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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The amount of time that teachers spend performing duties not having a direct bearing on instruction has been of concern to educators for many years. The rapid expansion of the pupil population, the lag in the output of teacher education programs and the increased standards of the profession have created a new concern for the demands on teacher time.

Emmerling and Kanawha have indicated a concern in this area by stating:

One of the chief obstacles to improvement of the educational process frequently cited by teachers is the limited time afforded them for teaching and for thinking and planning essential to developing more effective instructional activities. It is most difficult for the teacher to devote sufficient time to individual attention when, as some surveys indicate, as much as one-fifth of the school teacher's school day is consumed with clerical and other nonprofessional duties not directly related to instruction (19, p. 175).

Need for the Study

Proper utilization of teacher time has been of great interest to educators for a long time. In more recent years this problem has become prominent by the acute shortage of experienced and qualified teachers. "In the fall of 1967, 4.9 per cent of the total teaching force in the United States had less than a standard teaching certificate" (4, p. 2). Although these people had less than a standard teaching certificate, they were being utilized as regular classroom teachers and not as "teacher aids" or "paraprofessionals". Teacher organizations have recognized the need for "teacher aids" and "paraprofessionals" and have
exerted pressure to obtain them. Therefore, many state departments have established limited certification standards for supplementary help.

As the demands on teachers have increased, the problem of allowing teachers actual time to teach has been brought into focus. Information is greatly needed in this area which will assist the "decision makers" in education regarding such matters as staffing, scheduling, and salary. Additional research is also needed which will point out the actual amount of time teachers spend in non-academic areas, because this time could readily be used for the preparation of academic activities. Many teachers in general do not find non-teaching duties to be a challenge, and, therefore, feel their professional training is not being properly utilized.

There is a need for accurate information concerning the utilization of teacher time and the relationship of other factors pertinent to this subject.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the scope of non-teaching assignments in Iowa Public Secondary Schools, (grades 9-12), and to determine the effect of certain variables on non-teaching assignment practices as compared with school size. This study sought the answers to the following questions:

1. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa Public Secondary Schools when categorized with total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher?
2. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa Public Secondary Schools when categorized with the major academic assignment of the individual teacher?

3. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa Public Secondary Schools when categorized with the type of degree held by the individual teacher?

4. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa Public Secondary Schools when categorized with the age of the individual teacher?

5. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa Public Secondary Schools when categorized with the tenure in a particular school system of the individual teacher?

6. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa Public Secondary Schools as compared with the sex of the individual teacher?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size.

2. There is no significant difference of average total amount of cur-
rent non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher.

3. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher.

4. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the major academic assignment of the individual teacher.

5. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the major academic assignment of the individual teacher.

6. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the type of degree held by the individual teacher.

7. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the type of degree held by the individual teacher.
8. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the age of the individual teacher.

9. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the age of the individual teacher.

10. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the number of years the individual teacher had taught in the school system he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year.

11. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the number of years the individual teacher had taught in the school system he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year.

12. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the sex of the individual teacher.
13. There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the sex of the individual teacher.

Definitions

For the purpose of the study, selected terms were defined as follows:

1. Non-teaching assignment was considered to include supervision of students in the following areas: Homeroom, Study Hall, Lunch Room, Library, School Grounds, School Crossings, and Hall Duty.

2. Major academic assignment was considered the academic area where the teacher spent at least one-half of his teaching time.

3. School sizes were indicated by total student population in each district. The schools were grouped in the following categories with the number in parentheses indicating the number of schools in that category: 200-499 (116), 500-749 (124), 750-999 (68), 100-1499 (56), 1500-1999 (27), 2000-2999 (37), 3000-over (27).

4. Total years of teaching experience was considered the total years a person has taught, regardless of the various districts in which he had taught.

5. Years tenure in a particular school system was considered the number of years the person had taught in the district that he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year.
6. Library supervision was considered direct supervision by the person in charge while students were using the library for research or study.

7. Homeroom supervision was considered time taken from the regular school day for supervising students and handling administrative functions.

Sources of Data

All of the data used in the study dealing with teachers' time in non-academic areas were taken from the 1967-1968 "Card-Pac" file. Card-Pac was established by the State Department of Public Instruction on November 15, 1963 (27). The major purpose of "Card-Pac" as established by the State Board was to collect and maintain a complete file of information about Iowa students, public schools, personnel, buildings, administrative units, and fiscal records. It was also stipulated by the State Board that "Card-Pac" was to process this information and provide a systematic feedback of it to the individual schools and agencies and to also have such information available for research purposes.

Personal data concerning the secondary teachers of Iowa were obtained from the Iowa Professional School Employees Data Sheet (IPSEDS, 1967) and made available through the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. The data used in this study were put in usable form through a merger of the number 7 card of "Card-Pac" (Pupil Supervision Assignments) and the Iowa Professional School Employees' Data Sheet (1967).
Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited to the secondary school teachers in Iowa (grades 9-12). Although data were available on the total teaching population (grades K-12), it was decided to use just the data on secondary teachers. This was decided because of the incompatibility of non-teaching assignments between the elementary and secondary schools. This study was concerned primarily with the utilization of teacher time in the secondary schools of Iowa.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters. The first chapter includes need for the study, the problem, hypotheses, definitions, sources of data, delimitations of the study, and organization of the study. The second chapter contains a review of related literature. Chapter three explains the procedure used in the study. Chapter four contains the findings, and chapter five contains the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

The utilization of teacher time has been of interest to educators for a long time. The purpose of this study was to determine the scope of non-teaching assignments in Iowa Public Secondary Schools (grades 7-12) and to determine the effect of certain variables on non-teaching assignment practices.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Coupled with the vast body of knowledge to be transmitted by today's teachers to the students in America's schools is increasing concern with development of the most effective and productive utilization of the time these teachers are able to spend on the professional aspects of their vocation, namely, time to teach.

In the great majority of today's secondary schools, teachers are asked to cope with time-consuming duties of a supervisory or clerical nature, leaving them far short of the necessary time and energy for class preparation and actual teaching. Educators throughout the nation are facing this problem; many innovations are currently in practice in an attempt to solve it. Particularly noticeable are the trends toward team teaching, the use of paraprofessional personnel in the school system, and utilization of mechanical or electronic equipment.

Because literature dealing directly with the aspects of teacher time utilization which are the subject of this study is limited, the review of literature will cover the broad aspects of the problems related to time to teach.

Statistical Information

NEA Research Division reports

Current data compiled by the Research Division of the National Education Association reveals the average amount of time per week spent on
school-related activities by secondary school teachers to be 48.3 hours. The required school week is approximately 37.0 hours, 29.2 of which are spent in pupil contact work, while noncompensated school activities consume a mean of 11.2 hours per week (35, p. 26). These noncompensated school-related activities vary from lesson preparation and grading papers to making reports and attending extracurricular activities and meetings. Male secondary school teachers spend a mean of 10.8 hours, female secondary school teachers a mean of 11.7 hours in these activities (35, p. 25). Assigned duties other than teaching consume 7.9 teacher hours each week during the school day. Secondary teachers spend 30 per cent as much time in school work outside the school day as during official school hours.

Over one-fifth of our secondary school teachers, 22.9 per cent, work an unbroken school day with no unassigned periods in their weekly schedules. The number of unassigned periods per week in the schedules of secondary school teachers are (35, p. 82):

1 period - 8.0%
2 periods - 1.1%
3 periods - 2.0%
4 periods - 3.4%
5 periods - 5.4%
6 periods - 2.1%
7 periods - 1.9%
8 periods - 1.8%
9 periods - 0.6%
10 periods - 8.7%
Over 10 periods - 1.3%.

The median number of unassigned periods per week is 4.4; the average is 5.0.
The secondary teachers were reported as having a mean of 34.5 minutes free during the lunch period, a median of 30 minutes. Approximately 70.6 per cent reported a duty free lunch period, though the allotted time is obviously insufficient for any activity other than hurried eating (35, p. 23). Ohio (34, p. 7) is among the states pioneering in legislation providing mandatory duty free lunch periods of at least 30 minutes duration. Other states providing legislation to this effect are California, Illinois, and Massachusetts (18, p. 105-6).

Those secondary teachers involved in supervision of the lunch period included (35, p. 23):

Supervised all the time - 17.4%
  1) By own preference - 4.8%
  2) Because of school custom - 5.0%
  2) School requirement - 7.6%

Supervised on a rotating basis - 13.8%
  1) By own preference - 0.9%
  2) Because of school custom - 1.5%
  3) School requirement - 11.4%

Not at all - 68.8%.

Burrup (11, p. 185) reports figures derived from a 1962 NEA Research Bulletin detailing the division of the secondary school teachers' working week. Class instruction involved 51.4 per cent, or 23 hours, 36 minutes; related out-of-class instructional activities involved 29.0 per cent, or 13 hours, 18 minutes. Of this time, 4 hours, 54 minutes were spent correcting papers; 3 hours, 30 minutes were given to personal preparation; 2 hours, 30 minutes went to preparation of materials; 1 hour, 36 minutes were spent in individual help; and 48 minutes on parent contact.
Miscellaneous activities consumed 19.6 per cent, or 9 hours, of the teachers' working week. Study hall supervision took 1 hour, 48 minutes; monitorial duties consumed 1 hour, 30 minutes; coaching athletics took 54 minutes; sponsorship of clubs and pupil activities took another 54 minutes; official meetings consumed 48 minutes; while other duties consumed 1 hour, 36 minutes.

Other studies

Lawson (30), in his study, found that teachers spend approximately 50 per cent of their time in face-to-face teaching, 30 per cent in related instructional tasks, and the remaining 20 per cent in administrative and supportive clerical work. Results of his questionnaire, sent to one-third of the junior high school principals in each of nine major cities in the United States, revealed that 13 per cent of certificated teacher time assigned to schools is devoted to nonteaching tasks. Of this, one-third comes from teachers released from teaching for one or more periods.

Harnock (22, p. 34) has reported that the conventional school program involves 7-11 per cent of teachers' weekly professional time set aside for planning, while some innovative programs provide for increases up to the 35 per cent level for this aspect of teaching.

Studies of Time Utilization

NASSP Commission studies

One of the recent definitive studies of staff utilization has been administered by the National Association of Secondary School Principals.
This Commission, under the sponsorship of the Fund for Advancement of Education, the Ford Foundation, and the NASSP, has aided over 35 staff utilization projects throughout the country (45, pp. 278-282).

Respondents from 24 of the staff utilization school systems indicate 28 of 35 projects are continuing in like or modified form, and that seven have been terminated. Among those continuing, 11 projects are in team teaching, seven in the use of mechanical or electronic equipment, seven in the use of lay assistants, and three involving organizational forms permitting more independent study time for students (45, pp. 278-282). Large and small group instruction is also under examination.

Sixty-one innovative practices were identified as having been part of staff utilization studies conducted under NASSP auspices. Seventeen of the schools involved are, in 1968, still using an average of more than twice as many of these innovations than are the thirty-four other school systems with which they were compared. The average number of these sixty-one innovative practices in staff utilization schools is 15.40, with a median of 13.0. The average number of the same innovations in use in the control schools was 6.47, with a median of 5.5 (45, pp. 278-282).

Based on a limited sample of ten staff utilization schools and 28 control schools, 28 per cent of the innovations checked by staff utilization schools and 40 per cent of those checked by other schools are firmly established organizational forms throughout the school systems involved, 48 per cent and 45 per cent respectively are established in
some but not all schools within the system, and 24 per cent and 15 per cent respectively are still in experimental stages (45, pp. 278-282).

Staff utilization schools are reported as surpassing other schools by four-to-one in the use of innovations concerned with team teaching and independent study time for students. Among the most popular innovations in both sets of school systems are language labs, lay assistants in school libraries, office practice students assigned as clerical aides to teachers, lay readers for English classes, group guidance activities, and selected homeroom activities (45, pp. 278-282).

Of the fourteen checklist items related to team teaching, staff utilization schools checked these items 44 times, while other schools checked them 26 times, indicating the relative popularity of team teaching among schools in this survey.

It was found that difficulty in establishing accurate evaluation procedures was somewhat minimized in those schools which had available to them the services of college or university consultants.

Trump and Michael (54, pp. 7-10), reporting the initial findings of the NASSP study, mentioned findings in four areas: first, class size was not found to be important relative to learning achievement; second, teachers felt that advantages accrue to them when they work together as teams; third, carefully selected and trained non-professional personnel can perform many subprofessional teaching services; and last, teacher involvement in staff utilization studies is a valuable morale enforcement.

Sergir (48, pp. 1-13), reported in 1962, the results of a six-state survey conducted among staff utilization schools. The questionnaire in-
volved was divided into five sections: Team Teaching, Student Grouping for Special Purposes, Teacher Aides, Schedule Changes, and Technological Devices.

Conclusions in the Team Teaching section pointed out a considerable spread in this teaching technique since 1956, with social studies, English, and physical education the most active team teaching subjects. Most teams are arranged around existing time schedules, resulting in team members teaching the usual amount of hours weekly. A common planning time for team members was found to be essential.

Conclusions regarding the second section, Student Grouping for Special Purposes, found a trend toward experimentation with large group instruction, with accompanying small group discussion arrangements.

In the area of Teacher Aides, several types were listed, including student teachers (teacher trainees), college students (non-teacher trainees), clerical workers, college trained adults from the community, and other adults. Their duties were in the areas of laboratory supervision, objective test grading, remedial teaching, corridor and playground supervision, library assistance, shop supervision, clerical duties, and field trip assistance. New York, California, and Illinois led in activity in this area.

The six-state total included 148 schools employing aides as lay readers, 106 employing them as clerks, 98 as objective test graders, 88 as library assistants, and 65 as study hall supervisors. Hourly wages ranged from $1.00 - $2.50 per hour (48, p. 8).
The area of Schedule Changes was least active in innovation among the participating schools, though there was some indication of use of double periods, usually in English, social studies, and science.

Technological Devices, the fifth section covered by the questionnaire, revealed increasing interest in the development of educational television techniques (48, p. 10).

Baynham (5, pp. 15-98) reports on selected staff utilization projects in school districts involved in the NASSP studies.

In Rome, Georgia, outside assistance was provided in the areas of: preparation of and account procedures for school records and parents reports, through employment of additional clerical help in school offices; use of standardized objective tests, scored by aides; and employment of lay readers to correct written work in English (5, p. 36).

In Denver, the clerical staff maintains cumulative records of test data and develops class lists depicting the expectancy level of individual students. The clerical staff is also available to type and duplicate material upon teacher request. In Lakewood, Colorado, clerks' duties are extended to location and reproduction of teaching materials and supervision of large groups (5, p. 45).

Chicago schools have incorporated the honors study hall to relieve teachers of routine supervision duties, as have the New Lenox, Illinois, schools. Their plan includes study halls without constant teacher supervision. One teacher serves as administrator of the program, with four students serving as actual supervisors. A student chairman controls and
reports disciplinary problems, with an assistant to take over in his absence. A student secretary maintains roll and sign-out sheets. For 800 students in 29 study halls daily, involving 1,750,000 student study-hall hours for the year, only 36 violations were reported. Unanimous teacher endorsement of the program was matched by 91 per cent student preference for student supervision (5, p. 57).

The Flint, Michigan, high school team teachers reported a 40 hour/week teaching aide to perform clerical duties. Prior to the project, team members and aides discussed professional versus non-professional responsibilities, and defined the duties and schedules of the aides. An evaluation questionnaire indicated increases of from one to fifteen hours each week in time devoted to professional duties by teachers with aides (5, p. 76).

Harbor Beach, Michigan, indicated a flexible schedule to accommodate changes in their small high school program. Two special fifty-minute periods each week were designed to accommodate home rooms, club meetings, organizational activities, and assemblies (5, p. 79).

Wheatly School, New York, provided increased time for professional duties for its teachers through employment of education majors from nearby colleges to supervise study halls. Prior to this employment, 18 teachers had been used during the school day to accommodate study halls. Costs of $6,600 were reported for one school year for study hall assistants, releasing 18 teacher periods, or three and one-half teachers at a cost of $22,000. The objective was to release these teachers for out-of-class
professional duties centered on conferences, lesson planning, individual help, and parent conferences (5, p. 92).

The NEA Time to Teach studies

One major aspect of the time to teach studies sponsored by the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers is that of innovation.

In this regard, Manchester (31, pp. 138-140) reports on the use of college students as aides. This is considered one of the most legitimate sources of paraprofessional assistance because the program is of a professional nature, utilizing the services of college students with at least two years of college preparation for teaching, and augmenting their student teaching, which it precedes. The significant goals of this program include assistance to teachers through relief from routine work not involving actual teaching responsibility. Another consideration is the excellence of this means of preparing future teachers. Additional benefits accrue to the schools involved through awareness of outstanding teacher candidates.

College education departments play a significant role in the development of this program through provision of current, relevant data on applicants, and realistic recommendations.

The St. Paul, Minnesota, public schools launched a pilot program employing college students as paraprofessional aides during the 1962-63 school year, involving 21 student aides. Subsequent additions have been made; the only program limitation being financial. Principals in the system report favorable staff reaction to the program. Criteria for
assignment of aides include large class enrollments, recognition of specific services to be rendered, and ability of supervising teachers to use aides productively. Aides' duties include test and assignment correction, performance of routine clerical work, assistance in classroom activities, research and resource work, and remedial tutoring. Aides within the system have been found to have desirable personal characteristics, with ability to assume responsibility. They are usually employed 10 hours a week with compensation of $1.50 per hour (31, pp. 138-140).

The Time to Teach project has identified various sectors of the school program which may impinge upon and restrict the work of the teacher (34, pp. 4-5).

First, the instructional program may be poorly organized. Excessive class enrollments, widely divergent range of pupil ability within the class, inadequate provision of special services personnel, and excessive class preparation required of teachers contribute to the problem. Inadequate home room provision, requirement of teaching outside the area of preparation, and use of several different classrooms increase difficulties. Time must be provided for the preparation and evaluation of lessons.

Second, the curriculum and material section planning may be inadequate. Attention must be given to the adequacy of instructional materials and teaching aides, as well as to procedural plans for periodic updating and selection. Teacher involvement in the area of curriculum development and revision must be maximal. Excessive non-academic teach-
ing must be eliminated, attention to these areas being redirected to the home.

Third, excessive non-teaching duties must be brought under control. Abuse of teacher time in this area is widespread: collection of monies; athletic event management and policing; sponsorship of student organizations; administrative assignment related to pupil control, school banks and book stores, libraries, supply ordering, and committee work; assignment of teachers to monitorial duties maintaining order in corridors, playgrounds, lunchrooms, and bus loading; and non-professional clerical duties such as typing, duplicating, form and report completion, consume far too much of the teachers' time.

Fourth, inadequate guidance programs must be revised. Time for teacher assistance to individual pupils must be provided, as must adequate parent conference provisions. Procedural patterns for discipline cases are needed.

Last, administrative inconsistencies should be eliminated to the greatest extent possible. Interruption of classroom activities and overly lenient dismissal from class policies for non-academic purposes are major areas of dispute. Non-productive meetings must be revised. There is a need for definitive duty assignments, with policy procedures outlined in writing. Staff additions in special services should be such that excessive teacher coordination and supportive clerical tasks are minimized.

It is recommended that teachers be involved in decision making in the areas of (34, p. 16):
1. Use of community resources;  
2. Programs of professional growth and in-service education;  
3. Use of funds available for instruction;  
4. Pupil guidance and description;  
5. Definition of teaching duties in and out of class;  
6. Curriculum objectives, methods, and evaluation;  
7. School organization for instruction; and  
8. Other factors requiring attention.  

In conjunction with the Time to Teach program, the NEA has developed methods for local program involvement (52, p. 32). First the local association of teachers should appoint a committee to study the philosophy and operational aspects of the program and discuss it with the administration. Next, securement of final approval and enlistment of the support of association members should be completed, followed by definition of project limitations and selection of a program consultant.  

Further NEA research  

Small high schools were discussed in a 1963 research monograph of the NEA (36, p. 21). Classroom teachers in small schools need teaching time, yet are required to spend excessive time in supportive roles of a clerical and monitorial nature. In 1960-61, 81 per cent of these teachers reported inadequate time for guidance, counseling, and parent conferences; 69 per cent felt time for preparing reports was inadequate; 73 per cent were not able to find time for planning work; and 85 per cent felt the lack of adequate checking and grading time.  

Other related studies  

Trump and Baynham, anticipating future changes to accommodate increased professional use of teacher time, report a present average work week for
teachers of 48 hours, one-third of which go to clerical and sub-
professional tasks, and another one-third to work that could be ef-
ficiently performed by automated devices (53, p. 8).

Future use of assistants to make possible the full professionaliza-
tion of teaching will include (53, pp. 33-34):

1. Staff specialists - employed full time for several schools;
2. Community consultants - competent in specialized fields to
   make individual presentations;
3. General aides - for clerical and routine duties. A high
   school will require fifty hours/week of general aide services
   for each 400 students, including supervision of students on
   school grounds, in cafeterias, corridors, and auditoriums,
   and in some extra class activities. This will ordinarily be
   a part-time position involving 10-20 hours/week;
4. Clerks - for typing, duplication, report preparation, grading
   of objective tests, record keeping, and supply distribution.
   For every 400 students, schools will require 100 hours of
   clerical services each week.
5. Instruction assistants - to perform duties below the pro-
   fessional level, but above clerical chores. Some reading
   and evaluation of themes and reports will be included, as
   will student progress conferences, lab assistance, and
   supervision of out-of-school projects. The recommended ex-
   tent of these services is 200 hours/week for each 400 students.

The salaries recommended vary from $2.50 - $1.30 per hour, with
instruction assistants receiving the higher pay, and general aides the
lower.

Staff utilization studies reported by Trump show that teachers can
and do learn to make effective use of teacher assistants for non-
professional tasks. Individual teacher differences must be recognized,
some being able to work long hours, while others can make valuable con-
tributions while able to work shorter periods of time (53, p. 47).

Included in Trump's recommendations is the possibility of employ-
ment of assistants for performance of duties requiring neither clerical
nor subject matter competence, such as playground and study hall supervision (53, p. 108). His major recommendation is that teachers spend a maximum of fifteen hours each week with groups of students, most of that time with no more than fifteen students in a class (53, p. 109). This will enable time for adequate preparation, keeping up to date, conference with professional colleagues, and improvement of evaluation, usually as members of a teaching team (49, pp. 90-97).

**Teacher Aides**

Again reported by the National Education Association Research Division, the incorporation of teachers' aides into the school system has been the subject of research (37).

A basic problem involved in the question is definition of the position of the aide in the school system. Aides, like teachers, can function efficiently only within their areas of preparation. They must not be considered as substitutes for qualified teachers, nor as a means of stretching class size limits beyond their normal scope. Due to emphasis at the elementary level on the total concept of child development, emotional, physical, and educational, use of lay personnel involves difficulties not encountered at the secondary level, where thorough personnel selection procedures, unhurried staff development programs, and comprehensive evaluation procedures can assure employment of personnel qualified to relieve teachers of non-professional duties (16, p. 131).

Among prominent educators calling for assignments to teachers of
responsibilities at the highest level, with lower competence level
duties assigned to other staff members, is Dwight Allen (1, p. 47).

Rioux (46, p. 42) lists fourteen ways to utilize the services of
nonteaching personnel:

1. Homework helpers;
2. Study center monitors;
3. Team-teaching assistants;
4. Audiovisual equipment managers;
5. Community resource utilization assistants;
6. School-community block workers;
7. Case finders;
8. Group work aides;
9. Health service aides;
10. Automated instruction aides;
11. Playground assistants;
12. Educational survey aides;
13. Preschool assistants; and

Allen (1, p. 44) recommends extensive use of aides in the clerical
and monitorial fields, freeing team teachers to devote a significantly
greater proportion of time to development of the students' conceptual
powers, discipline of their prose and speech abilities, and attacks
on various problems.

Perkins (40) in a dissertation dealing with role development of the
paraprofessional, surveyed experiments using the paraprofessional, and
sought to define his role and to identify those factors associated with
role development. His procedural methods included use of an evaluative
questionnaire through which experts judged the definition and criteria
for the role of the paraprofessional. He concluded that:

The role of the paraprofessional is to assist the classroom
teacher with routine procedures and under his direction to
perform special assignments, which will vary according to the
nature of special competencies and the degree of interest and
ability to work with pupils and adults that the paraprofessional
may have.
Bush (12, pp. 317-320), in describing a study of administrators' viewpoints on improving instruction, relates a study conducted at the University of Mississippi. Using the Flanagan critical incident technique, 708 selected school administrators throughout the United States were surveyed. Twenty-first on the resultant list of thirty-four items was, "Provide more time for classroom instruction by relieving teachers of menial tasks (respondents suggested that menial tasks could be handled by student assistants, full-time administrative secretaries, etc.)."

Arnstein (3, pp. 120-123) suggests employment of Neighborhood Youth Corps members as subprofessional aides. When the NYC is sponsored by local boards of education, enrollees may work in schools as teacher aides. A 10 per cent local contribution for the program will be matched by 90 per cent from the Department of Labor under the Economic Opportunity Act when necessary provisions are met. Currently, successful programs are being administered in New York City, where enrollees are tutoring, supervising playgrounds, and helping with extracurricular activities.

New York City also participates in a volunteer program, whereby, since 1956, carefully selected, intelligent and dependable volunteers work from one to two days each week in teacher relief roles (28, p. 125). Volunteers are never in sole charge of an entire class, but they do assume complete responsibility for monitorial duties, such as lunchroom supervision.
Turney (55, pp. 133-137), emphasizes secretarial help as the only currently listed type of teacher assistance not involving large numbers of partially trained persons. Lack of pupil contact in their effective service to teachers eliminates the need for organization of in-service training programs. Studies of secretarial help conducted from 1958-1962 in Tennessee and Missouri with the cooperation of the George Peabody College for Teachers found secretaries competent in treating confidential material professionally, and found that schools willing to provide employment on the basis of four to five hours a day would find a large number of trained people at their disposal. These studies found that secretaries employed as aides spent 30 per cent to 40 per cent of their time typing, 12 per cent to 30 per cent checking or scoring work, 10 per cent to 22 per cent duplicating materials, and the remainder recording, filing, or doing miscellaneous duties. The areas of teacher need for assistance were, in order of frequency of request:

1. Preparing materials;
2. Performing routine clerical duties;
3. Checking papers;
4. Ordering materials for instruction and arranging educational experiences;
5. Assembling information; and
6. Preparing communications with parents and outside agencies.

It was found that teacher time saved for redeployment to additional duties was 100 hours of teaching time during the 180 day school year, when the secretary-teacher ratio was 1:7, based on a four-hour work day for the secretary. Teachers spent 76 per cent of the time thus saved for professional purposes directly related to instruction.
Bazeli (6) reports in his dissertation the results of an evaluative study of school service assistants in inner-city junior high schools. Through use of data collection instruments, teacher time analysis, aide time analysis, and observation, he concluded that teachers spent as much time with as without aides on class routine and discipline, but more time on clerical and preparatory work when aides were present. While teacher morale improved, turnover did not decrease. Aides proved useful in clerical and routine tasks, and the paraprofessional staff was institutionalized in the system.

Supervision of students was discussed by Plutte (43, p. 16) in describing a California high school which had used up to eight teacher periods per day for student supervision. This situation resulted in one and three-fifths teachers used for supervision at a cost of $8,000/year. A full-time supervisor was hired at less cost, given orientation training with new teachers, and assigned student assistants to take over all out-of-class discipline and monitorial work.

Bookout (8, p. 136) reports a Pennsylvania school district's solution to teacher lunch period relief. Mature women were hired for two hours daily to supervise this period. Daily conferences were arranged to review policy and procedure.

Student clerical and secretarial assistance is used in many schools, often on a credit basis (15, pp. 67-69).

Lawson (30), in his study, found the Los Angeles school system to be providing less certificated time for nonteaching task performance, and more noncertificated personnel available within the schools, than
the other eight major cities studied. His study found that:

1. Teachers are generally expected to perform additional duty tasks;
2. Principals believe that 2/3 of the 91 separate tasks listed in the study should be performed by non-certificated personnel;
3. Noncertificated personnel would be used to a greater extent if available; and
4. Tasks involving direct pupil contact should be the responsibility of certificated personnel.

The Bay City, Michigan, study was based on how the professional competencies of teachers can best be utilized. It found that from 21 per cent to 69 per cent of the total school day (elementary) was spent on activities which could be performed by aides. The teacher with an aide was found to decrease the amount of time directed to these activities by 26 per cent (38, pp. 45-55). Initial reports found the progress of the teacher-aide teams to be satisfactory, accepted by all concerned, but later reports reflected change in viewpoints. Differentiation between the teaching and nonteaching functions of the teacher was more difficult than initially thought, and the experiment failed to foster development of new instructional methods (37, p. 11). The tendency to use aides to justify badly overcrowded classes was found undesirable by an educator evaluating the experiment. A psychologist felt that conformity was overstressed. Teachers within the system expressed preference for smaller classes without aides, and only one of eight principals favored extension of the program. The ideal expressed was class enrollments of not more than 30, with secretarial assistance for all teachers (39, pp. 100-158).
The Yale-Fairfield study of 1954 (37, p. 11) describes a variety of assignment types for aides. A one-to-one assignment provides a full-time aide in the self-contained classroom. Pooled assignments provide one assistant for a group of teachers, plus clerical services for the entire school. Multiple-faculty assignments provide a team of assistants to serve a team of teachers.

San Angelo, Texas (37, p. 13) reports use of certified teacher assistants to help in non-teaching and instructional areas, remedial teachers to remove exceptional children from overcrowded classes, and teacher secretaries. The amount of assistance in this system is dependent upon class size.

The Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, conducted a lay reader study in 1958-59. A total of 8,000 students in 16 cities throughout the country were involved. College graduate applicants were chosen as lay readers on the basis of results of tests in verbal aptitude, paper grading, paper correction, and a paper writing assignment. The stipulation that lay readers would be withdrawn if the English staff was reduced was made to circumvent increase of class size. The program's purpose was to allow necessary student writing assignment increases.

Cost of the program came to less than $3/year/student assisted (37, pp. 14-15).

Illinois school participation in student aide programs is reported in NEA staff utilization research (37). Advanced students helped with test administration, paper correction, small group problems, and laboratory assistance in the Arlington Heights schools. In Beecher, Illinois,
student aides were recruited through "help wanted" cards posted on bulletin boards. Their duties included clerical work, cleaning and supply care, and library book circulation. Lack of recognition, lack of use of special skills, and reluctance to be considered "pets" hindered this program.

McGlothen (32, pp. 21-23) advocates a means of student supervision which reduces this problem. The student council can be recruited to supervise a program of student monitoring of school lunch rooms, corridors, and study halls.

Discussion of the paraprofessionals in the school reveals pro and con issues. Negative aspects include: the threat aides represent through justification of large classes; teacher-aide conflict; return to rote learning; and arbitrary division of the activities of the students. On the positive side are listed: merit in time of crisis; teacher recruitment benefits; creation of atmosphere conducive to personality development; slight increase in student achievement; and involvement of lay citizens in a worthwhile project (37, p. 17).

Hallfish (37, p. 18) mentions the possibility of solving much of the controversy centered on the aide program by using pre- rather than non-professional aides. His proposal includes future teachers spending part or all of their third college year in full-time aide work.

Team Teaching

Organization

Reorganization of the professional staff at the secondary level into teaching teams is a foremost trend in the search for solution of
teaching time difficulties. The team is usually involved in teaching a class of above average size in a flexibly scheduled program including flexibility in class period length. Variations of the team approach include (37, p. 20):

1. A team of four; two certified teachers and two non-certified assistants teaching large classes in one classroom;
2. A traditional classroom visit with regrouping of students in each experimental; and
3. A multiple number team with a unit coordinator, such as the six man team operating at the University of Chicago High School.

Emphasis on training and motivation of students to work independently in a responsible manner is integral to the team approach.

**Premise**

The premise on which team teaching experiments are based is that certain noninstructional duties of the teacher can be handled by others, freeing the teacher to teach. Differentiation of functions within the basic job of teaching is recognized.

**Benefits of team teaching**

Benefits accrued through the team approach include (37, p. 20):

1. Capitalization on strengths and obtainment of help with weaknesses of individual teachers;
2. Increased individual preparation time, with flexibly grouped students; and
3. Teaching of certain subjects more effectively in large groups.

**Problems related to team teaching**

Difficulties recognized in this approach center on team rapport, hierarchy, and overdependence, as well as on finding time to plan together. Complex attendance recording, particularly during the official
home room period becomes another disadvantage of team teaching (50, p. 183).

Wiley and Bishop (58, p. 15) report experience in providing increased teacher preparation time through employment of variable class scheduling without direct dollar increases in cost to the school district.

Studies of team teaching

Griffin (21, pp. 124-125) finds that team teachers should spend approximately two-thirds of their school week in classroom instruction, and the remaining one-third in curriculum responsibilities outside the classroom.

The role of the instruction assistant to the team teacher in one school is defined by Heller and Belford (24, p. 120) as: taking attendance, supervision of study areas, assisting in language and reading laboratories, grading papers, managing some seminars, and assisting during large group instruction.

The Instructional Materials Center

In many flexibly scheduled programs, the library, or instructional materials center (IMC), assumes paramount importance, functioning as the core of the program of instruction. The librarian and his assistants are given responsibility for provision to teachers of material on given subjects, as well as preparation of teaching materials if the library doesn't contain them as requested. Student instruction in the use of the IMC must be thorough. In many instances, students are employed as
assistants in the IMC (7, pp. 257-262).

A modular-flexible program described by Petrequin (42, pp. 85-89) features paraprofessional members of the resource center department team, who are asked to assume some of the clerical duties normally required of teachers. These duties include: supervision of the center and assistance to students; liaison work between the administrative office and teachers, and between teachers and students; check-out work; teacher assistance in the classroom; file organization; research and resource work; typing; paper and test grading; and textbook checking. Their primary purpose is assistance to students; their secondary purpose, assistance to teachers in distribution and collection of assignments, projects, and worksheets.

Electronic Teaching Aids

A report of the Committee of Economic Development (10, pp. 38-39), dealing with change in the American educational system, advocates freeing the classroom teacher of much routine work through use of electronic teaching aids. Mentioned were: centralized tape libraries, closed circuit television, electronic teaching machines, programmed learning systems, scanning devices in the classroom linked to the library and records office, computer centers for grading examinations, and computers for cataloging and retrieving information.
Teacher Attitudes

Problem Solution Policy

Perhaps the most beneficial point of departure in solving the problem of teacher dissatisfaction is instigation of teacher involvement in meetings designed to attack the problem. A dictatorial policy is often the basis of complaints regarding "over-load". Cooperative attitudes and techniques of administration relieve this problem.

Related studies

Weber (56, pp. 138-140) found the sources of teacher dissatisfaction with the teaching load to be: 18 per cent - requirements of extra-curricular work; 15 per cent - clerical and administrative work; 12 per cent - planning. Those teachers reporting considerable strain complained most frequently about the above mentioned factors, in addition to poor facilities, and guidance activities.

The NEA (14, pp. 33-40) mentions build-up of many jobs requiring a few minutes each, such as collection of monies, lunchroom, corridor, and bus duty, and taking attendance, as a source of mounting frustration. Outside the school day, teachers are asked to add to these non-professional responsibilities through patrol of schools and parking lots during dances, maintaining order at sports events, ticket collection, etc.

Efficiency demands relief from these roles.

Causal elements of time to teach problems include (34, pp. 10-12):

1. Community double standards - the community is desirous of respect for authority, yet fails to respect teachers;
2. Superintendent and school board double standards - they want a professional staff, yet fail to allow innovation and to provide self-study and growth opportunities; and

3. Classroom teacher double standards - the teacher wants to mold pupils, yet often faces, rather than guides; he wants to participate in teaching decisions, yet fails to assume responsibility for them; he wants time to plan, yet fails to make advantageous use of the time provided.

In North Dakota, classroom teachers resolved that (34, p. 6):

1. Administrative personnel and teacher education instructors be asked to teach at least one public school class every three years;
2. Cocurricular activities should not be allowed to interfere with the academic program;
3. Educational secretaries should be employed to relieve teachers of clerical chores;
4. A free lunch period plus one unassigned period each day be provided for teachers;
5. Public solicitation by school children should be discouraged; and
6. Classroom teachers should be involved in devising and evaluating school policies, and share in the responsibility imposed by such policies.

Means (33) in studying problems related to teacher morale and turnover, devised a four-point rating scale to reflect the degree of felt need for improvement by principals and teachers concerning 31 identified personnel services. Those services found to be in greatest need of improvement included clerical aid, relief from pupil contact, and lighter loads for beginning teachers. Those teachers teaching at the secondary level and possessing higher academic degrees felt the most need for improvement.

Denemark (17, pp. 17-19) pointed to the danger of standardization of curricula rather than individualization if teachers are kept busy in supervision, recording, and other non-professional duties. He suggests that it is unrealistic to establish the same standards for
and assign the same duties to all teachers. The talent range must be considered.

Kuhlen (29), in discussing career development in teaching, with reference to changing motivation, pressures, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction of secondary school teachers, finds that career stability increases with age, yet serious reservations regarding the professional status of the occupation remain. Less than one-fifth of those interviewed assigned it "good" status, while the same proportion felt it was improving.

Peterson (41, pp. 264-315) reported research dealing with age, teacher's role, and the institutional setting. His methodology centered on comprehensive interviews with a relatively small sample of female public high school teachers in a medium-sized Midwestern city. His emphasis was on insights, with qualitative techniques. Concern centered on social patterns and processes. These teachers generally felt that the early years of teaching, following a few years experience, but while energy levels remained high, were most satisfactory. Focus was on concern with moral decline and lack of discipline, with this overriding teaching in many cases. These older teachers placed great emphasis on informal seniority rights. Implications of the study suggest the necessity of consideration of age, commitment, and job satisfaction in duty assignments.

Summary

Concern with the widely divergent aspects of full professionalism of the teacher and the need for major revisions in the educational
system to provide efficient use of teacher time are the objects of widespread study and experimentation. The major discernible trends devised to accomplish these objectives are centered on the use of para-professional aides, flexible scheduling, team teaching, and electronic teaching aids. Many of these programs are still in their initial stages, yet reliable evaluation and development of other programs have already been accomplished. These programs are currently being integrated into America's schools in an effort to provide the best and most efficient methods of education for the students of the country, coupled with satisfactory working conditions for their teachers.
CHAPTER 111: METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to investigate the scope of non-teaching assignments in Iowa Public Secondary Schools (grades 9-12) and to determine the effect of certain variables on non-teaching assignment practices as compared with school size.

This chapter will describe the methods and procedures which were utilized to gather and analyze the data required for the completion of the study. The chapter has been divided into four sections: (1) description of the population, (2) description of the variables, (3) description and collection of the data, and (4) analysis of the data.

Description of the Population

The population utilized in this study included secondary teachers (grades 9-12) employed in all Iowa public school districts during the 1967-1968 school year. The term secondary teachers usually includes teachers in grades 7-12, however for this study the population was limited to grades 9-12. This was felt necessary because of the vast differences in assignments of teachers in grades 7 and 8 as compared with grades 9-12. The population was further refined by using just the teachers that were assigned, as part of their regular duties, the direct supervision of students in a "non-classroom" situation.

The total population of teachers used was further sub-divided by school district size. The criteria used in this breakdown was the total school age population by district. The breakdown by student population and number of schools in each category are shown in Figure 1.
Student population | Number of schools
---|---
200- 499 | 116
500- 749 | 124
750- 999 | 68
1000-1499 | 56
1500-1999 | 27
2000-2999 | 37
3000-Over | 27

Figure 1. Breakdown of student population per district and number of schools per category

The breakdown of school sizes is the same as that used by the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction for reporting purposes.

Description of the Variables

This study was concerned primarily with the comparison of certain "non-teaching" duty assignments with selected teacher variables as compared with school sizes.

Non-teaching duty assignments

The basic data on non-teaching duty assignments were taken from the Card-Pac files of the Iowa Educational Information Center for the reporting period covering the 1967-1968 school year. The Card-Pac system, cooperatively developed by the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction
and the Iowa Educational Information Center, provides information needed by local, state, and other educational agencies.

This study was primarily interested in obtaining information concerning the hours per week that each teacher spent in the following non-teaching assignments:

1. Homeroom
2. Study hall
3. Lunch room
4. Library
5. School grounds
6. School crossings
7. Hall duty

Information on secondary teachers in Iowa Public Schools (grades 9-12) showing the hours per week spent in the seven non-teaching areas for the 1967-1968 school year was provided on tape by the Iowa Educational Information Center.

**Teacher variables**

Information concerning the individual teacher was taken from the Iowa Professional School Employees Data Sheet (IPSEDS) 1967-1968 school year. Information was gathered concerning the following six variables:

1. Years of experience
2. Major academic assignment
3. Type of degree held
4. Teacher age
5. Tenure in this system
6. Sex of teacher

The information concerning the individual teacher was provided by the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction.

For the purpose of this study the above variables were defined as follows:
Years of experience  The total number of years spent in the teaching profession, regardless of the school district, constituted the total years of experience. Years of experience was categorized in the following manner:

1. 0-1  
2. 2-3  
3. 4-5  
4. 6-10  
5. 11-15  
6. 16-20  
7. 21-Over

Major academic assignment  Any one academic area where a teacher spent 50 per cent of his time was considered a major academic assignment. The major academic assignments were drawn from the following list as prepared by the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction.

1. Agriculture  
2. Art  
3. Biology  
4. Business Education  
5. Chemistry  
6. Communicative Arts  
7. Foreign Language  
8. General Science  
9. Health and Physical Education  
10. Home Economics  
11. Industrial Arts  
12. Mathematics  
13. Music  
14. Other Science  
15. Physical Science  
16. Physics  
17. Social Science  
18. Technical

Type of degree held  The type of degree variable was broken down in such a way to coincide with the reporting forms used by the teacher certification branch of the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction.
The type of degrees were reported in the following categories:

1. Less than 2 year
2. Two year
3. B.A. or B.S.
4. M.A. or M.S.
5. Specialist
6. Doctorate

Teacher age The teacher age variable was categorized in the following manner:

1. Under 20
2. 21-25
3. 26-30
4. 31-35
5. 36-40
6. 41-45
7. 46-50
8. 51-55
9. 56-60
10. 61-65
11. 66-Over

Tenure in this system The tenure variable contained the number of years teaching experience the teacher had in the school district he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year. Tenure was categorized in the following manner:

1. 0-1
2. 2-3
3. 4-5
4. 6-10
5. 11-15
6. 16-20
7. 21-Over

Sex of the teacher It was felt necessary to include this variable because of the recent emphasis being placed on the equalization of pay for teachers.
Collection of Data

All of the data used in this study were taken from two sources; the Card-Pac files and the Iowa Professional School Employees Data Sheet; both sources of information were completed by Iowa public school teachers in the fall of 1967. The data on Card-Pac were available from the Iowa Educational Information Center on one IBM computer tape whereas the data on IPSEDS were available from the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction on three IBM computer tapes. Thomas stated that he felt that the data taken from the Card-Pac cards and placed on tape were accurate within an approximate error of less than four per cent, whereas Perry felt that the IPSEDS tapes were accurate within approximate error of two-five per cent.¹ ²

The IBM tape containing the Card-Pac information was used in its original form. However, much information was included on the IPSEDS tapes that was not appropriate to this study. Therefore, it was necessary to transpose the desired information to a second set of tapes. The second set of IPSEDS tapes was then merged with the tape containing the Card-Pac information. The merger of the two tapes was made possible by the matching of social security numbers of the individual teacher. This provided the common linkage between the two files.

¹ Don Thomas. Project Coordinator. Iowa Educational Information Center. State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. Personal interview. 1968.

Analysis of the Data

After the reorganization of the original data to a second and third set of tapes was completed, the analysis of the data took place in five steps: (1) The school districts were divided by student population into seven categories; (2) The six variables to be considered were tabled by school district size; (3) The number of teachers fitting each variable and school size category were calculated and tabled; (4) The mean amount of time for each group of teachers was matched with the proper variable and tabled with the corresponding non-teaching assignment; and (5) The data were analyzed statistically.

School district division

The 455 school districts were divided into seven size categories. The decision was made by the student population parameter as established by the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction.

Variables

Each of the six variables studied were tabled within each of the seven school district size category. Eight tables were produced for each variable, one for each size category and one for total.

Variable, school size and assignment

Each teacher reporting was categorized by variable and school size. After matching of these two, the amount of time in hours per week per assignments as reported by the teachers was tabled by the corresponding assignments.
Calculation of means

The mean amount of time by school size, by variable, and by assignment was calculated from the raw data mentioned above and put in table form.

Analysis

A total of six Analysis of Variance tables were constructed, one for each of the six variables. Statistically significant differences were determined by a values of "F" table in Popham (44, p. 399). It was assumed that the Analysis of Variance was an adequate method of reporting the data, and that a study of this type did not demand a more powerful technique which could have led to conclusions that were not justifiable on the basis of the data utilized.

All programs utilized in the analysis of the data for this study were filed at the Iowa Educational Information Center, Iowa City, Iowa.

Summary

The method of analysis of the data consisted of determining a mean figure for each variable in each non-teaching duty assignment and comparing the computed means by school sizes. The differences were compared by using the Analysis of Variance Technique.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the scope of non-teaching duty assignments in Iowa Public Secondary Schools, (grades 9 - 12), and to determine the effect of certain teacher variables on non-teaching assignment practices as compared with school size. The findings reported were based on data gathered for the 1967-1968 school year.

The report of the findings has been divided into two major sections. One is the number of teachers and the mean number of hours per week spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments as categorized by school size, total years experience, major academic assignment, type of degree, age, tenure, and sex. This data is presented in table form. Because of the close relationship between the various school sizes, three school size categories (200-499, 1000-1499, 3000-over), and the total for each variable are discussed. The remainder of the tables by variable are found in Appendices A through F. Second is the report of the statistical analyses of the variables. The questions asked and the hypotheses stated in Chapter I have formed an integral part of this chapter.

Non-Teaching Assignments Categorized by Variables and School Size

The data were presented by teacher variable for each school size category. The six variables and the order in which they were tabled are: total years of experience, major academic assignment, type of degree held, teacher age, tenure, and sex. Four tables for each variable were
reported, the remainder of the tables appear in the appendices.

An examination of the tables presented will reveal that the N column in the Total is not a cumulative total. The total column represents the number of individuals involved. In many cases one individual was involved in more than one non-teaching assignment; therefore, the rows are not additive.

**Total years experience**

For the purpose of this study, total years teaching experience was categorized in the following manner: 0-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, and 21-over.

Table 1 indicates that when teachers in school systems with a total enrollment of 200-499 were categorized by total years of teaching experience 800 individuals were involved in non-teaching duty assignments. Study hall had the greatest total number of occurrences with 575 with a mean number of hours per week of 4.5 per individual. School crossings had the smallest number of total occurrences with six and a mean number of hours per week of 1.6. Hall duty had the second highest number of occurrences with a total of 364 and a total mean of 1.9. Table 1 also indicates that of the 800 teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments, 2-3 years teaching experience was the most prominent with 189 people involved whereas the 16-20 year category had the least number of people involved with 57. However, it is interesting to note that the 83 people involved in non-teaching assignments with 21 or more years of teaching experience spent an average of 7.0 hours per week in non-teaching
Table 1. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 200 - 499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD^a No.</th>
<th>HD^a Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aThe abbreviations in this table and throughout are as follows: HR = homeroom; SH = study hall; LR = lunch room; L = library; SG = school grounds; SC = school crossings; HD = hall duty.
duty assignments, which was the highest reported. Teachers with 11-15 total years teaching experience spent on the average the least number of hours per week in non-teaching assignments with 5.1. On the average, the 800 teachers involved spent 5.9 hours per week performing these duties.

Table 2 indicates that school districts with an enrollment of 1000-1499 had a total of 759 teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments which is less than that reported for the schools with 200-499 enrollment. Of the 759 teachers involved, study hall once again had the highest total occurrence with 473 and a mean of 4.7 hours. School crossings had the fewest people involved with 14 and a mean of 3.0 hours per week. It is interesting to note that only 19 teachers were involved in library supervision in schools with an enrollment of 1000-1499 whereas Table 1 indicated 50 teachers were involved in library supervision in schools with 200-499 enrollment. Considering the total of 759 teachers the largest number, or 183, came from the category with 6-10 years experience whereas the smallest number of 82 came from the category of first year teachers. This shows a marked change from the trend in schools with 200-499 enrollments. On the average, the 759 teachers in schools with enrollments of 1000-1499 spent 5.6 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments.

Table 3 presents the data for schools with an enrollment of 3000-over; this represents the 27 largest districts in Iowa. A total of 993 teachers were involved in non-teaching assignments. Homeroom had the highest occurrence with 861 people involved. These teachers spent an average of 1.4 hours per week in homeroom supervision. School crossings
Table 2. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 1000 - 1499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 3000 - over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
again had the lowest total number of occurrences with only two, and an
average of 2.8 hours per week. It is interesting to notice that of the
861 teachers involved in homeroom assignments, teachers with 21 or more
years of experience had the highest occurrence with 175, whereas teachers
in their first year of teaching had the fewest number involved with only
79. This pattern also holds true when considering the total 993 teachers
involved. Non-teaching assignments were most common with teachers with
21 or more years experience, 193 teachers were involved, whereas only 93
teachers were involved in their first year of teaching. Although the
total number of teachers represented by the two extremes were vastly dif­
ferent, the average number of hours per week were the same at 3.7.
Teachers in school districts of over 3000 that are involved in non­
teaching duty assignments spent on the average 3.9 hours per week per­
forming these duties.

Table 4 represents the tabulation of non-teaching duty assignments
for the total state as categorized by total years teaching experience.
A total of 5,759 teachers were involved in non-teaching duty assignments.
Study hall had the largest number of occurrences with 3,305 teachers in­
volved. Hall duty had the second highest number of occurrences with
2,601. School crossing had the lowest number of occurrences with only
51. Library supervision represented the second lowest number of occur­
rences with 214, however the total average number of hours per week was
9.7 which was the highest reported. Teachers with 16-20 years experience
represented the smallest group with 492, however the average number of
Table 4. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, total schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5759</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hours per week were the same for both groups. On the average, the 5,759 teachers in the state that were involved in non-teaching duty assignments spent 5.3 hours per week on these assignments.

**Major academic assignment**

Any one academic area where a teacher spent 50 per cent of his time was considered a major academic assignment. Table 5 indicates the 18 academic areas by which teachers were categorized. In schools representing a student population of 200-499, it will be noticed that no teachers were involved in non-teaching duty assignments that had either Physics or Technical as a major academic assignment. It was assumed that very few teachers probably work in these two areas in this particular school size category. Table 5 also indicates that of the total 800 teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments only three were teachers of Agriculture whereas 129 were classified as Other Science Teachers. Of the 575 study hall assignments involved, 90 were classified as Other Science Teachers whereas Agriculture only had three occurrences in study hall. The only other occurrence which involved an agriculture teacher was hall duty.

Table 6 indicates a close relationship with Table 5 in the total distribution of the number of teachers involved. The 56 schools reporting in this category had a total of 759 teachers spending time in non-teaching duties. The total indicates a wide range, from one person in Physics to 264 in Other Science. However, the physics teacher spent only
Table 5. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, enrollments 200 - 499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. assignmet.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Sci.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, enrollments 1000 - 1499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. assgnmt.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Sci.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
.4 of an hour per week whereas the Other Science Teachers spent on the average 6.8 hours performing such duties. Hall duty had the second highest number of occurrences with 361 teachers and an average of 2.1 hours per week.

Table 7, which represents the largest schools in Iowa, indicates that Physical Science Teachers spent on the average 4.9 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments. This represents the highest average reported in this school size category. Agriculture had no teachers involved in non-teaching duties, however Technical had two people assigned. It is interesting to note that Library has only 12 occurrences, this would indicate that in many of the larger schools the librarian is not assigned to student supervision duties. The largest number of occurrences in Library is represented from the Other Science Teachers with five.

Table 8, which represents the total state as categorized by major academic assignment, shows that more Other Science Teachers are involved in non-teaching duties than any other area. The second highest is communicative arts with Social Science third. The smallest number of teachers involved comes from Technical with Distributive Education having the second smallest. It is also interesting to note that the 38 Agriculture teachers involved in the state spent on the average a total of seven hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments. This represents the highest total average reported.

Type of degree

For the purposes of this study teachers were divided into five degree levels: none, B.A., M.A., Specialist, and Doctorate. An examination of
Table 7. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, enrollments 3000 - over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. assgnmt.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys.Sci.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, total schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. asgnmt.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.1035</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Sci.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5759</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 9-12 will reveal that no teacher with the Doctorate Degree was involved in non-teaching duty assignments during the 1967-1968 school year. However, four teachers with a specialist degree were involved. This indicates that the remaining 5,755 teachers involved were distributed among the three categories of no degree, B.A., or M.A.

Table 9 which represents the schools with enrollments of 200-499 indicates that of the total 800 teachers involved, 12 had no degree, 684 had a B.A., and 104 had an M.A. However, the 12 teachers with no degree spent on the average 10.6 hours per week performing non-teaching duties, while the 684 teachers with a B.A. spent 6.0 hours per week and the 104 teachers with an M.A. spent 4.7 hours. This would indicate that in schools with a total enrollment of 200-499, as the educational level of the teacher increases, the amount of time spent in non-teaching duty assignments decreases. Of the 12 teachers with no degree, study hall also had the highest number of occurrences with teachers having a B.A. and M.A. with 492 and 76 respectively.

Table 10, which represents the 56 schools with enrollments of 1000-1499 indicates that 15 teachers with no degree were involved in non-teaching duty assignments while 624 had a B.A. and 120 had an M.A. However, in this school size category as the educational level increased the average amount of time spent in non-teaching duties did not decrease, as was the case in school sizes of 200-499. Table 10 will show that the 120 teachers with the M.A. degree spent on an average of 6.0 hours per week performing these duties, whereas teachers with a B.A. spent 5.6
Table 9. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 200 - 499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 1000 - 1499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hours per week. Of the 120 people with the M.A. degree, 62 of the occurrences were in study hall.

Of the four teachers having the Specialist degree that were involved in non-teaching duty assignments, three were represented in schools with an enrollment of 3000-over, (Table 11). The other teacher with the Specialist degree was found in a school with an enrollment of 750-999, Appendix C, Table 40. This particular teacher was involved in both study hall and lunch room supervision with an average amount of time of 4.2 hours per week. Table 11 indicates that the three teachers with the Specialist degree spent an average of 4.1 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments, while teachers with no degree and teachers with an M.A. degree spent 3.8 hours per week in these duties. With the exception of the M.A. degree, as the educational level of the the teachers increased in the largest school districts, the total average amount of time spent in non-teaching duty assignments also increased. Of the 993 teachers reporting in the largest schools, homeroom had the greatest number of occurrences with 861. This indicates a change in pattern as study hall had the greatest number of occurrences in the smaller schools. Table 41, Appendix C indicates that this change becomes apparent in schools with a student population of 1500-1999.

Table 12 shows that of the 5,759 teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments, 73 had no degree and spent on the average 7.4 hours per week performing these duties, 4,704 had a B.A. degree and spent 5.4 hours per week, 977 had an M.A. degree and spent 4.7 hours per week, and four
Table 11. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 3000 - over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, total schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2759</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had a Specialist degree and spent on the average 4.1 hours per week. This would indicate that when considering the entire state, as the educational level of teachers increases, the average amount of time spent in non-teaching duties decreases. It is interesting to note that the only duty that teachers without a degree are not included in is school crossings. Across the state, study hall has by far the greatest number of occurrences with 3,305, while school crossings has the least with only 51.

**Teacher age**

For the purpose of this study the variable of teacher age was divided into 11 categories with intervals of five years. An examination of Appendix D and Tables 13-16 will reveal that there were no teachers under 20 who were assigned non-teaching duty assignments. Table 13 shows that of the 800 teachers involved in schools with enrollments of 200-499, the range was from 217 teachers who were 21-25, to 10 teachers who were 66 or over. However, the younger teachers spent on the average 6.3 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments as compared with 6.8 hours per week for the teachers 66 and over. It is interesting to note that the 50 teachers involved in school crossings again had the lowest number of occurrences with six and an average of 1.6 hours per week. Teachers involved in library supervision spent on the average of 13.9 hours per week performing these duties.

Table 14 indicates that in schools with enrollments of 1000-1499, 185 teachers in the age category of 26-30 were involved in non-teaching duty assignments. This shows a change from the practice in the smallest
Table 13. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 200 - 499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR No. Mean</th>
<th>SH No. Mean</th>
<th>LR No. Mean</th>
<th>L No. Mean</th>
<th>SG No. Mean</th>
<th>SC No. Mean</th>
<th>HD No. Mean</th>
<th>Total No. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>46 2.5</td>
<td>168 4.8</td>
<td>24 2.1</td>
<td>9 19.4</td>
<td>16 1.5</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td>104 1.9</td>
<td>217 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>37 1.7</td>
<td>125 4.4</td>
<td>21 2.1</td>
<td>6 13.0</td>
<td>26 2.0</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>81 1.8</td>
<td>178 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>21 1.2</td>
<td>66 4.0</td>
<td>10 2.3</td>
<td>2 16.7</td>
<td>9 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>43 1.7</td>
<td>93 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>9 0.7</td>
<td>39 4.1</td>
<td>12 3.0</td>
<td>1 4.6</td>
<td>6 2.1</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>23 2.2</td>
<td>58 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>14 2.2</td>
<td>46 4.4</td>
<td>11 2.7</td>
<td>6 10.3</td>
<td>7 2.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>27 2.1</td>
<td>67 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>11 1.9</td>
<td>35 4.3</td>
<td>5 2.2</td>
<td>3 5.3</td>
<td>5 2.1</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>24 2.1</td>
<td>50 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>8 1.2</td>
<td>25 4.0</td>
<td>7 2.0</td>
<td>4 13.5</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>17 1.7</td>
<td>38 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>11 1.7</td>
<td>32 4.8</td>
<td>6 2.0</td>
<td>8 17.5</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>23 1.8</td>
<td>45 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>8 1.2</td>
<td>33 6.1</td>
<td>5 3.0</td>
<td>9 12.1</td>
<td>4 2.1</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>19 2.3</td>
<td>44 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>6 4.3</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>2 11.0</td>
<td>1 9.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>10 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166 1.8</td>
<td>575 4.5</td>
<td>102 2.4</td>
<td>50 13.9</td>
<td>80 1.9</td>
<td>6 1.6</td>
<td>364 1.9</td>
<td>800 5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 1000 - 1499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
schools reporting. It will also be noted that teachers in the 1000-1499 enrollment category spent on the average 5.6 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments as compared with 5.9 hours per week reported in the smallest schools. Teachers in the age category of 56-60 spent on the average 9.9 hours per week carrying out non-teaching duty assignments; this was the highest total mean reported for this enrollment category.

Table 15, which represents the largest schools reporting, also indicates that non-teaching duty assignments were most prominent in the 26-30 age category with 220 of the total 993 teachers involved. These 220 teachers spent on the average 4.0 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments. The age category containing the smallest number of teachers was 66-over; this category contained six people with an average of 1.6 hours per week. It is interesting to note that the bulk of non-teaching duty assignments in the largest schools are assigned to teachers with an age range of 21-40. The trend is then downward by age with the exception of the ages of 61-65. This age category had 86 teachers assigned which is higher than the two categories ranging from 51-55 and 56-60. Homeroom had the greatest number of occurrences with 861 whereas study hall was second with 373.

Table 16, which represents the total schools reporting by teacher age, indicates that non-teaching duty assignments are most prominent among teachers that are 26-30 years of age. The over 66 category has the fewest number of teachers involved with 43; however, these 43 teachers spend on the average of 6.0 hours per week performing these duties. When
Table 15. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 3000 - over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR No. Mean</th>
<th>SH No. Mean</th>
<th>LR No. Mean</th>
<th>L No. Mean</th>
<th>SG No. Mean</th>
<th>SC No. Mean</th>
<th>HD No. Mean</th>
<th>Total No. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>134 1.5</td>
<td>53 4.4</td>
<td>18 2.4</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 8.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>44 2.3</td>
<td>156 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>190 1.5</td>
<td>90 4.4</td>
<td>34 2.3</td>
<td>2 2.6</td>
<td>7 0.6</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>53 2.1</td>
<td>220 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>95 1.4</td>
<td>49 5.2</td>
<td>21 2.2</td>
<td>3 21.1</td>
<td>4 2.7</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>28 2.1</td>
<td>114 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>96 1.3</td>
<td>42 3.8</td>
<td>18 2.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>8 1.8</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>25 1.8</td>
<td>105 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>80 1.2</td>
<td>35 3.9</td>
<td>15 2.9</td>
<td>1 40.0</td>
<td>7 1.6</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td>17 2.2</td>
<td>92 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>72 1.3</td>
<td>26 4.0</td>
<td>13 2.1</td>
<td>1 0.9</td>
<td>4 1.0</td>
<td>1 4.6</td>
<td>33 2.0</td>
<td>87 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>60 1.3</td>
<td>27 4.3</td>
<td>6 2.3</td>
<td>3 14.8</td>
<td>2 1.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>21 2.1</td>
<td>75 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>48 1.3</td>
<td>15 4.3</td>
<td>5 2.4</td>
<td>1 27.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>11 2.0</td>
<td>52 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>80 1.3</td>
<td>35 4.7</td>
<td>9 1.8</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>2 1.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>21 1.9</td>
<td>86 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>6 0.8</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
<td>6 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861 1.4</td>
<td>373 4.4</td>
<td>139 2.3</td>
<td>12 15.3</td>
<td>35 1.7</td>
<td>2 2.8</td>
<td>254 2.1</td>
<td>993 3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, total schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table presents the number of non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age across different schools, with columns for different types of assignments: HR, SH, LR, L, SG, SC, HD, and total number of assignments. The mean values are provided for each category.
considering the entire state, most of the non-teaching duty assignments are clustered among the teachers from 21-35. The overall trend shows that as teacher age increases, the number of teachers involved decreases; however, the average number of hours spent per week in non-teaching duty assignments increases.

Tenure

For the purpose of this study, the category of tenure was divided into seven levels. The first three levels were divided by one-year intervals and the next three by five-year intervals. This was felt necessary because the bulk of non-teaching assignments fall in the first three categories.

Table 17, which represents schools with enrollments of 200-499, shows that of the total 800 teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments, 290 had taught in that particular school system 2-3 years and spent on the average 6.2 hours per week performing these duties. First year teachers in a particular school system also had a relative high representation with 209 teachers spending on the average 5.4 hours per week in non-teaching duties. Sixteen teachers with tenure of 21-over years spent on the average 4.9 hours per week in non-teaching duties. Study hall, which involved the greatest number of occurrences, had 206 teachers involved with 2-3 years tenure. Table 17 indicates that after 10 years experience in a school system of 200-499 enrollment the number of teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments decreases.
Table 17. Non-teaching assignments categorized by tenure, enrollments 200 - 499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Non-teaching assignments categorized by tenure, enrollments 1000 - 1499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 indicates a trend in non-teaching duty assignments which is comparable to Table 17. Of the 759 teachers involved in non-teaching duty assignments, 214 had a tenure of 2-3 years. Six-ten years experience in a particular school system was second with 176 teachers involved. Teachers in their first year teaching were third with 162. Teachers in the tenure category of 6-10 years spent on the average 5.0 hours per week in non-teaching assignments; this represented the smallest mean reported. The 23 teachers reported in the 16-20 year category reported a mean of 8.2 hours per week; this figure was also reported by the 56 teachers in the 11-15 year category.

Table 19, which represents the largest schools, indicates a similar trend to Tables 17 and 18; however, the total number of teachers involved appears to be more evenly distributed across total years teaching experience. Teachers with 4-5 years tenure spent on the average 4.7 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments, while teachers with 11-15 years tenure spent only 3.4 hours per week performing the same duties. It is interesting to note that the 373 teachers involved in study hall supervision are fairly evenly distributed as compared with tenure.

Table 20 indicates that the greatest number of non-teaching duty assignments are supervised by teachers with 2-3 years tenure; these 1,700 teachers spent an average of 5.1 hours per week performing these duties. First year teachers in a particular system spent on the average 5.4 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments. The highest mean number of hours per week, 5.6, was reported by teachers with tenure of 6-10 years.
Table 19. Non-teaching assignments categorized by tenure, enrollments 3000 - over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Non-teaching assignments categorized by tenure, total schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>5755</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21, which represents schools with enrollments of 200-499, indicates that of the 800 teachers involved, 494 were men and 306 were women. Men spent on the average 5.5 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments, while women spent on the average 6.5 hours per week. Men were involved more in each non-teaching duty assignment with the exception of library supervision. Women teachers were involved in every non-teaching duty assignment with the exception of school crossings.

Table 22 indicates a greater range in the division of non-teaching duty assignments between men and women. Of the total 759 teachers involved, 474 were men and spent an average of 5.4 hours per week on such duties while 285 were women and spent 6.1 hours per week. This ratio holds fairly constant in all non-teaching duties with the exception of school crossings where six men were included as compared with eight women.

Table 23 indicates that of the 993 teachers in the largest school districts involved in non-teaching duty assignments, 536 were men and 457 were women. The average number of hours per week in large schools was very close between men and women; it was reported as 3.9 for men and 4.0 for women. It is interesting to note that only one man was involved in library supervision as compared with 11 women. It will also be noted that the 11 women involved spent an average of 16.6 hours per week in library supervision. This was by far the highest average reported in non-teaching duty assignments in the large schools. Of the 993 teachers reporting, only two occurrences appeared in school crossing supervision; both of these assignments were filled by men.
Table 21. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 200 - 499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 1000 - 1499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 shows non-teaching duty assignments as categorized by sex for the total state. Of the 5,759 teachers involved, 3,521 were men and 2,238 were women. Men spent on the average 5.2 hours per week performing non-teaching duties and women spent 5.5 hours per week. The non-teaching duty assignment requiring the least amount of time was homeroom supervision with 1.8 hours per week, whereas library supervision required 9.7 hours per week.

Summary

The following summary is compiled from the data as it was presented in Tables 1-24. Seven non-teaching duty assignments were studied and the total average amount of time spent by teachers carrying out these assignments were calculated. Library supervision required the greatest total average amount of time, 9.7 hours per week. Study hall and school crossings supervision were next; they required an average of 4.5 hours per week. School grounds supervision was next; it required an average of 2.4 hours per week. Lunch room and hall duty supervision both required 2.0 hours per week, and finally home room supervision required 1.8 hours per week. The overall average number of hours per week when distributed across the seven non-teaching duty assignments was 5.3 hours per week.

The seven non-teaching duty assignments were tabled with the six teacher variables presented in the study. Teachers that are represented in the most common non-teaching duty assignments had the following characteristics: had 6-10 years of total teaching experience; taught in the Other Science Field; had a B.A. degree; was 26-30 years old; had taught
Table 23. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 3000 - over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, total schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3521</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5759</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for 2-3 years in the system he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year; and was a male.

Statistical Analysis

The purpose of this study was to investigate the scope of non-teaching duty assignments in Iowa public secondary schools (grades 9-12) and to determine the effect of certain teacher variables on non-teaching assignment practices as compared with school size. The scope of non-teaching duty assignments was reported in the first section of this chapter. The effect of certain variables on non-teaching duty assignment practices as compared with school size will be reported in this section.

The total average number of hours per week spent by teachers performing non-teaching duty assignments were computed by school size, teacher variable, and type of assignment. The differences in these means became the basis for the statistical analysis utilized in this study.

The analysis of variance - multiple classification - was selected as the technique that best describes the comparison of the mean amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments when categorized by school size, teacher variables, and type of assignments. A total of 5,759 teachers were utilized in gathering the data for this study. In carrying out the calculation for the analysis of variance, it was decided that an N of this magnitude was not necessary. Therefore, the N was randomly reduced to a range from 3,871 to 3,227. This was done to expedite the analysis process. In interpreting the F table, any N over 1000 is interpreted equivalently. All of the hypotheses tested in the study were
tested at both the 0.05 and 0.01 levels of significance. The significance levels were determined by the values of F table in Popham (44, p. 399). The degrees of freedom used ranged from one to 3870. In the analysis of variance technique the statement of no significant difference in form is essentially the statement of no appreciable difference between the means of the variables under investigation. If the tabular F value was lower than the calculated F value, the difference was considered to be significant or highly significant depending on the level, in which case, the null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected and a significant difference was assumed. The hypotheses will be discussed in the order in which they were presented in Chapter I.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size.

Because a different N count was used in testing each variable, the category of school size will appear as the first main affect in Tables 25-30. It will be noted that each F is highly significant at the .01 level. Table 26 which reports the smallest N used of 3226 indicates a calculated F of 10.493. Tables 25-30 indicate that there is a highly significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size.

The null hypothesis was rejected.
Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher.

The F value of 3.120 reported in Table 25 indicates that there is a significant difference at the .01 level between the average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher.

Table 25 shows an F value of 1.203 which indicates that there is no significant difference of average total cost of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 25. Analysis of variance of non-teaching assignment time by school size and total years teaching experience of the individual teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1585.901</td>
<td>264.316</td>
<td>8.308**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>595.665</td>
<td>99.277</td>
<td>3.120**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x experience</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1378.589</td>
<td>38.294</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>120925.413</td>
<td>31.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3849</td>
<td>124485.569</td>
<td>32.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Values significant at or beyond the one per cent level of confidence, here and throughout other tables.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the major academic assignment of the individual teacher.

Table 26 shows an F value of 3.172 which indicates that there is a significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the major academic assignment of the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was rejected.
Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the major academic assignment of the individual teacher.

Table 26 indicates an F value of 0.632 which is not significant. This indicates no significant interaction between size of school and the major academic assignment of the individual teacher in relation to time spent in non-teaching duty assignments.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 26. Analysis of variance of non-teaching assignment time by school size and major academic assignment of the individual teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1807.804</td>
<td>301.300</td>
<td>10.439**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major academic assignment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1556.687</td>
<td>91.5698</td>
<td>3.172**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x assignment</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1861.015</td>
<td>18.245</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>89503.668</td>
<td>28.862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3226</td>
<td>94729.175</td>
<td>29.364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the type of degree held by the individual teacher.

Table 27 indicates an F value of 0.841 which is not significant. This indicates there is no significant difference in the total average amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching assignments when based on the type of degree held by the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the type of degree held by the individual teacher.

Table 27 shows an F value of 0.591 which is not significant. This indicates no significant interaction between size of school and type of degree held by the teacher in relation to time spent by the teacher in non-teaching duty assignments.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public
secondary school teachers when based on the age of the individual teacher.

Table 28 reports an F value of 2.622 which is significant at the .01 level. This indicates that there is a significant difference in average amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments when teachers are categorized by age.

The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 27. Analysis of variance of non-teaching assignment time by school size and type of degree held by the individual teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1343.057</td>
<td>223.842</td>
<td>6.978**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80.928</td>
<td>26.976</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>341.666</td>
<td>18.981</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3612</td>
<td>115860.617</td>
<td>32.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3639</td>
<td>117626.270</td>
<td>32.323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Analysis of variance of non-teaching assignment time by school size and age of the individual teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1432.507</td>
<td>238.751</td>
<td>7.840**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher age</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>718.822</td>
<td>79.869</td>
<td>2.622**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x age</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2264.889</td>
<td>41.942</td>
<td>1.377*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3759</td>
<td>114471.204</td>
<td>30.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3828</td>
<td>118887.422</td>
<td>31.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values significant at or beyond the five per cent level of confidence, here and throughout following tables.
Hypothesis 9

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the age of the individual teacher.

Table 28 shows an F value of 1.377 which is significant at the .05 level. This indicates there is a significant difference in the total average amount of non-teaching assignment time when school sizes interact with the age of the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 10

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the number of years the individual teacher had taught in the school system he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year.

Table 29 shows a calculated F value of 1.707 which is not significant. This indicates that there is no significant difference of average total amount of time spent in non-teaching assignments when teachers are categorized by tenure.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 11

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public
secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the number of years the individual teachers had taught in the school system he was teaching in during the 1967-1968 school year.

Table 29 indicates an F value of 1.347 which is not significant. This indicates there is no interaction between school size and teacher tenure in the total average amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching assignments.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 29. Analysis of variance of non-teaching assignment time by school size and tenure of the individual teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1385.794</td>
<td>230.965</td>
<td>7.660**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>308.838</td>
<td>51.473</td>
<td>1.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x tenure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1462.878</td>
<td>40.635</td>
<td>1.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td>105110.515</td>
<td>30.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3534</td>
<td>108268.027</td>
<td>30.636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 12

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the sex of the individual teacher.

Table 30 shows an F value of 3.506 which is not significant. This indicates that there is no significant difference of average total amount
of current non-teaching assignment time between Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the sex of the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Hypothesis 13**

There is no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time (hours per week) between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the sex of the individual teacher.

Table 30 shows an F value between size of school and sex of the teacher to be 0.776. This indicates no significant difference of average total amount of current non-teaching assignment time between Iowa public secondary schools categorized on the basis of size and Iowa public secondary school teachers when based on the sex of the individual teacher.

The null hypothesis was not rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1829.533</td>
<td>304.922</td>
<td>9.525**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.247</td>
<td>112.247</td>
<td>3.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x sex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>149.066</td>
<td>24.844</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3857</td>
<td>123471.824</td>
<td>32.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3870</td>
<td>125562.672</td>
<td>32.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Figure 2 presents in summary form the hypotheses that were rejected or were not rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses rejected</th>
<th>Hypotheses not rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>School size x total years experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years experience</td>
<td>School size x major academic assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major academic assignment</td>
<td>Type of degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher age</td>
<td>School size x degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size x teacher age</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School size x tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School size x sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Summary of hypotheses rejected and hypotheses not rejected

School size was rejected in all cases at the .01 level when compared with the six teacher variables. The only interaction that was significant occurred when comparing school size and teacher age. The remainder of the interactions when presented in null form were not rejected.
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the scope of non-teaching assignments in Iowa public secondary schools (grades 9-12), and to determine the effect of certain variables on non-teaching assignment practices as compared with school size.

A survey of the literature was conducted to discover previous research findings in teacher time utilization and related areas. A minimal amount of research bearing directly on the utilization of teacher time was found. The following factors were commonly found in the literature that was reviewed.

1. Most recent research in staff utilization indicated that teachers spent on the average, 3.3 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments.

2. Major efforts to relieve teachers of some of the non-teaching duty assignments have come about through the utilization of team teaching, mechanical or electrical equipment, use of lay assistants, more clerical help, use of Education majors from colleges and universities, and alteration of some administrative practices to utilize such innovations as flexible scheduling.

3. Special care should be taken by administrators to assure that beginning teachers do not have an excessive number of non-teaching duties because formal class preparation is extremely
important to the beginning teacher.

4. A major effort to obtain more time to teach is coming from teacher organizations with limited support from administrators.

Data concerning the amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments were obtained from the Card-pac files from the Iowa Educational Information Center, Iowa City, Iowa. Information used concerning the various teacher variables were obtained from the I.P.S.E.D.S. file of the State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa. The total information used was obtained through a merger of the two files.

All 455 school districts in Iowa were utilized in the study; the school districts were divided into seven size categories. Each of the six teacher variables studied were tabled within each of the seven school district size categories. Each teacher reporting was categorized by variable and school size. The amount of time in hours per week per assignment was tabled. The mean amount of time by school size, by variable, and by assignment was calculated from the raw data and put in table form. A total of 5,759 teachers were used in this study.

The results of this study pointed out the following facts.

1. Teachers that are involved in non-teaching duty assignments spend on the average, 5.3 hours per week performing these duties.

2. Teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience have the greatest number of occurrences in non-teaching duties.

3. Study hall assignments involve more teachers than do any other non-teaching assignments.
4. School crossing assignments involve the fewest number of teachers.

5. More science teachers are involved in non-academic assignments than are teachers from other areas.

6. Teachers of technical subjects are least likely to be found with non-academic assignments.

7. Most non-academic assignments are supervised by teachers with a B.A. degree.

8. Non-teaching duty assignments are most common among teachers who are 26-30 years old.

9. Non-teaching assignments are least common among teachers who are over 65.

10. Few teachers with more than 16 years of tenure have non-teaching duty assignments.

11. More male teachers are involved in non-teaching duty assignments than are female teachers.

Limitations

This study was limited by the fact that only teachers in grades 9-12 were used. Therefore, the entire secondary population was not utilized. The secondary population is more commonly referred to teachers that teach grades 7-12. The study was also limited by the fact that information was not available concerning all non-teaching assignments, such as club sponsorship, directing plays, and coaching athletics.

The study was also limited by the fact that all the information gathered was provided by the individual teacher. This eliminates the
possibility of complete accuracy of individual information. The only verification of the accuracy of the forms was visual inspection.

The statistical technique utilized was the analysis of variance. This technique does not provide any cause and effect relationship where significant differences occurred. This study should provide the background for further research to determine why there are significant differences between certain variables studied.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been organized around the questions which were posed as the problem and the hypotheses which evolved from the questions which were tested. The hypotheses that were tested were stated in the null or no difference form. In the analysis of variance, the statement of no difference in hypothesis form is basically the statement of no difference between the means of the variables being considered. If the calculated F exceeded the tabular F value, the difference was considered to be significant, in which case, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected and a significant difference was assumed.

1. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools? This question was basic to every teacher variable studied. When considering size of school, and total average amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments, the null hypothesis was rejected. The total average amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments ranged from 5.9 hours per week in the smallest schools to 3.9 hours
per week in the largest schools. The total average for the state was 5.3 hours per week. As school size increased, the total average amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching assignments decreased until the school size category of 2000-2999 was reached, then the total average amount of time showed a slight increase and then dropped sharply in the largest schools. Thus, it appeared that teachers in very small districts and in medium sized districts spent a significantly greater amount of time in non-teaching duties than did teachers in large districts.

This situation is probably created by the lack of para-professional help for teachers in smaller schools. Smaller schools probably use poorer organizational patterns in scheduling student and teacher time; such as too many study halls or too long and too many homeroom periods. In medium sized schools the teaching assignments become mixed; for instance, one teacher can only handle six sections of seventh grade English. The addition of a second teacher to handle sections seven and eight and so forth usually results in a split assignment which usually involves the supervision of areas such as study hall or hall duty.

2. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools when categorized with total years of teaching experience of the individual teacher? As the years of experience increase the total average amount of time spent in non-teaching duty assignments decreases until the teacher has had 6-10 years experience, then it increases to where the teachers with 21 or more years experience spent an average of 5.8 hours per week in non-teaching duty assignments. It would appear that teachers with 2-6 years
experience are given fewer non-teaching duties. While the study cannot explain this, Dwight Allen, a specialist in staff utilization, indicates that the best classroom teachers in America are found in this experience range and are generally favored by their building administrators. This indicates that the majority of non-teaching duties are handled by teachers very new to the profession or teachers relatively old in the profession. The interaction between school size and total years experience was not significant.

3. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools when categorized with the major academic assignment of the individual teacher? Teachers of Agriculture spend significantly more total average time in non-teaching duties than do teachers from other areas. This is probably true because the types of non-teaching assignments assigned to Agriculture teachers are conducive to utilizing more time. The interaction between school size and major academic assignment was not significant.

4. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools when categorized with the type of degree held by the individual teacher? The total average amount of time a teacher spends on non-teaching duty assignments is not affected by the type of degree the teacher holds. This is probably true because advanced degrees are becoming more common among classroom teachers. There is also no interaction between school size and the type of degree held by the individual teacher.
5. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools when categorized with the age of the individual teacher? Teachers that are 56-60 years of age spend significantly more total average hours per week performing non-teaching duty assignments than do teachers in other age categories. There is a significant interaction between school size and age of teacher. This is not true in school sizes of 200-499, 500-749, 1500-1999, 2000-2999, and 3000-over. This may be true because administrators in large schools probably have more latitude in making non-teaching assignments than do administrators in small schools. Therefore, this significant difference is attributable to something other than school size.

6. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools when categorized with tenure in a particular school system of the individual teacher? The total average amount of time spent in non-teaching duty assignments is not affected by the tenure of the teacher. It is possible that non-academic assignments such as coaching, class sponsorship, and directing plays are most often given to younger teachers, these variables were not included in this investigation. Thus, it might be that the older teachers were working in the assignments used in this study and the younger teachers were working in the areas mentioned above. There is no significant interaction between school size and tenure.

7. What is the status of current non-teaching assignment practices in the various sizes of Iowa public secondary schools as compared with the sex of the individual teacher? The total average amount of time
spent by teachers in non-academic assignments is not affected by the sex of the teacher. This is probably true because of the nature of the assignments studied. There also is no significant interaction between school size and the sex of the teacher.

Recommendations

Recommendations growing out of this study have been divided into two categories: (1) use of the study and (2) additional research.

Use of the study

It is recommended that local school administrators become cognizant of the results of this study and determine if there is a need for additional or supportive assistance to the teachers of his district. Administrators should also study the organizational structure of their scheduling process both for students and teachers to determine if unrealistic burdens are being placed on the time of the people involved. Building administrators should study non-teaching assignments each year in a manner similar to this investigation to guard against inequities in non-teaching loads. Caution should be taken so unrealistic assignments are not placed on first year teachers, because preparation time is extremely important at this phase.

The certification officials of the State Department of Public Instruction should use the results of this study to help in establishing realistic standards for the certification of people to work in public schools as para-professionals and teacher aides. There is a danger that if these standards are set too high there will not be an adequate supply
of teacher aides to assure that teacher time will be properly utilized. A strong effort should be made by this branch to see that these people are available as needed by the schools of Iowa.

Education Departments of colleges and universities should use the results of this study in the preparation of teachers. The study provides a realistic view as to the amount of time spent in specific duties.

**Additional research**

Additional research is needed to determine the cause and effect of the variables used in the study. For example, there is a difference between school size and the amount of time spent by teachers in non-teaching duty assignments. The challenge that remains is to probe to determine why there is a difference and what causes the difference.

Additional research is also needed using the same basic format only on the elementary school level. Relationships could then be drawn between elementary and secondary school teachers.

Research is also needed using the same basic format but adding more variables such as: geographic location of school district, valuation of school district, pupil-teacher ratio of school district, and the approval status of the school district as established by the Department of Public Instruction.

Research is also needed in the area of extra-curricular activities. Relationship could then be drawn between the amount of time spent by teachers in non-academic assignments during the school day as compared with time spent outside the school day. This study has also pointed out
the need for an in-depth study of the relationship of teacher tenure and non-teaching duty assignments.
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Table 31. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 500 - 749

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 750 - 999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 1500 - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Non-teaching assignments categorized by total years experience, enrollments 2000 - 2999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total yrs exp</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. assignmt.</td>
<td>HR No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SH No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>LR No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>L No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SG No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SC No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>HD No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Total No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</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>Agri.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Ed.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Arts</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For. Lang.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Sci.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ed.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Sci.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, enrollments 750 - 999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. Assignmt</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, enrollments 1500 - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. Assgnmt.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Sci.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38. Non-teaching assignments categorized by major academic assignment, enrollments 2000 - 2999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad. assignmt.</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus.Ed.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.Arts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.Lang.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Sci.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-PE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sci.</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Sci.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Sci.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
Table 39. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 500 - 749

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No. Mean</th>
<th>SH No. Mean</th>
<th>LR No. Mean</th>
<th>L No. Mean</th>
<th>SG No. Mean</th>
<th>SC No. Mean</th>
<th>HD No. Mean</th>
<th>Total No. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5 4.3</td>
<td>9 5.3</td>
<td>4 3.3</td>
<td>1 6.7</td>
<td>4 3.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>7 4.8</td>
<td>11 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>292 2.0</td>
<td>661 4.7</td>
<td>157 1.8</td>
<td>65 8.0</td>
<td>118 3.5</td>
<td>8 8.4</td>
<td>453 2.1</td>
<td>1014 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>29 2.0</td>
<td>79 4.4</td>
<td>34 2.3</td>
<td>6 5.1</td>
<td>18 2.2</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>52 2.6</td>
<td>135 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326 2.0</td>
<td>750 4.7</td>
<td>195 1.9</td>
<td>72 7.7</td>
<td>140 3.3</td>
<td>9 7.6</td>
<td>513 2.2</td>
<td>1161 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Non-teaching duty assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 750 - 999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No. Mean</th>
<th>SH No. Mean</th>
<th>LR No. Mean</th>
<th>L No. Mean</th>
<th>SG No. Mean</th>
<th>SC No. Mean</th>
<th>HD No. Mean</th>
<th>Total No. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8 4.2</td>
<td>14 4.8</td>
<td>7 0.7</td>
<td>1 4.7</td>
<td>4 0.9</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
<td>18 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>147 2.8</td>
<td>397 4.8</td>
<td>126 1.6</td>
<td>35 8.9</td>
<td>57 1.6</td>
<td>8 2.5</td>
<td>320 1.4</td>
<td>598 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>11 1.9</td>
<td>54 4.1</td>
<td>18 2.1</td>
<td>1 35.0</td>
<td>8 1.5</td>
<td>2 3.1</td>
<td>43 1.5</td>
<td>79 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166 2.8</td>
<td>466 4.7</td>
<td>152 1.6</td>
<td>37 9.5</td>
<td>69 1.6</td>
<td>10 2.6</td>
<td>367 1.4</td>
<td>696 5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 1500 - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No. Mean</th>
<th>SH No. Mean</th>
<th>LR No. Mean</th>
<th>L No. Mean</th>
<th>SG No. Mean</th>
<th>SC No. Mean</th>
<th>HD No. Mean</th>
<th>Total No. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 1.2</td>
<td>2 2.3</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>5 1.9</td>
<td>6 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>234 1.3</td>
<td>227 4.3</td>
<td>123 1.8</td>
<td>10 9.7</td>
<td>70 2.4</td>
<td>5 2.5</td>
<td>183 2.0</td>
<td>438 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>43 1.3</td>
<td>51 4.0</td>
<td>20 2.3</td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
<td>5 3.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>54 1.9</td>
<td>103 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>10 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280 1.3</td>
<td>280 4.2</td>
<td>144 1.9</td>
<td>11 10.7</td>
<td>75 2.5</td>
<td>5 2.5</td>
<td>242 2.0</td>
<td>553 4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Non-teaching assignments categorized by type of degree, enrollments 2000 - 2999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HR No. Mean</th>
<th>SH No. Mean</th>
<th>LR No. Mean</th>
<th>L No. Mean</th>
<th>SG No. Mean</th>
<th>SC No. Mean</th>
<th>HD No. Mean</th>
<th>Total No. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
<td>1 2.7</td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>3 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>385 1.8</td>
<td>313 4.1</td>
<td>198 2.0</td>
<td>13 4.6</td>
<td>64 2.8</td>
<td>4 16.0</td>
<td>402 2.3</td>
<td>623 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>100 1.7</td>
<td>74 4.0</td>
<td>57 2.1</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>18 3.6</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>97 2.3</td>
<td>171 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487 1.8</td>
<td>388 4.1</td>
<td>256 2.0</td>
<td>13 4.6</td>
<td>82 2.9</td>
<td>5 13.2</td>
<td>500 2.3</td>
<td>797 5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Table 43. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 500 - 749

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 750 - 999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 1500 - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46. Non-teaching assignments categorized by teacher age, enrollments 2000 - 2999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher age</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>HR No.</td>
<td>HR Mean</td>
<td>SH No.</td>
<td>SH Mean</td>
<td>LR No.</td>
<td>LR Mean</td>
<td>L No.</td>
<td>L Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50. Non-teaching assignments categorized by tenure, enrollments 2000 - 2999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>HR No.</th>
<th>HR Mean</th>
<th>SH No.</th>
<th>SH Mean</th>
<th>LR No.</th>
<th>LR Mean</th>
<th>L No.</th>
<th>L Mean</th>
<th>SG No.</th>
<th>SG Mean</th>
<th>SC No.</th>
<th>SC Mean</th>
<th>HD No.</th>
<th>HD Mean</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 51. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 500 - 749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Sex</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</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></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 52. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 750 - 999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 53. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 1500 - 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 54. Non-teaching assignments categorized by sex, enrollments 2000 - 2999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>