used. Elsbree and Reutter state that they consider such a statement unnecessary, however, with an illness of a week or less, "unless there is reason to suspect malingering."

Advantages of the cumulative plan extend beyond the teacher who suffers an extended illness; it also helps the healthy person. It gives him a feeling of security against any extended illness, it is on a personal basis, and it does not affect others' pay and schedule. Unlimited or high maximums in the number of days one can accumulate tend to prevent the abuse of sick leave provisions.

One suggestion for initiating or revising sick leave programs states that consideration should be given older teachers with good attendance records. They could be credited with a reserve of days based on the record for the preceding five years.

A proposal by William D. Kuhlman for sick leave regulation sets forth the following stipulations:

1. Teachers absent from duty because of personal illness shall receive three fourths regular salary for absent period at the regular time; the remaining one fourth will be held in reserve until the end of the year. If the group (those absent) has not exceeded an average (set upon previous records) days of absence, the total amount deducted will be refunded. If the group

---

9Ibid., p. 172.  
10Ibid., p. 172.  
exceeds the average, a proportionate deduction will be made for each day of absence. The formula: refund per day of absence equals reserve per day — (daily salary times a constant). The constant is the per cent which the increase in average days of absence for the group over the expected days of absence is of the actual days of absence; e.g., if the average is five, and the average for the current year is six, the six minus five equals one. This one sixth or 16 2/3 per cent is the constant. Thus, in this case, if the average salary is $10, and if a teacher is absent twenty days, $50 will have been held in reserve. Sixteen and two thirds per cent of $50 or $83.34 will be deducted, and $41.66 will be refunded.

2. In case of death in the immediate family (the teacher shall be allowed no more than three days with no loss of pay).

3. All other absences will be administered by the proper officials.

Those initiating or revising a sick leave program might take into consideration some salient facts as determined by one author. These facts have been stated as:

Men are absent less frequently than women. Single women have fewer absences than do married women. The greatest number of absences occur on Mondays and Fridays during the week before and after holidays. A small number of the total number is responsible for the larger number of absences. Between 40 and 50 per cent are never absent. The preponderance of absences lies between 1 per cent who are absent 100 days or more and 5 per cent who are absent more than 21 days.

One of the major concerns of this study is to determine if any relationship exists between the number of days with full pay that is given to teachers for sick leave and the number of days teachers are absent on sick leave. According

---

to Kuhlman, a definite relationship does exist. In citing specific instances of teachers working when ill in systems with poor sick leave benefits, Kuhlman maintains that teachers under harsh regulations force themselves to go to school when they would stay home from school under more liberal regulations.

To substantiate his assertion, Kuhlman cites the cases of City A and City B. In 1928-29 City A had twenty days at one half pay for sick leave benefits. During the next school term the benefits were expanded to ten days at full pay and twenty days at one half pay. In 1930-31 (the first full year under the new regulation), 39 per cent of the teachers had perfect attendance; 92 per cent had perfect attendance under the older less liberal regulation.

City B changed from ten days at full pay to ten days at one half pay. Under the former and more liberal sick leave benefits, 193 one-day absences were recorded per year; under the new regulation with reduced benefits, only 47 one-day absences were taken. Thus, Kuhlman maintains that the higher percentage of absences occur when regulations regarding sick leave are more liberal.

---

13 Kuhlman, op. cit., p. 32.
14 Ibid., pp. 33-36.
The Texas State Teachers Association made a study in 1960 to determine sick leave practices of Texas schools. Of 950 school administrators queried, 507 replied to a four-page questionnaire. The returned forms were divided into three groups according to number of teachers: 1-99 teachers—small; 100-379 teachers—medium; and 380 or more teachers—large. The schools included the one teacher school to a large system with 4,200 teachers.

Of the schools replying, 54 per cent reported five days sick leave annually without pay deductions. A few schools allowed less than three days, and one large district granted forty days. No salary deductions were made by 92.3 per cent for professional meetings. The amount of sick leave granted annually averaged 5.7 days for the small schools, 8 days for the medium schools, and 9.5 days for the large schools. Four out of five systems had a sick leave without loss of pay policy.

The Texas State Teachers Association study indicated that less than one half the districts had cumulative leave. Forty districts paid for unused sick leave on retirement, and 23 paid for unused sick leave on resignation. Five days was the minimum for cumulative leave, and four schools reported 50 to 90 days.

---

15Elizabeth Little, "How Much Sick Leave Is Enough?" The Texas Outlook, XLIV (April, 1960), 33-35.
CHAPTER III

SICK LEAVE PRACTICES OF INDEPENDENT
SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges

The 138 independent school districts responding in the 1957 study were divided into six groups, according to the number of teachers employed. Figure 1 shows the per cent of participating districts in each of the six size groups.

Number of Teachers

| Number of Teachers | 
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 6-20               | ![Graph](image1.png) |
| 21-50              | ![Graph](image2.png) |
| 51-100             | ![Graph](image3.png) |
| 101-500            | ![Graph](image4.png) |
| 501-1,000          | ![Graph](image5.png) |
| 1,001 or more      | ![Graph](image6.png) |

Fig. 1—Per cent of 138 Texas independent school districts in different size groups.
Of the school districts participating in the study, 42, or 30.4 per cent, had 6 to 20 teachers. A range of 21 to 50 teachers was reported by 51 districts, or 37 per cent. Twenty-seven districts, or 19.6 per cent, had 51 to 100 teachers, and 15, or 10.9 per cent, employed 101 to 500 teachers. Two districts, or 1.4 per cent, had 501 to 1,000 teachers, and one, or 0.7 per cent, employed more than 1,000 teachers.

The small numbers of large districts in the study prove to be relatively proportionate to the number in the state. The Public School Directory lists 915 independent school districts in Texas; the 138 respondents constitute 15.1 per cent of that number. The directory lists seven districts having more than 1,000 teachers; thus, the one district of more than 1,000 teachers responding to the questionnaire is 14.3 per cent of all such districts. Nine districts were listed in the 501-to-1,000-teacher range; two of them, or 22.2 per cent, participated in the study.

Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Granting Sick Leave with Full Pay

The percentage of districts in the various size ranges providing sick leave with full pay and the amount of sick leave provided are the next items considered by the study.

Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers

Figure 2 shows the per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers which granted sick leave with full pay and the amount of sick leave given.
Number of days full pay
given for sick leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>Full Pay Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent of districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig. 2—Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with full pay.

Of the districts in the 6-to-20 bracket, 13, or 31 per cent, granted no sick leave time with full pay. However, 26 districts, or 61.8 per cent, granted from 1 to 5 days; two, or 4.8 per cent, gave 6 to 10 days; and one, or 2.4 per cent, provided 11 to 20 days with full pay.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

A similar study was made of sick leave with full pay by the districts employing 21 to 50 teachers. Figure 3 shows the per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers which granted sick leave with full pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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Fig. 3--Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with full pay.

Ten districts, or 19.6 per cent, in the 21-to-50-teacher range allowed no time with full pay for sick leave. Thirty-one districts, or 60.8 per cent, gave 1 to 5 days. Nine districts, or 17.6 per cent, provided 6 to 10 days' sick leave with full pay. And unlimited time with full pay was given by one district, or 2 per cent.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Investigation of sick leave with full pay by the districts employing 51 to 100 teachers was the next phase of the study. Figure 4 shows the per cent of districts employing 50 to 100 teachers which granted sick leave with full pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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Fig. 4—Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with full pay.

Three districts, or 11.1 per cent of the 51-to-100-teacher group, gave no full pay for sick leave. From 1 to 5 days' full pay was granted by 17 districts, or 63 per cent of the group; three districts, or 11.1 per cent, gave 6 to 10 days; three districts, or 11.1 per cent, provided 11 to 20 days; one district, or 3.7 per cent, allowed 30 days each year.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

The per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers was the next item of concern in the study. Figure 5 shows the per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers which granted sick leave with full pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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Fig. 5—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with full pay.

All districts in the 101-to-500-teacher range granted sick leave with full pay. Seven districts, or 46.6 per cent, gave 1 to 5 days; seven more gave 6 to 10 days; and one district, or 6.7 per cent, granted 40 days.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

The two districts in the 501-to-1,000-teacher group indicated that one allowed 1 to 5 days, the other 6 to 10.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The one district with more than 1,000 teachers granted 10 days' annual sick leave.

Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Granting Sick Leave with Partial Pay

The percentage of districts in the various size ranges providing sick leave with partial pay and the amount of sick leave provided are the next items considered by the study.
**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 6 shows the per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers which granted sick leave with partial pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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Fig. 6--Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with partial pay.

Fifteen districts, or 35.7 per cent of the 6-to-20-teacher group, gave no partial pay for sick leave. Six districts, or 14.3 per cent, allowed 1 to 5 days; three districts, or 7.8 per cent, granted 6 to 10 days; five districts, or 11.9 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days. One district, or 2.4 per cent, allowed 60 days; unlimited time was granted by
six districts, or 14.3 per cent; and six districts, or 14.3 per cent failed to indicate partial pay policies.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

Figure 7 shows the per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers which granted sick leave with partial pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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**Fig. 7—Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with partial pay.**

Ten districts, or 19.6 per cent of those employing 21 to 50 teachers, had no partial pay for sick leave; five districts, or 9.8 per cent, provided 1 to 5 days annually; five,
or 9.8 per cent, granted 6 to 10 days; and eight districts, or 15.7 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days. One district, or 2 per cent, granted 30 days, and another gave 45. Unlimited time was given by nine districts, or 17.6 per cent. Twelve districts, or 23.5 per cent, failed to indicate their policy.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 8 shows the per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers which gave sick leave with partial pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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Fig. 8—Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with partial pay.

Of the districts employing 51 to 100 teachers, nine, or 33.3 per cent granted no partial pay for sick leave. Allowing
1 to 5 days were three districts, or 11.1 per cent; 6 to 10 days were given by one district, or 3.7 per cent; three districts, or 11.1 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days; two districts, or 7.4 per cent, allowed 30 days; five districts, or 18.5 per cent, gave unlimited time; and four districts, or 14.8 per cent, failed to indicate the number of days granted with partial pay.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

Figure 9 shows the per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers which give sick leave with partial pay and the amount of sick leave given.
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**Fig. 9**—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers granting different amounts of sick leave with partial pay.
Four districts, or 26.6 per cent of those employing 101 to 500 teachers, did not provide partial pay for sick leave. One district, or 6.7 per cent, gave 1 to 5 days, and three districts, or 20.1 per cent, allowed 6 to 10 days. Two districts, or 13.3 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days; one district, or 6.7 per cent, gave 40 days; unlimited time was given by two districts, or 13.3 per cent; and two districts failed to indicate whether they gave partial pay.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

One of the districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers gave 11 to 20 days, and the other failed to indicate whether leave with partial pay was granted.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers granted 5 days leave with partial pay.

**Per Cent of Deduction Made in Partial Pay Cases**

The per cent of deduction made in partial pay cases has been listed in four categories: less than 50 per cent; 50 per cent; more than 50 per cent; and regular salary less substitute's pay.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 10 shows graphically the per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers which deducted various percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.
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Fig. 10--Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers deducting different percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.

The 6-to-20-teacher group reported that nine districts, or 21.4 per cent, deducted less than 50 per cent of regular salary in cases of partial pay. Two districts, or 4.8 per cent, deducted 50 per cent, and more than 50 per cent was deducted by four districts, or 9.5 per cent. Regular salary less substitute's pay was paid by two districts, or 4.8 per cent; in such cases the percentage of deduction was dependent upon the teacher's salary. Ten districts, or 23.8 per cent, did not indicate deductions. Fifteen districts, or 35.7 per cent, offered no partial pay.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

Figure 11 shows the per cent of districts employing 21-50 teachers which deducted various percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.
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Fig. 11-Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers deducting different percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.

Fourteen of the districts employing 21 to 50 teachers, or 27.5 per cent, deducted less than 50 per cent of regular salary. An even 50 per cent was deducted by eight districts, or 15.9 per cent, while one district, 1.9 per cent, deducted more than 50 per cent. Regular salary less substitute's pay was given by five districts, or 9.8 per cent, and thirteen districts, or 25.5 per cent, failed to indicate the percentage of deduction. Ten districts, or 19.6 per cent, allowed no partial pay.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 12 shows the per cent of districts employing 51-100 teachers which deducted various percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.
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\[\text{Fig. 12}--\text{Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers deducting different percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.}\]

The districts with 51 to 100 teachers had seven, or 25.9 per cent, deducting less than 50 per cent; two districts, or 7.4 per cent deducted 50 per cent; two districts, or 7.4 per cent, deducted more than 50 per cent. Two districts, or 7.4 per cent, paid regular salary less substitute's pay, and five districts, or 18.5 per cent, failed to indicate the deduction. Nine districts, or 33.3 per cent, gave no partial pay.

\text{Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers}\n
The per cent of deduction in partial pay cases by the districts employing 101-500 teachers is the next consideration of the study. Figure 13 shows the per cent of districts employing 101-500 teachers which deducted various percentages of regular pay in cases of partial pay for sick leave.
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Fig. 13--Per cent of districts employing 101-500 teachers deducting different percentages of regular salary in cases of partial pay for sick leave.

Five, or 33.3 per cent, of the districts hiring 101 to 500 teachers deducted less than 50 per cent of regular salary. Two districts, or 13.3 per cent, deducted 50 per cent, and two districts deducted more than 50 per cent. Two districts failed to indicate the deduction, and no partial pay was granted by four districts, or 26.7 per cent, of those responding.

Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers

One of the districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers reported that it deducted more than 50 per cent. The other failed to show the percentage deducted.

District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers

The district with more than 1,000 teachers deducted 50 per cent of regular salary in partial pay cases.
Per Cent of Districts Granting Sick Leave Pay

Figure 14 shows the per cent of districts of various sizes which grant some form of pay for sick leave.
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Fig. 14—Per cent of districts of different sizes granting some form of pay for sick leave.

All districts in the 51-to-100 group, 101-to-500 group, the 501-to-1,000-teacher districts, and the district with more than 1,000 teachers gave pay for sick leave--either full, partial, or a combination of both. Nine districts, or 21.4 per cent of the 6-to-20-teacher group, gave no sick leave pay, and two districts, or 3.9 per cent of the 21-to-50-teacher group, gave none.
Number of Districts of Various Sizes Granting Both Partial Pay and Full Pay for Sick Leave

Figure 15 shows the number of districts in the various size ranges which granted full pay for sick leave and the number of those districts which also gave partial pay for sick leave.
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### Fig. 15—Number of districts of different sizes allowing full pay for sick leave and the number of those districts which also gave partial pay for sick leave.

A large portion of those districts giving full pay also gave partial pay. Of 29 districts with 6 to 20 teachers granting full pay, 17, or 58.6 per cent, also gave partial pay. Forty-one of the 21-to-50-teacher districts gave full
pay, and 21, or 51.2 per cent of that number, gave partial pay. In the 51-to-100 group, 24 districts gave full pay, and 10, or 41.6 per cent, also gave partial pay. All of the 15 districts in the 101-to-500-teacher range gave full pay, and nine, or 60 per cent, added partial pay. The two districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers gave full pay; neither gave partial pay. The district with more than 1,000 teachers gave both.

Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges
Extending Sick Leave Benefits To Include
Different Types of Leave

A survey limited to those districts granting some form of sick leave pay was made to determine the extent of benefits beyond pay for personal illness. Five categories were used in the survey including: death in the immediate family; illness in the immediate family; professional meetings and conventions; other personal reasons; and personal illness only. The data from the survey was divided into six groups corresponding to the six district size groups.

Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers

Figure 16 shows the per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers which extended sick leave benefits to include various types of leave with pay.
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Fig. 16—Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers extending sick leave benefits to include different types of leave.

Twenty-three, or 70 per cent, of the districts with 6 to 20 teachers granting sick leave pay paid for absence due to death in the immediate family. Coverage of illness in the immediate family was given by 16 districts, or 48.5 per cent; 11 districts, or 33.3 per cent, paid for professional meetings. Three districts, or 9.1 per cent, gave time for other personal reasons, while 24.2 per cent restricted sick leave pay to absence caused by personal illness only.

Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers

Figure 17 shows the per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers which extended sick leave benefits to include various types of leave with pay.
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Fig. 17--Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers extending sick leave benefits to include different types of leave.

The 21-to-50-teacher districts had 39, or 79.6 per cent, that paid for absence caused by death in the family. Illness in the immediate family was covered by 34 districts, or 69.4 per cent, and 22 districts, or 44.9 per cent, paid for conventions and professional meetings. Other personal reasons were covered by five districts, or 10.2 per cent. Only six districts, or 12.2 per cent, limited sick leave pay to personal illness.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 18 shows the per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers that extended sick leave benefits to include various types of leave with pay.
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*Fig. 18--Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers extending sick leave benefits to include different types of leave.

Of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers, 23, or 85.9 per cent, paid for absence due to death in the immediate family. Nineteen districts, or 70.4 per cent, included illness in the immediate family; 10 districts, or 37 per cent, paid for conventions and professional meetings; and one district, or 3.7 per cent, covered other personal reasons. Four districts, or 14.8 per cent, limited the sick leave benefits to personal illness.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

Figure 19 shows the per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers which extended sick leave benefits to include various types of leave with pay.
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Fig. 19—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers extending sick leave benefits to include different types of leave.

All 15 districts of 101 to 500 teachers paid for absence due to death in the family; illness in the immediate family was paid for by 13 districts, or 86.7 per cent; and five districts, or 33.3 per cent, paid for professional meetings; three districts, or 20 per cent, covered other personal reasons; and one restricted sick leave to personal illness only.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

Both of the districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers gave sick leave pay for death in the immediate family and for professional meetings. One paid for illness in the family.
**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers paid for death in the immediate family and illness in the immediate family.

**Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Giving Different Amounts of Time For Absence Caused by Reasons Other than Personal Illness**

Number of days granted annually by districts for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness is the next item considered by the study.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 20 shows the per cent of districts with 6 to 20 teachers that made annual allowances of various amounts of time for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness.
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### Figure 20

Per cent of districts granting pay for different numbers of days annually for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness.
Eight districts, or 24.2 per cent of those employing 6 to 20 teachers, allowed no time for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness. Seventeen districts, or 51.5 per cent, allowed 1 to 5 days; two districts, or 6.1 per cent, granted 6 to 10 days; five districts, or 15.2 per cent, allowed unlimited time; and one district, or 3 per cent, failed to indicate the amount of time allowed.

Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers

Figure 21 shows the per cent of districts with 21 to 50 teachers that made allowances of various amounts of time for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness.
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Fig. 21—Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers granting pay for different numbers of days annually for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness.
Six of the districts with 21 to 50 teachers, or 12.2 per cent, gave no time for absences other than those caused by personal illness. Thirty districts, or 61.2 per cent, allowed from 1 to 5 days; five districts, or 10.2 per cent, gave 6 to 10 days; two districts, or 4.1 per cent, 30 to 45 days; one district, or 2 per cent, granted unlimited time. Five districts, or 10.2 per cent, failed to indicate their policy.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 22 shows the per cent of districts with 51 to 100 teachers that made allowance of various amounts of time for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 22--Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers granting pay for different numbers of days annually for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness.

Four districts with 51 to 100 teachers, or 14.8 per cent, granted no time other than for personal illness. Nineteen, or 70.4 per cent, granted 1 to 5 days; two districts,
or 7.4 per cent, 11 to 20 days; two districts, or 7.4 per cent, failed to indicate their policy.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

Figure 23 shows the per cent of districts with 101 to 500 teachers which gave various amounts of time for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness.

Number of days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 23--Per cent of districts employing 101-500 teachers granting pay for different numbers of days annually for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness.

All districts in the 101-to-500-teacher bracket gave sick leave pay for absence due to causes other than personal illness. Eight districts, or 53.3 per cent, granted 1 to 5 days; three districts, or 20 per cent, gave 6 to 10 days; one district, or 6.7 per cent, 11 to 20 days; one district, or 6.7 per cent, 40 days; two districts, or 13.3 per cent, unlimited time.
**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

One of the districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers granted 1 to 5 days' sick leave for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers granted 11 to 20 days for absence caused by reasons other than personal illness.

**Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Providing Cumulative Leave**

A study of cumulative leave practices was made to determine the amount of such leave granted by the various sizes of districts.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 24 shows the per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers and granting pay for sick leave that allowed accumulation of sick leave annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 24—Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers allowing different amounts of annual sick leave accumulation.
Twenty, or 60.6 per cent, of the 6-to-20-teacher districts giving sick leave pay made no provisions for accumulation of sick leave. Annual accumulation of 1 to 5 days was granted by seven, or 21.2 per cent, of the districts; three districts, or 9.1 per cent, allowed 6 to 10 days; two districts, or 6 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days; and one district, or 3 per cent, failed to indicate the annual accumulation allowed.

**Districts Employing 21 to 50 Teachers**

Figure 25 shows the per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers and granting pay for sick leave that allowed accumulation of sick leave annually.

**Number of days**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Per cent of districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig. 25--Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers allowing different amounts of annual sick leave accumulation.
Twenty, or 40.8 per cent, of the districts employing 21 to 50 teachers had no cumulative leave. Eleven districts, or 22.4 per cent, had an annual accumulation of 1 to 5 days; nine districts, or 18.4 per cent, had 6 to 10 days; five, or 10.2 per cent, permitted 11 to 20 days; three, or 6.1 per cent, 27 to 30 days; and one, or 2 per cent, failed to indicate the accumulation allowed annually.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 26 shows the per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers and granting pay for sick leave that allowed an annual accumulation of sick leave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>0  10  20  30  40  50  60  70  80  90  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 26--Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers allowing different amounts of annual sick leave accumulation.

Eight, or 29.8 per cent, of the districts having 51 to 100 teachers had no cumulative leave. Twelve, or 44.4 per cent, granted 1 to 5 days; two, or 7.4 per cent, gave 6 to
10 days; four, or 14.8 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days; one, or 3.7 per cent, failed to indicate the annual accumulation permitted.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

Figure 27 shows the per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers and granting pay for sick leave that allowed various amounts of annual accumulation of sick leave.

**Number of days**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent of districts

---

Fig. 27—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers allowing different amounts of annual sick leave accumulation.

Three, or 20 per cent, of the 101-to-500-teacher districts had no cumulative leave. Four districts, or 26.7 per cent, gave 1 to 5 days annually; five districts, or 33.3 per cent, 6 to 10 days; two districts, or 13.3 per cent, 11 to 20 days; and one district, or 6.7 per cent, 30 days.
**Districts Employing 501 to 1,000 Teachers**

One of the 501-to-1,000-teacher districts granted 1 to 5 days, and the other, 6 to 10 days.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers provided annual accumulation of 1 to 5 days of sick leave benefits.

Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Giving Different Maximums of Days For Sick Leave Accumulation

A query concerning the maximum number of days of sick leave teachers are allowed to accumulate is the next item in the study.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 28 shows the per cent of the districts in the 6-to-20-teacher range which allowed various amounts of accumulation of sick leave.

```
Number of days

none
1-5
6-10
11-20
21-60

Per cent of districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>11-20</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</table>
```

Fig. 28--Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers allowing different amounts of maximum sick leave accumulation.
The districts with 6 to 20 teachers indicated that 20 districts, or 60.6 per cent, had no cumulative leave; four districts, or 12.1 per cent, had a maximum accumulation of 1 to 5 days; three districts, or 9.1 per cent, allowed 6 to 10 days; four, or 12.1 per cent, provided for 11 to 20 days; one, or 3 per cent, allowed 21 to 60 days. One district, or 3 per cent, failed to indicate the maximum accumulation.

District Employing 21-50 Teachers

Figure 29 shows the per cent of the districts in the 21-to-50-teacher range which allowed various amounts of accumulation of sick leave.

Number of days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 29--Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers allowing different amounts of maximum sick leave accumulation.
Twenty, or 40.8 per cent, of the 21-to-50-teacher districts having sick leave policies had no cumulative leave. Six districts, or 12.2 per cent, granted 1 to 5 days maximum accumulation; five districts, or 10.2 per cent, provided 6 to 10 days; seven districts, or 14.3 per cent, gave 11 to 20 days; eight, or 16.3 per cent, allowed 21 to 60 days; and two, or 4.1 per cent, had no limit on accumulation. One district, or 2.1 per cent, failed to indicate its policy.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 30 shows the per cent of districts with 51 to 100 teachers which allowed various amounts of sick leave accumulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 30—Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers allowing different amounts of maximum sick leave accumulation.
The districts with sick leave policies that employed 51 to 100 teachers included eight, or 29.6 per cent, with no cumulative leave. From 6 to 10 days maximum accumulation was given by two districts, or 7.4 per cent; 11 to 20 days were given by 12 districts, or 44.4 per cent; 21 to 60 days were allowed by three districts, or 11.1 per cent; and 61 to 90 days were given by one district, or 3.7 per cent. Another district, or 3.7 per cent, failed to indicate the maximum accumulation.

Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers

Figure 31 shows the per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers that granted different amounts of time for maximum accumulation of sick leave.

Number of days

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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<tr>
<td>none</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

Per cent of districts

Fig. 31--Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers allowing different amounts of maximum sick leave accumulation.
Three, or 20 per cent, of the districts employing 101 to 500 teachers had no cumulative leave. One district, or 6.7 per cent, gave 6 to 10 days; five districts, or 33.3 per cent, allowed 11 to 20 days; five, or 33.3 per cent, gave 21 to 60 days; and one, or 6.7 per cent, allowed 61 to 90 days.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

A maximum accumulation of 21 to 60 days' sick leave was granted by one of the districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers; the other gave 91 to 150 days.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district employing more than 1,000 teachers had a maximum cumulative leave of 61 to 90 days.

**Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Having Different Percentages of Teachers Absent Each Year**

Another phase of the study deals with the percentage of teachers having absences annually under sick leave policies. Answers pertaining to this segment of the study have been divided into ten ranges with each range including 10 per cent.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 32 indicates the per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers having various percentages of teachers with absences each year paid for under sick leave provisions.
### Per cent of teachers absent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Teachers Absent</th>
<th>Districts with Given Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Per cent of districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 32**—Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers having different percentages of teachers absent annually under sick leave policies.

Ten districts employing 6 to 20 teachers, or 54.4 per cent, reported 0 to 10 per cent of the teachers were absent annually. Four districts, or 12.1 per cent, had 11 to 20 per cent of their teachers absent; five districts, or 15.1 per cent, had 21 to 30 per cent absent; one district, or 3 per cent, had 31 to 40 per cent absent; three districts, or 9.1 per cent, reported 41 to 50 per cent absent; and two districts, or 6.1 per cent, failed to indicate the percentages of teachers having absences.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

Figure 33 shows the per cent of districts with 21 to 50 teachers having various percentages of teachers absent annually.
Per cent of teachers absent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 33—Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers having different percentages of teachers with absences annually under sick leave policies.*

The districts with 21 to 50 teachers reported 18, or 36.9 per cent of their group, had 0 to 10 per cent of their teachers absent annually; 11 districts, or 22.4 per cent, had 11 to 20 per cent absent; eight districts, or 16.3 per cent, had 21 to 30 per cent absent; two districts, or 4.1 per cent, had 31 to 40 per cent absent; two, or 4.1 per cent, had 41 to 50 per cent; one district, or 2 per cent, had 51 to 60 per...
cent of its teachers absent; two districts, or 4.1 per cent, had 61 to 70 per cent absent; one district, or 2 per cent, had 71 to 80 per cent; another, or 2 per cent, had 81 to 90 per cent. Three districts, or 6.1 per cent, failed to indicate the percentages.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 34 shows the per cent of districts with 51 to 100 teachers that have various percentages of teachers absent each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent of teachers absent</th>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 34—Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers having different percentages of teachers with absences annually under sick leave policies.
The 51-to-100-teacher districts indicated that seven, or 25.9 per cent, of their number had 0 to 10 per cent of their teachers absent annually. Twelve districts, or 44.4 per cent, had 11 to 20 per cent teacher absences; four districts, or 14.8 per cent, had 21 to 30 per cent of the teachers absent; one, or 3.7 per cent, had 31 to 40 per cent absent; one, or 3.7 per cent, had 31 to 40 per cent; one, or 3.7 per cent, had 51 to 60 per cent; one, or 3.7 per cent, had 81 to 90 per cent; and one did not indicate.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

More districts in the 101-to-500-teachers districts had 0 to 10 per cent of teachers absent than in any other percentage range. However, the percentages ran as high as 71 to 80. The 11-to-20 per cent range and the 41-to-50 per cent range were the only other categories with any appreciable number of districts.

Figure 35 indicates the per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers which have various percentages of teachers absent each year under sick leave provisions.
Fig. 35—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers having different percentages of teachers with absences annually under sick leave policies.

The districts having 101 to 500 teachers reported that four, or 26.7 per cent, of their group had 0 to 10 per cent of the teachers absent annually; two districts, or 13.3 per cent, had 11 to 20 per cent absent; one district, or 6.7 per cent, had 21 to 30 per cent absent; one, or 6.7 per cent, had 31 to 40 per cent; two, or 13.3 per cent, had 41 to 50 per cent; one, or 6.7 per cent, had 51 to 60 per cent; one, or 6.7 per cent, had 61 to 70 per cent; and one, or 6.7 per cent,
had 71 to 80 per cent. Two districts, or 13.3 per cent, failed to indicate the annual percentage of teachers having absences.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

One of the districts employing 501 to 1,000 teachers had 11 to 20 per cent of its teachers absent annually. The other district did not indicate its annual percentage of absence.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district which employed more than 1,000 teachers did not indicate the percentage of teachers having absences annually.

**Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Having Different Lengths of Average Annual Absence Per Teacher**

Data on the average annual absence per teacher, based on the total faculty, constituted the next phase of the study. After being separated into groups according to district size, the data were further divided into ten length ranges which started with less than one day and ran to a range of 9 to 9.9 days.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 36 indicates the per cent of districts with 6 to 20 teachers having various lengths of average annual absence per teacher based on the total faculty.
Length of average annual absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Absence</th>
<th>Per Cent of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 2.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 3.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 7.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 8.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 36—Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers having different lengths of average annual absence per teacher.

Twelve, or 36.4 per cent, of the districts with 6 to 20 teachers had average annual absences per teacher of less than one day; nine districts, or 27.3 per cent, had an average of 1 to 1.9 days; six, or 18.2 per cent, had 2 to 2.9 days; two, or 6.1 per cent, 3 to 3.9 days; one, or 3 per cent, 7 to 7.9 days; one, or 3 per cent, 8 to 8.9 days; and two, or 6.1 per cent did not indicate.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

Figure 37 shows the per cent of districts with 21 to 50 teachers that had various lengths of average annual absence based on the total faculty.
Length of average annual absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Absence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 2.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 3.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 4.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 5.9 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent of districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent of districts</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig. 37--Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers having different lengths of average annual absence per teacher.

The districts in the 21-to-50-teacher range reported 12, or 24.5 per cent, had absences per teacher of less than one day; 16, or 32.7 per cent, had 1 to 1.9 days; 11, or 22.4 per cent, had 2 to 2.9; five, or 10.2 per cent, had 3 to 3.9; one, or 2 per cent, had 4 to 4.9; one, or 2 per cent, had 5 to 5.9; and three, or 6.1 per cent, did not indicate the average.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Figure 38 indicates the per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers that had various lengths of average annual absence based on the total faculty.
Length of average annual absence
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Fig. 38—Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers having different lengths of average annual absence per teacher.

Five, or 18.5 per cent, of the districts employing 51 to 100 teachers had average annual absences per teacher of less than 1 day; six districts, or 22.2 per cent, had averages of 1 to 1.9 days; 12, or 44.4 per cent, had 2 to 2.9 days; two, or 7.4 per cent, had 3 to 3.9 days; and two, or 7.4 per cent, did not indicate the average annual absence per teacher as based on the total faculty.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

The preponderance of districts in the 101-to-500-teacher group had average annual absences per teacher ranging from 1 to 3.9 days, but the total group had averages running from less than a day to a range of 5 to 5.9 days. Figure 29 shows the per cent of districts having 101 to 500 teachers which have various lengths of average annual absence.
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Fig. 39—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers having different lengths of average annual absence per teacher.

The districts with 101 to 500 teachers reported that one, or 6.7 per cent, had average annual absences of less than 1 day; four, or 26.7 per cent, had 1 to 1.9 days; four, or 26.7 per cent, had 2 to 2.9 days; three, or 20 per cent, had 3 to 3.9 days; one, or 6.7 per cent, had 5 to 5.9 days; and two, or 13.3 per cent, did not indicate the average.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

In the 501-to-1,000-teacher range, one of the districts had an average annual absence per teacher of 5 to 5.9 days; the other did not indicate its average annual absence.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers did not indicate its average annual absence.
Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges
Having Different Lengths of Average Annual
Absence Per Teacher Excluding
Perfect Attendance

Data were collected on the average annual absence per
teacher, omitting all perfect attendance per year per
teacher cases.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 40 shows the per cent of districts with 6 to 20
teachers having various lengths of average annual absence
per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.
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Fig. 40—Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teach-
ers having different lengths of average annual absence per
teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.

Among the 6-to-20-teacher districts, seven, or 21.2 per
cent, had average annual absences, excluding perfect attendance
cases of less than 1 day; six districts, or 18.2 per cent, had
averages of 1 to 1.9 days; four, or 12.1 per cent, had 2 to 2.9 days; five, or 15.2 per cent, had 3 to 3.9 days; one, or 3 per cent, had 4 to 4.9 days; and seven, or 21.2 per cent, did not indicate such averages.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

Figure 41 shows the per cent of districts with 21 to 50 teachers having various lengths of average annual absence per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.
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Fig. 41—Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers having different lengths of average annual absences per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.
Ten, or 20.4 per cent, of the 21-to-50-teacher districts reported the average annual absences, excluding perfect attendance, as being less than 1 day; nine districts, or 18.4 per cent, had 1 to 1.9 days; six, or 12.2 per cent, had 2 to 2.9 days; eight districts, or 16.3 per cent, had 3 to 3.9 days; six districts, or 12.2 per cent, had 4 to 4.9 days; two, or 4.1 per cent, had 5 to 5.9 days; one district, or 2 per cent, had 6 to 6.9 days; one district, or 2 per cent, had 7 to 7.9 days; one, or 2 per cent, had 8 to 8.9 days; and five districts, or 10.2 per cent, failed to indicate the average annual absence per teacher, excluding perfect attendance.

**Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers**

Districts with 51 to 100 teachers reported a range of less than 1 day to the 10-to-11.9-days bracket. The majority, however, ranged from 1 day to 4.9 days. Figure 42 indicates the per cent of districts with 51 to 100 teachers having various lengths of average annual absence per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.
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Fig. 42—Per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers having different lengths of average annual absence per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.

The average annual absence of teachers in the districts with 51 to 100 teachers ran less than 1 day for one district, or 3.7 per cent; seven districts, or 25.9 per cent, had 1 to 1.9 days; three, or 11.1 per cent, had 2 to 2.9 days; four, or 14.8 per cent, had 3 to 3.9 days; six, or 22.2 per cent, 4 to 4.9 days; two, or 7.4 per cent, 5 to 5.9 days; one, or 3.7 per cent, 7 to 7.9 days; one, or 3.7 per cent, 10 to 11.9 days; and two, or 7.4 per cent, failed to indicate the average.
Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers

Figure 43 shows the per cent of districts with 101 to 500 teachers having various lengths of average annual absence per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.
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Fig. 43—Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers having different lengths of average annual absence per teacher, excluding perfect attendance cases.

Those districts employing 101 to 500 teachers reported no average annual absence per teacher of less than two days when excluding those teachers with perfect attendance. Two, or 13.3 per cent, of such districts reported 2 to 2.9 days; four districts, or 26.7 per cent, had 3 to 3.9 days average; two, or 13.3 per cent, had 4 to 4.9 days; one, or 6.7 per cent, had 5 to 5.9 days; two, or 13.3 per cent, had 6 to
6.9 days; and one, or 6.7 per cent, reported an 18 to 19.9 average. Three districts, or 20 per cent, failed to indicate the average.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

One of the 501-to-1,000-teacher districts had an average of 5 to 5.9 days; the other had no record of absences.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers had no record on average annual absence per teacher.

**Per Cent of Districts in Various Size Ranges Requiring a Doctor's Statement As Proof of Personal Illness**

Doctors' statements as proof of personal illness were not required of the majority of districts as determined by the next phase of the study.

**Districts Employing 6-20 Teachers**

Figure 44 shows the per cent of districts with 6 to 20 teachers that required doctors' statement as proof of personal illness for various lengths of time. As shown in Figure 44, the preponderance of districts in this size category did not require the statements.
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Fig. 44--Per cent of districts employing 6 to 20 teachers requiring doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for different lengths of absence.

The 6-to-20-teacher districts indicated that a statement was required by one district, or 3 per cent, for an absence of 1 day or more; one district, or 3 per cent, required the statement for 6 to 10 days. However, 30 districts, or 90.9 per cent of the group, required no statement for any length of absence due to personal illness. One district, or 3 per cent, did not indicate whether a statement was required.

**Districts Employing 21-50 Teachers**

The majority of districts in the 21-to-50-teacher group did not require doctors' statements. Figure 45 shows the per cent of districts with 21 to 50 teachers which required doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for various lengths of time.
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Fig. 45--Per cent of districts employing 21 to 50 teachers requiring doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for different lengths of absence.

A doctor's statement for an absence of 1 day or more was required by two districts, or 4.1 per cent of those with sick leave programs and having 21 to 50 teachers. Six, or 12.3 per cent, required statements for absences of 2 to 5 days; one district, or 2 per cent, required a statement for 6 to 10 days; no statement was required by 30 districts, or 61.2 per cent. Ten districts, 20.4 per cent, failed to indicate their policies regarding doctors' statements.

Districts Employing 51-100 Teachers

Figure 46 shows the per cent of districts employing 51 to 100 teachers which required doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for various lengths of absence.
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Fig. 46--Per cent of the districts employing 51 to 100 teachers requiring doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for different lengths of absence.

The districts employing from 51 to 100 teachers had one, or 3.7 per cent, of their number requiring doctors' statements for an absence of one day or more; two districts, or 7.4 per cent, required a statement for 2 to 5 days; and one district, or 3.7 per cent, made the requirement for 6 to 10 days. Twenty-one, or 77.7 per cent, of the districts required no statement, and two, or 7.4 per cent, failed to indicate the requirement.

**Districts Employing 101-500 Teachers**

Figure 47 shows the per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers that required doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for various lengths of absence.
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Fig. 47--Per cent of districts employing 101 to 500 teachers requiring doctors' statements as proof of personal illness for different lengths of absence.

None of the districts employing 101 to 500 teachers required a doctor's statement for a one day's absence, but one district, or 6.7 per cent of the group, required statements for 2 to 5 days. For 6 to 10 days, two districts, or 13.3 per cent, required statements. Ten districts, or 66.7 per cent, did not require statements, and two, or 13.3 per cent did not indicate whether they had such a requirement.

**Districts Employing 501-1,000 Teachers**

The two districts with 501 to 1,000 teachers did not require doctors' statements.

**District Employing More than 1,000 Teachers**

The district with more than 1,000 teachers did not indicate whether doctors' statements are required as proof of personal illness.
Per Cent of Districts in Study
Granting Bonuses for
Perfect Attendance

Bonuses for teachers having perfect attendance for any
one school year are rarely given. Only three districts, or
2.2 per cent of all those in the entire study, gave such
bonuses. Two of these employed 21 to 50 teachers; the
other, 51 to 100. Two gave the bonus in the form of
additional income; the third did not indicate the form
of the bonus.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE 1957 STUDY AND A COMPARISON OF THESE FINDINGS WITH THOSE OF THE 1960 TEXAS STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION STUDY

Sick Leave Practices

The smallest districts (6-20 teachers) had the largest percentage (31 per cent) without full pay benefits for sick leave. The next districts in size (21-50 teachers) had 19.6 per cent with no full pay. The third group (51-100 teachers) had 11.1 per cent with no full pay provisions. None of the districts in the three largest categories (101-500; 501-1,000; more than 1,000) were without some full pay for absence under sick leave programs.

Of the smallest districts (6-20 teachers), 92.8 per cent had 5 days or less of full pay for sick leave each year. The 21-50 teacher group had 80.4 per cent with 5 days or less with full pay. The group with 51-100 teachers had 74.1 per cent falling into the 5-day-or-less category; 46.6 per cent of the 101-500 teacher group gave 5 days or less. One of the 501-1,000 teacher districts gave 5 days or less; the district with more than 1,000 teachers gave more than 5 days.

The district with 6-20 teachers had 35.7 per cent giving no partial pay; the 21-50 teacher group showed 19.6 with no partial pay; 33.3 per cent of the 51-100-teacher districts gave none; and 26.6 per cent of the 101-500 group gave no
partial pay for sick leave. Information on the 501-1,000 teacher districts was incomplete. The district with more than 1,000 teachers gave partial pay.

All districts employing 51 or more teachers provided some form of sick leave pay; 21.4 per cent of the 6-20 teacher districts had no sick leave programs; and 3.9 per cent of the 21-50 teacher districts had none. Thus, all districts with no sick leave pay fell within the 6-50 teacher range.

The types of absence covered by sick leave pay varied little, but the percentage of districts participating in payment for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness varied according to district size. The districts having 6-20 teachers showed 24.2 per cent limiting sick leave to personal illness only. The group with 21-50 teachers showed 10.2 per cent allowing sick leave to cover nothing but personal illness. The personal illness restriction was invoked by 14.8 per cent of the 51-to-100-teacher districts. Not a single district among the three largest classifications restricted sick leave pay to personal illness only.

In the 6-20 teacher districts, 60.6 per cent provided no cumulative leave. Forty and eight-tenths per cent of the 21-50 teacher districts had no cumulative leave. The 51-100 classification had 29.6 per cent without cumulative policies; 20 per cent of the 101-500 teacher districts had no cumulative leave; and all districts in the 501-1,000, and 1,000 plus groups granted cumulative leaves.
Maximums allowed in cumulative leave varied considerably. However, no appreciable number of districts with 50 or fewer teachers allowed more than ten days' accumulation of sick leave. It should be noted that although 4.1 percent of the districts in the 21-50 teacher range put no limits on the number of days that may be accumulated, all of the districts allowing unlimited accumulation allowed no more than five days per year for sick leave; thus, it would require twenty years of perfect attendance to accumulate 100 days of sick leave.

One phase of the 1960 Texas State Teachers Association study dealt with sick leave without pay deduction. Table I shows the days of sick leave without pay deduction allowed by Texas schools as determined by the study.

**TABLE I**

**SICK LEAVE WITHOUT PAY DEDUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Allowed Each Year</th>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Three</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number Reporting Length of Periods**

308 | 66 | 23 | 397 | 100.0
The Texas State Teachers Association study showed that 74 per cent (308 of 416) of the small districts (1-99 teachers) participating in the study gave full pay for sick leave, 97 per cent (66 of 68) of the medium-sized districts (100-379 teachers) allowed full pay sick leave benefits, and 100 per cent (23) of the large districts (380 or more teachers) gave full pay for sick leave.

All districts giving 3 days or less full pay for sick leave were in the small classification. The study showed that 77.6 per cent (239) of the small districts reporting length of sick leave granted 5 days or less at full pay; 51.5 per cent (36) of the medium-sized districts granted 5 days or less at full pay; and 21.7 per cent (5) of the large districts reporting length of sick leave granted 5 days or less at full pay.

The 1960 study showed also that 13.6 per cent (42) of the small schools allowed 10 days or more of sick leave with full pay; 31.8 per cent (21) of the medium-sized schools granted 10 days or more; and 47.8 per cent (11) of the large schools allowed 10 days or more of sick leave with full pay each year.

Another phase of the Texas State Teachers Association study was the determination of the maximum amount of sick leave Texas schools permit teachers to accumulate. Table II shows the maximum days of sick leave accumulative, according to the study.
The maximum leave accumulative was 10 days or less in 22.8 per cent (34 of 152) of the small schools which allowed cumulative leave; in 8.6 per cent (4 of 49) of the medium schools; and in none of the large schools.

More than 10 days' sick leave was accumulative in 77.6 per cent (118) of the small schools which gave cumulative leave, 91.8 per cent (45) of the medium-sized schools, and 100 per cent (23) of the large schools.

Of the small schools reporting sick leave, 49.4 per cent (152) had cumulative leave; 74.2 per cent (49) of the medium-sized schools provided for cumulative leave; and 73.9 per cent (17) of the large schools with sick leave allowed accumulation of leave.
For the purposes of comparison, the three small groups (6-20, 21-50, and 51-100 teachers) of the 1957 study were compared with the small group (1-99 teachers) of the 1960 study. The 101-500 teacher group of the earlier study was compared with the medium-sized group (100-379 teachers) of the later study, and the 501-1,000 and more than 1,000 teacher groups of the 1957 study were compared with the large group (380 or more teachers) of the 1960 study.

Table II shows the comparative findings of the two studies in regard to full pay for sick leave.

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF THE FINDINGS OF TWO STUDIES REGARDING SICK LEAVE WITH FULL PAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Per Cent of Districts Having Sick Leave With Full Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1957 Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of the comparison indicate a slightly higher percentage of small and medium-sized districts in the 1957 study granted sick leave with full pay than did those of the
1960 study. However, the differences are small, and the findings indicate comparable practices in respect to full pay for sick leave during both years.

Table IV shows the comparative findings of the two studies in regard to the per cent of districts allowing accumulation of sick leave.

**TABLE IV**

A COMPARISON OF THE FINDINGS OF TWO STUDIES REGARDING PER CENT OF DISTRICTS WITH SICK LEAVE ALLOWING ACCUMULATION OF SICK LEAVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Per Cent of Districts Allowing Accumulation of Sick Leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1957 Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison shows that a slightly larger percentage of the small and medium-sized districts in the 1957 study allowed accumulation of sick leave than did those of the 1960 study. Again the differences are slight.

The only major difference is found in a comparison of the percentage of large districts granting cumulative leave as shown by the two studies. This difference, however, cannot
be considered conclusive because of the small number (3) of large districts in the 1957 study. The 1960 study included 23 such districts.

Teacher Absence

The small districts (6-20 teachers) in the 1957 study showed 54.4 per cent reporting from 0 to 10 per cent of the teachers absent per year. The districts with 21-50 teachers counted 36.9 per cent having 0 to 10 per cent absent; 25.9 per cent of the 51-100 teacher districts had 10 per cent or less teacher absence; the 101-500 teacher districts reported 26.7 per cent with 0 to 10 per cent teacher absence. None of the districts with 501 or more teachers reported absence rates of less than 11 to 20 per cent.

The length of the average annual absence per teacher was shorter among the smaller districts. The 6-20 group had an average annual absence per teacher of less than one day in 36.4 per cent of the cases. The districts employing 21-50 teachers reported 24.5 per cent having average annual absences of less than one day. The districts with 51-100 teachers had less than one day average annual absence in 18.5 per cent of their group, and the 101-500 teacher districts had 6.7 per cent with an average absence rate of less than one day. Information on average annual absences was incomplete for the 501-1,000 teacher and the more than 1,000 teacher districts.
Proof of personal illness when absent was required by few districts percentage-wise. Among the 5-20 group, 90.0 per cent required no doctors' statements; of the 21-50 group, 61.2 per cent did not ask for statements; the 51-100 teacher districts reported 77.7 per cent without the requirement; and no district employing more than 100 teachers required doctors' statements as proof of personal illness.

A rare item in Texas sick leave provisions is the granting of a bonus to teachers having perfect attendance. Three of the 138 participating districts, or 2.1 per cent, made such an offer in their sick leave policies. Of these, two indicated additional income as the form of the bonus.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to compare sick leave policies and practices according to school district size to determine whether any relationship exists between the amount of time granted for sick leave and the amount of time used by teachers for sick leave, and to compare 1957 sick leave practices with those of 1960.

Eleven districts, which represent 8 per cent of all districts participating in the study, had no provisions for sick leave payment; every one of these districts employed fifty or fewer teachers. On the other hand, all districts participating in the study which employed more than 100 teachers made provisions for full pay for sick leave.

The districts ranging from 51 to 100 teachers had a variety of sick leave provisions including some with partial pay only, others with a combination of partial pay and full pay, and still others with set numbers of days with full pay. But each of these districts had some form of sick leave pay.

Thus, a definite pattern is established showing that the small school districts are the only ones lacking some
sort of sick leave policy and further showing that the larger
districts are more liberal in their sick leave policies.

The 6-20 teacher districts with sick leave policies
allowed accumulation of sick leave time in 39.4 per cent of
the cases. Of the 21-50 teacher districts, 59.2 per cent
provided for cumulative leave; 70.4 per cent of the 51-100
teacher districts allowed cumulative leave. Eighty per cent
of the 101-500 teacher districts had cumulative leave, and
all the districts with 501 or more teachers granted it.
Thus, a definite pattern is established with cumulative
leave becoming more frequent among the larger schools.

The Texas State Teachers Association study showed that
sick leave with full pay is more frequent and for longer
times among larger school districts. It also showed that
more of the larger schools give cumulative leave than do
small schools. And, according to the study, the large dis-
tricts give larger amounts of cumulative leave than do small
schools. However, no significant differences in sick leave
practices could be ascertained by a comparison of the 1957
and 1960 studies.

A definite relationship between the amount of time
granted for sick leave by the school district and the amount
of time used by teachers for sick leave is established by
the 1957 study.

More than half the districts employing 6-20 teachers
reported less than 10 per cent of their faculty members
absent during any one year; this same group showed that 92.8 per cent limited full pay for sick leave to from 0 to 5 days, 31.0 per cent granted none and 61.8 per cent gave 5 days or less. On the other hand, districts employing 101-500 teachers reported only 26.7 per cent of their districts having 10 per cent or less absenteeism per year; but this group had only 74.1 per cent falling into the five-days-a-year-or-less category, and every district in the group gave full pay for sick leave.

The average annual absence per teacher was less than one day among 36.4 per cent of the 6-to-20-teacher districts; such average annual absence was evident in only 6.7 per cent of the districts with 101 to 500 teachers.

Conclusions

1. The study indicates that percentage-wise fewer small school districts grant sick leave with pay than do large districts.

2. The study indicates that among districts granting pay for sick leave absence the larger districts grant more per year than do the small districts.

3. The study indicates that percentage-wise fewer small school districts grant cumulative leave than do large districts.

4. The study indicates that percentage-wise fewer teachers are absent in small school districts than in large districts.
5. The study indicates that average annual absence per teacher is shorter in small school districts than it is in large districts.

6. The study indicates that only a small percentage of districts require doctors' statements as proof of personal illness, and there appears to be no relationship between such requirements and the size of districts.

7. The study indicates that teachers are absent more days each year under liberal sick leave provisions than they are under more stringent sick leave provisions.

8. A comparison of the 1957 and the 1960 studies indicate that sick leave policies and practices continue to follow the same pattern in the later study as was established in the earlier study. No significant changes or improvements could be detected through the comparison.

Recommendation

On the basis of the data presented in this thesis and the conclusions drawn from them, it is recommended that legislation be enacted providing for a state minimum of five days sick leave per year cumulative to fifty days for all teachers in Texas as suggested by the Hals-Aikin recommendations.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

To the Superintendent: Please encircle the letter preceding the appropriate answer or answers to the following statements and questions.

I. Our system annually grants each teacher full pay for absence due to personal illness for
   a. no time
   b. 1 to 5 days
   c. 6 to 10 days
   d. 11 to 20 days
   e. if more than 20 days, specify ______ days
   f. unlimited

II. The current number of teachers in our system is
   a. 6 to 20
   b. 21 to 50
   c. 51 to 100
   d. 101 to 500
   e. 501 to 1,000
   f. 1,001 or more

III. Our system annually grants each teacher partial pay for absences due to personal illness for
   a. no time
   b. 1 to 5 days
   c. 6 to 10 days
   d. 11 to 20 days
   e. if more than 20 days, specify ______ days
   f. unlimited

IV. The amount deducted in cases of partial payment is
   a. less than 50%
   b. 50%
   c. more than 50%

V. Our sick leave program also grants pay for absences due to
   a. death in the immediate family
   b. illness in the immediate family
   c. conventions, etc.
d. other personal reasons

e. nothing other than personal illness

VI. The total number of days granted annually by our sick leave program to each teacher for absences caused by reasons other than personal illness is

a. no time
b. 1 to 5 days
c. 6 to 10 days
d. 11 to 20 days
e. if more than 20 days, specify _______ days
f. unlimited

VII. Our program provides for an annual accumulation of

a. no time
d. 11 to 20 days
b. 1 to 5 days
e. if more than 20 days, specify _______ days
c. 6 to 10 days
f. unlimited

VIII. The maximum number of days each teacher may accumulate over any period of time under our program is

a. 1 to 5 days
e. 61 to 90 days
b. 6 to 10 days
f. 91 to 150 days
c. 11 to 20 days
f. unlimited
d. 21 to 60 days

IX. The average annual percentage of teachers having absences under our sick leave program is

a. 0 to 10
f. 51 to 60
b. 11 to 20
g. 61 to 70
c. 21 to 30
h. 71 to 80
d. 31 to 40
i. 81 to 90
e. 41 to 50
j. 91 to 100
X. The average annual absence per teacher under our sick leave program is

- less than 1 day
- 1 to 1.9 days
- 2 to 2.9 days
- 3 to 3.9 days
- 4 to 4.9 days
- 5 to 5.9 days
- 6 to 6.9 days
- 7 to 7.9 days
- 8 to 8.9 days
- 9 to 9.9 days
- 10 to 11.9 days
- 12 to 13.9 days
- 14 to 15.9 days
- 16 to 17.9 days
- 18 to 19.9 days
- 20 days or more

XI. The average annual absence per teacher based only on the number of teachers having absences (i.e., excluding the number of teachers having a year's perfect attendance) under our sick leave program is

- less than 1 day
- 1 to 1.9 days
- 2 to 2.9 days
- 3 to 3.9 days
- 4 to 4.9 days
- 5 to 5.9 days
- 6 to 6.9 days
- 7 to 7.9 days
- 8 to 8.9 days
- 9 to 9.9 days
- 10 to 11.9 days
- 12 to 13.9 days
- 14 to 15.9 days
- 16 to 17.9 days
- 18 to 19.9 days
- 20 days or more

XII. Our sick leave program requires that a teacher who is absent because of personal illness submit a doctor's statement for

- one day absence
- 2 to 5 days absence
- 6 to 10 days absence
- more than 10 days absence
- does not require a statement

XIII. Our system grants a bonus to teachers having a perfect attendance record for any one year.

- yes
- no
Disregard XIV if answer to XIII was no.

XIV. The bonus granted to teachers for perfect attendance records is in the form of

   a. additional income    c. lessening or reduction of duties
   b. additional grants of sick leave or other d. other awards or grants leave
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