

Summer 1972

Washington State Teacher-administrator Liability in Industrial Education Accidents

Jack Dwane Estep
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Vocational Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Estep, Jack Dwane, "Washington State Teacher-administrator Liability in Industrial Education Accidents" (1972). *All Master's Theses*. 1847.
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1847>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

WASHINGTON STATE TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR LIABILITY
IN INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION ACCIDENTS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Jack Dwane Estep
August, 1972

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Ronald M. Frye, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Wilhelm Bakke

Dohn A. Miller

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My appreciation is expressed to Dr. Ron Frye, chairman of the graduate committee, whose interest and assistance has brought me in five years in the field of education from my first teacher position to President of the Washington Industrial Arts Association and to this my greatest goal, formulation of this thesis.

Thanks are also extended to Wilhelm Bakke and Dr. Dohn A. Miller for their time and assistance in the completion of this study.

To my wife, Nancy, sincere thanks for the encouragement and time spent typing during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
Preface	1
THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Importance of the Study	1
DEFINITION OF TERMS	2
Tort	2
Negligence	2
In Loco Parentis	2
Proximate Cause	3
Common Law	3
Save-harmless Laws	3
Accidents	3
Contributory Negligence	3
Foreseeability	3
Statute	3
Comparative Negligence	3
Class Load	4
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	4
METHOD OF RESEARCH	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
LIABILITY - NATIONALLY	5

CHAPTER	PAGE
LIABILITY - STATE OF WASHINGTON	7
ESTABLISHING A CASE	8
Reasonable Prudence	8
Inherently Dangerous	8
Foreseeability	9
In Loco Parentis	9
Proximate Cause	9
WASHINGTON STATE COURT CASES	10
Swanson v. School District No. 15 Pierce County	10
Banks v. Seattle School District No. 1	10
Casper v. Longview School District No. 122	10
Babcock, Respondent v. School District No. 17 of Clallam County	11
Swartley v. Seattle School District No. 1	11
SUPERVISION	12
SUMMARY	13
III. PERSONAL PROTECTION	16
LIABILITY INSURANCE	16
Purpose of Liability Insurance	16
School District Liability Insurance	17
Individual Liability Insurance	17
Group Liability Insurance	18
REASONABLE AND PRUDENT JUDGEMENT	18
Documentation	19
Summary	19

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	21
Class Loads	22
Dangerous Equipment	22
Safety - Safety Rules	23
First Aid	23
Color Code	24
Accident Reports	24
Parent Permission	24
Summary	25
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	26
SUMMARY	26
CONCLUSIONS	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY	29
APPENDIX	
A.	32
B.	35

WASHINGTON STATE TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR LIABILITY
IN INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION ACCIDENTS

by

Jack D. Estep

August, 1972

This paper presents the history and development of liability of teachers of industrial education in the State of Washington. The study was designed to give industrial education teachers a basic understanding of tort liability and the ways in which to prevent tort suits.

Recommendations included further investigation of teacher liability insurance and that teachers of industrial education in the State of Washington become more concerned and aware of the potentially hazardous situations in their teaching laboratories.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Preface

This study was initiated as the result of concern by local industrial education teachers and administrators in the Bellevue Public Schools and gained support from the King County Industrial Arts Association which presented the problem of teacher liability to the Executive Board of the Washington Industrial Arts Association. A state committee was established and this writer was named to chair the committee.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to assist state and local school administrators and teachers in their responsibilities regarding liability and negligence in school shop accidents in the State of Washington. An additional purpose was to recommend safety guidelines concerning class loads in industrial arts laboratories.

Importance of the Study

The chances of a teacher or administrator being sued are greater now than at any time in history. This was emphasized recently in an article published by The Machinist entitled "Suing a School" (32:4). The purpose of the article was to inform the public regarding rights in bringing legal action against teachers, school districts and administrators.

For years, since 1917, school districts in the State of Washington have been immune from a tort or liability suit, but with the passage of Chapter 164, Laws of the State of Washington 1967, school districts no longer enjoy immunity (5). The implications of this law are far-reaching. With teachers salaries improving and teachers gaining more assets, the likelihood of a suit increases. Also with the passage of Chapter 164, the incentive to sue is even greater. The parent can now bring legal action against the school district, administrator, and the teacher; consequently, their chances of a larger monetary compensation awarded in court improve.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study, the following terms shall be defined as:

Tort

Any wrongful act, except for breach of contract, for which a civil suit can be brought for the recovery of damages (13:12).

Negligence

The failure of a person to use care and caution as another reasonable and prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances (13:12).

In Loco Parentis (in place of a parent)

Teachers and administrators inherit from parents the duty of providing adequate direction and supervision to keep youngsters free from injury (13:36).

Proximate Cause

The accident must be the direct result of the teacher's or administrator's negligent behavior (13:17).

Common Law

The basic law of the land, based on judicial precedents and previous court decisions (13:19).

Save-harmless Laws

School districts are required to defend teachers against suits and pay all judgements against the teacher (13:55).

Accidents

An unforeseen or unplanned event resulting in injury to a person (13:11).

Contributory Negligence

An act on the part of the injured person which combined with the defendant's actions contribute to the injury (13:15).

Foreseeability

The ability to foresee a hazardous situation (13:18).

Statute

An act of the state legislature (13:53).

Comparative Negligence

The damage to be divided on a basis of a comparison of faults (13:16).

Class Load

The maximum number of students a teacher can safely supervise in an industrial education laboratory (13:100).

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This investigation was based on the present and past laws for the State of Washington relating to tort liability. Exclusive of the laws themselves, very little information was found in the professional literature. This writer could find no present or past research work on the topic.

Industrial arts teachers and administrators can be held liable for their torts; therefore, this study was limited to the history, exposure, and protection against tort suits within the State of Washington.

IV. METHOD OF RESEARCH

Data utilized in this study was obtained from the State Supervisor of Industrial Arts Education, law books and law reviews, professional journals, state statutes, books on school law, and interviews with experts in the fields of education, law and medicine.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

School districts' officers and employees in the State of Washington are responsible to a number of regulations. The list includes the state legislative statutes, judicial decisions, common law, opinions of the state Attorney General, Supreme Court decisions and the codes and regulations of the State Board of Education. Also, consideration of legal decisions in other states that would influence a decision in this state by way of precedence will be included.

A number of law suits have been brought against school districts in this state as a result of injuries sustained in the industrial education laboratories. Few of these have been against the teacher; however, one should not conclude that industrial education teachers are immune from their liability torts.

I. LIABILITY - NATIONALLY

Governmental immunity is still very common in the United States. In the past few years some state legislatures have begun to remove the old court-created doctrine of "the king can do no wrong" (10:35). By using this doctrine, "the king" and his agency could not be brought to trial without his consent. This common or sovereign-law immunity has prevailed down to the present time in many of our states (27). By legislative enactment, the states of Washington, California, Utah,

North Carolina, Idaho, Louisiana and Minnesota have removed all or most governmental immunity. In the states of Washington and California, the school districts and their agents are held responsible for their torts (10:37).

In some states there exists save-harmless laws. In these states the school district is required by law to defend the agent and to pay all judgements made against him. At the present time the states that have save-harmless laws are New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut. In the State of Hawaii, the State Department of Education has been made liable by way of statutory waiver for injuries sustained. Also save-harmless laws may be in effect by school district adoption (30:47).

The turning point in governmental immunity cases was handed down in the State of Illinois in 1959. The Illinois Supreme Court was the first court in the nation to negate the old doctrine of governmental immunity. In Moletor v. Kaneland Community Unit School District (25), the Supreme Court of Illinois held that school districts were to be held liable for their torts. Following the lead of Illinois in 1959, many state supreme courts started handing down rulings rejecting the old common law doctrine. Among these were Wisconsin, Arizona, and Minnesota (24:47).

The legal status of the teacher has never been in doubt. They have always been liable for their torts. The courts have been unanimous in their opinion that the teacher is an employee rather than an officer of the state. With the employee status goes the responsibility of tort liability. The industrial educator, then, is in a high risk area of teaching due to the tools and equipment that a student uses in the

laboratory area. It is of prime importance that teachers and administrators provide adequate supervision for the students entrusted to them.

II. LIABILITY - STATE OF WASHINGTON

Looking at the history of liability in the State of Washington it is interesting to note that this state was the leader in removing the immunity law of the school district. In 1868, the Washington Territorial Legislature abrogated the common law rule of immunity to the school district (13:39). For forty-eight years the school district, along with its employees, was held responsible for its torts. Then in 1917, the Washington State Legislature enacted a law which stopped legal action against a school district for noncontractual acts relating to a park, playground or field house, athletic apparatus, or manual training equipment . . . owned, operated, or maintained by the school. This partial immunity law lasted until the 1967 legislature (13:40).

In 1967, a force of parents backed by the Parent Teacher Association pushed for more liability on the part of the employees of the State's schools. The legislature eventually did not raise the employees liability, but removed the fifty year old immunity law on school districts (26).

In the State of Washington a suit may be filed against a teacher by a parent or guardian of a student until the student reaches the age of twenty-one. The student may then bring suit at any time within the next three years. In some cases liability may exist even longer (8). It should also be noted that a suit against a school district by law must be filed within 120 days from the date of the accident (5).

The full impact of this law is yet to be felt in this State. Teachers and administrators should be aware of the changes and be prepared to react to each individual case.

III. ESTABLISHING A CASE

Violation of at least one of the following five basic principles could render a teacher or administrator liable for his wrongful acts. These are: 1) reasonable prudence, 2) inherently dangerous situations, 3) foreseeability, 4) in loco parentis and 5) proximate cause.

Reasonable Prudence

A legal case against a teacher can be built around the old legal phrase, "act as a reasonable and prudent person would under similar circumstances" (27). This is one of the major charges brought against a teacher. It is very general and can apply to almost any case to which an attorney may apply it. This will be seen later in a review of the Washington State Supreme Court ruling of Walter E. Swartley, Respondent, v. Seattle School District (34).

Inherently Dangerous

Inherently dangerous equipment should not be allowed in a school shop. If the equipment is a continual hazard to its operator or other workers within a close proximity, it is considered inherently dangerous. This was illustrated in the case of Banks v. Seattle School District No. 1 (3), which will be discussed as well in a later section of this chapter.

Foreseeability

The ability of a teacher or administrator to foresee any unsafe or hazardous condition and take corrective action is of prime importance. "It has been alleged that the first test to determine whether or not there has been negligence is the test of foreseeability" (13:18).

In Loco Parentis

The teacher accepts the responsibility of the parent pro tem. In his responsibility, he should use the accepted standards of the time. Any unreasonable acts by the teacher could bring a charge of negligence (13:36).

Proximate Cause

If the student's injury is the direct result of a teacher's actions, the teacher may be charged with negligence. The key words here are "direct result." The teacher must be proven the direct causation between the act and the injury (13:17).

If any of the above five principles are violated, a case for personal liability based on negligence can be established. It then is the duty of the defendant to build a case in his defense.

There are certain circumstances which serve as a defense for a person charged with negligence. Contributory negligence is one defense that can be used. Most of the time a defense of contributory negligence is of little value, since the injured party is a minor; the courts feel that a minor does not have the maturity and understanding necessary to protect himself as an adult would under the same

circumstances. Intervention by a third party disallows a negligence charge to be brought against a teacher. In the eyes of the courts any accident occurring due to natural forces, which are commonly called acts of God, are not considered to be negligent.

IV. WASHINGTON STATE COURT CASES

Swanson v. School District No. 15 Pierce County

As was mentioned earlier, Washington State has been one of the leaders in cases filed against industrial education teachers. One of the first cases ever recorded in the nation was in 1920. The plaintiff in this case charged the school district with negligence in the care and operation of a circular saw. In its ruling of this case, Swanson v. School District No. 15 Pierce County, the State Supreme Court held in favor of the school district by way of governmental immunity (33).

Banks v. Seattle School District No. 1

In 1938, the State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the plaintiff in a case with inherently dangerous equipment. In this case the student caught her foot between the treadle and crossbar of a printing press. Soon after the injury the school district equipped the press with a safety guard and based its defense on foreseeability. They argued that with ordinary prudence the accident could not have been anticipated.

The court ruled that by the districts own admission, by installing a guard, the equipment was inherently dangerous (3).

Casper v. Longview School District No. 122

The disposition of a lower court regarding wrongful death from maintenance and operation of manual training equipment was appealed to the State Supreme Court on September 18, 1940, from a ruling in favor

of the plaintiff. Without a review of the evidence, the court overruled a lower court citing the case of Swanson v. School District No. 15 which had upheld the school district immunity law (6).

Babcock, Respondent, v. School District No. 17 of Clallam County

In 1957, a student in a manual training class in Clallam County suffered permanent injury to his left hand while operating a table saw. The school district was charged with negligence. After a lengthy trial, the court found in favor of the plaintiff. The school district appealed to the Washington State Supreme Court on grounds of governmental immunity. The judgement was reversed and the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the school district (2).

Swartley v. Seattle School District No. 1

On December 12, 1962, a boy was working in a junior high woods class and walked into an unlocked storage room in which plywood was stacked vertically. While trying to obtain some plywood, the stack fell over on him. When found, the student was pinned between a pile of plywood and some storage racks. One of the pieces was pressed across his throat which caused his death by strangulation (34).

The suit was brought against the school district and charged the teacher with negligence. A lower court found in favor of the school district, and upon appeal the State Supreme Court affirmed the lower courts ruling (34).

This case was interesting for many reasons. First the Supreme Court Ruling was not handed down until 1966, just one year before

school district immunity was abolished by the State Legislature. The School District did not use a defense of governmental immunity.

Secondly, this case upheld the rules laid down in the case of Briscoe v. School District No. 123 (4). In that decision the court stated, "When a pupil attends a public school, he or she is subject to the rules and discipline of the school and the protective custody of the teacher is substituted for that of the parent" (4).

Thirdly, the trial judge, in his instruction to the jury, said the following:

A knowing violation of a safety rule by a student in a manual training class may in itself be negligent and a teacher of such students is only required to use due and reasonable care and diligence, under all of the facts and circumstances in the supervision and enforcement of such a safety rule (4).

The trial judge also instructed the jury,

. . . that the fact Mr. Swartley (deceased's father) gave written consent for Russell Swartley (the deceased) to use shop machinery as indicated by the defendant's exhibit No. 9, did not relieve the school district of, or alter its duty of care toward Russell Swartley as that duty has been defined for you in these instructions(4).

With these instructions the judge completely killed the commonly used defense of many industrial education teachers of today. Parent permission slips do not relieve the industrial education teacher of liability. Also, the judge upheld the defense of a teacher by way of contributory negligence on the part of the student.

V. SUPERVISION

The problems of teacher liability and laboratory supervision are supplementary. One of the primary purposes of supervision should

be the prevention of accidents. With the prevention of accidents, the chances of a liable suit are lost.

In the last few years a growing concern has been voiced by industrial education teachers with the lack of concern by principals and other school administrators in overloading of classes, which reduces the effective supervision a teacher can give to an individual and a class in general.

The courts have been most severe in the criticism of the school administration for requiring pupils to perform experiments or to operate certain machines which subject them to dangers without requiring that the strictest supervision be exercised over them (13:39).

The State of Washington at the present time provides no set guidelines for class loads. Kigin recommends a class size of "twenty-four pupils as a maximum for any one teacher in any one shop" (13:100).

On the following page is a survey conducted by this writer to see which states have at the present time guidelines on laws governing class loads in industrial education classes.

As can be seen from this tabulation of thirty-one states that replied, seventeen had some type of guideline or limiting factor at the state level on class loads.

SUMMARY

Throughout the nation school districts in common law states are immune from a liable suit under the principle of common law immunity.

In the State of Washington, at the present, school districts are held responsible for their torts by way of the State Laws of 1967.

State	Class Load Standards
Alaska	None
Arizona	None
California	None
Colorado	None
Connecticut	None
Florida	20 (7)
Georgia	25 (23)
Hawaii	None
Idaho	Junior High 24 Senior High 18-24 (22)
Kansas	None
Kentucky	24 (19)
Louisiana	24 (18)
Maine	16-20 (21)
Michigan	24 (29)
Minnesota	24 (12)
Missouri	None
Montana	None
New Jersey	None
New Mexico	Junior High 20 Senior High 24 (20)
New York	None
North Carolina	16 (31)
North Dakota	22 (17)
Ohio	30 (16)
Pennsylvania	20 (9)
Puerto Rico	25 (15)
Rhode Island	None
South Carolina	20 (1)
South Dakota	None
Tennessee	None
Utah	Junior High 20 Senior High 24 T.I.E. 18 (14)
Virginia	24 (11)

Therefore school districts as well as teachers are responsible for the negligent acts of its agents and employees.

The violations by which a liability suit can be based is founded on five basic principles: Reasonable prudence, inherently dangerous situations, foreseeability, in loco parentis and proximate cause.

In the five Supreme Court cases reviewed, only one was in favor of the plaintiff. The other four were awarded to the districts on grounds of governmental immunity. In the case of Swartley v. Seattle School District, three precedents were established. The first was that a student is subject to the rules and regulations of the school. Second, a knowing violation of a safety rule by a student may in itself reflect negligence. Third, that parent permission slips do not relieve the industrial education teacher of liability.

In the past few years, class loads and supervision have received considerable attention in this State as well as many others. A survey of these states show that seventeen states out of thirty-one had established guidelines for class loads.

CHAPTER III

PERSONAL PROTECTION

In the State of Washington, according to State Law RCW 4.08.120, a person is held legally responsible for his negligent torts if found guilty by a civil court of law.

An industrial educator has at his disposal two means of protecting himself from financial loss: 1) He can purchase personal liability or group liability insurance for payment of tort litigation rendered against him, 2) He can use reasonable and prudent judgement to minimize his exposure to tort liability suits.

I. LIABILITY INSURANCE

Purpose of Liability Insurance

The basic reason for the existence of insurance is to provide security against financial catastrophe by transferring a risk of economic loss from one less able to bear it to one more able. Liability insurance differs from other kinds of insurance in that it agrees to pay the cost of litigation up to the limits of the insurance policy (24).

Unlike the normal insurance policy, liability insurance agrees to certain services beyond settling financial claims. The company agrees to pay the cost of preparing and defending any suit filed against the insured. It also accepts the responsibility of investigating the circumstances of the claim. The company pays all cost regardless of the court's disposition.

It is a known fact that insurance companies have the means to research and take a case to court, if necessary. The uninsured is left without this financial base and will try to make a quick out of court settlement, which in some cases increases the chances for a liable suit.

School District Liability Insurance

With the passage of Chapter 164 Laws of 1967, in which the school district's immunity was abolished, school districts have moved to protect themselves and their employees by taking out liability insurance. Some school districts have only purchased minimal coverage while others have quite adequate policies.

It is not within the scope of this writer's knowledge to define the term adequate with regards to a liable suit. There are so many variables to account for and in the end each case is subject to different interpretations.

Individual Liability Insurance

Personal or individual insurance can be obtained through many sources. This type of insurance is designed to protect the insured only.

The industrial educator can buy a liability rider on his home owners policy which would increase the liability coverage both on and off the job. Most insurance companies offer separate liability policies at a low premium rate.

In the past some educators have used the excuse that buying personal liability insurance is admitting that they are liable; therefore they would not purchase the policies. This has been found untrue

since industrial educators have been named in suits whether they were insured or not.

Group Liability Insurance

Group policies are the most common liability insurance. This insurance is usually offered through a large association or company. The reason it is the most popular is that with a large group the premiums are usually kept very low.

In 1962, the Executive Board of the American Industrial Arts Association approved a group liability insurance plan for its members. All members of this organization are eligible to buy this insurance at a fairly low premium (13).

Some state industrial arts associations have experimented with offering group insurance to their members. Most of these state plans have been discontinued due to the high cost and the lack of interest from the members themselves.

In the State of Washington, industrial education teachers can purchase group plans through the National Education Association and Washington Education Association. Also, they can usually get a group plan through insurance companies such as Public Employees Mutual.

II. REASONABLE AND PRUDENT JUDGEMENT

The best personal protection an industrial educator can have is to painstakingly eliminate all possible risks and hazards in the industrial education laboratories.

It has been shown in the case of Banks v. Seattle School District No. 1, that the courts can be harsh when inherently dangerous equipment

is in use. The courts have also been harsh on teachers who could have foreseen a potential hazard in the laboratory area.

Documentation

Throughout the history of industrial education the most careful and conscientious instructor at one time or another is placed in the position of a possible liable suit brought against him. With this ever present threat an instructor should take all steps necessary to protect himself from being placed in such a position.

Documentation has been proven to be the best defense in a court of law. The instructor should keep accurate records of a students progress. All safety tests should be kept and any disciplinary restrictions placed upon the student while in the shop should be put in written form.

In chapter four, several steps in protective liability are to be discussed. Many of these deal with items which need careful documentation. It must be stressed that written proof is the best evidence possible in a court of law dealing with negligence. If the defendant can prove that prior to the accident he had taken steps to prevent the accident, his chances are increased for a favorable settlement. It might be stated that one should document everything which deals with laboratory safety.

Summary

Injuries to others or damage to their property resulting from the negligence of an instructor may give rise to a liability claim. Almost every form of industrial education activity involves a liability hazard. The need for liability insurance is obvious and insurance

companies readily supply policies to meet the needs of industrial educators.

The basic reason for insurance is to transfer the risk of economic loss from one less able to bear it to one more able.

When a liability insurance policy is purchased, the insurance company agrees to pay the cost of preparing and defending the insured for any suit filed against him.

Basically, there are two types of liability insurance that the instructor has at his disposal. They are individual and group plans.

Individual insurance plans are usually riders which are attached to a family insurance policy. This plan usually extends the liability coverage of the instructor's employer.

Group insurance policies are the most common type of liability insurance. The plan is usually offered through a large association or company which keeps the premiums low.

Washington State industrial educators have several ways in which to secure liability policies. A few of these are American Industrial Arts Association, Washington Education Association, and the National Education Association.

The best insurance an educator can have is to eliminate all possible risks and hazards in the laboratories. Documentation of all safety tests, machine check-outs and any other pertinent information that may be of help in a court of law is advisable.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS

When an industrial education teacher accepts a teaching position, he shoulders a great responsibility for the education and safety of the students in his class. While he is dependent upon a hierarchy of administrators, supervisors, and representatives of the people, the teacher, nevertheless, is the principal organizer and director of educational experience and activities within the laboratory.

Safety, or more properly, a safety oriented attitude, is not something with which we are born or something which is "picked up" as an incidental part of education or of experience. The human instinct for self preservation is not very strong when everyday safety is considered and almost everyone falls victim to the "it can't happen to me" attitude. The student must be educated in safety, generally and specifically, just as he receives education in other areas of endeavor. Obviously, the purpose of protective liability is twofold: 1) To protect the student from injury while in the school shop or laboratory, and 2) To take all necessary protective steps to assure that the teacher will not be found guilty of negligence in case of an accident.

The following are recommendations that, if followed, will substantially reduce the possibility of a liability suit being rendered against an industrial educator.

Class Loads

Class loads should be restricted to twenty-four students or less in any one class for any one teacher. When the class load is increased for any reason, it should be well documented by whose authority the class size was increased and that it was over the objection of the instructor. This will partially shift the responsibility from the instructor to the administrator. It must be noted that this will not alleviate the possibility of a liable suit, since the students are under the direct supervision of the teacher. The teacher is acting as the parent pro tem.

In conjunction with class loads, adequate supervision should be maintained at all times in the laboratory. At no time should an industrial education teacher turn his class over to an instructor who is unfamiliar with the laboratory equipment. In some schools this is a practice when the industrial educator needs relieving for some other duties. In most cases the relieving teacher has no industrial education background and is lacking in first aid training. When an instructor is ill and needs a full day substitute, it is imperative that an industrial educator be called if the students are to use the laboratory area.

Dangerous Equipment

As was mentioned earlier, the first test of a liable case is foreseeability. It is recommended that an instructor and administrator be on constant vigil for any machines or equipment which could be considered dangerous. When a problem arises, it is the duty of the laboratory instructor to take immediate action. The teacher should

immediately instruct the students of the danger and make a written request for repair to the school district. It should be emphasized that the request be in written form. Remember that it is hard to give supportive proof in a court of law without written documentation. A safety inspection check list may be obtained from the National Safety Council (Appendix A).

Safety - Safety Rules

Safety in the laboratory area should be an everyday part of educating the students under an instructor's direction. The instructor should constantly point out potentially dangerous situations to the students.

Along with the day to day safety instructions, the instructor should have a complete unit on laboratory safety and for each machine include safety check-outs with tests. The tests and dates of check-out should be kept on file in the instructor's office. If an accident occurs to a student, it is recommended that all such tests and documentation on that student be kept until the student has reached the age of twenty-four, since he may bring suit on his own behalf at the age of twenty-one and for the following three years.

First Aid

It is recommended that each instructor in the field of industrial education have a current first aid card and that each year he participate in a first aid refresher course. In larger school districts, where coordinators are available, the coordinator should make a special effort to offer a first aid course with emphasis on industrial accidents. In the smaller districts industrial education instructors should participate

in the first aid course offered for the district athletic staff or request assistance from the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Division of Industrial Safety.

In the laboratory itself it is mandatory that a complete first aid kit be placed where it is easily accessible to the students and the instructor in charge. The kit should be inspected and supplied monthly. For each kit records should be kept which will document that the kit was periodically inspected and that it was in good order.

Color Code

It is recommended that each laboratory and its equipment be safety color coded according to the American Standard Color Code. Color code information may be obtained from the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries.

Accident Reports

Each school or school district should have a standardized accident procedure. The procedure should start with the steps to be taken at the time of the accident and should follow through with an accident report documenting thoroughly the time, place, and circumstances of the accident. Accident report forms may be obtained from Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Division of Industrial Safety (Appendix B).

Parent Permission

As stated earlier, parent permission slips cannot relieve the instructor of his obligations to the student, but the slips can be used to inform the parent of the nature of activities his child will

be involved with in the industrial education laboratory. From this standpoint they can be used as supportive evidence in a court case to show that the instructor has given the parent the opportunity to withhold from his child the right of operating certain equipment.

Summary

Injuries to others can best be avoided if a few protective steps are taken to avoid the accidents. Leading the list of these is to always have adequate supervision in the laboratory area; and the class size should not exceed the recommended number of twenty-four.

It is imperative that all dangerous equipment be replaced or repaired immediately upon recognition of the potential danger.

Students should be instructed on safety and given safety tests to determine if they have the knowledge to safely operate the laboratory equipment.

All industrial educators should hold a valid and current first aid card. Administrators in the district should make available an industrial oriented course in first aid.

Industrial education laboratories should be color coded using the American Standard Color Code System.

Each school should have a standardized accident report form to include the steps to be taken immediately after an accident and to follow with the time, place, and circumstances of the accident.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

The chances of a teacher or administrator being sued is greater today than at any other time in history. Although some incidents causing injury or death result from accidents, others stem from wrongful conduct on the part of the principal, instructor, and/or pupils themselves.

The legal status of the educator changed greatly in 1959, when the Illinois Supreme Court negated the old doctrine of governmental immunity with respect to school districts. This change was carried into the State of Washington in 1967, by the Parent Teacher Association push for more liability on the part of the employees. The result of this push was the removal of the fifty year old immunity law on school districts.

One of the five basic principles of liability suits must exist before a student or guardian can make a case against a teacher. They are reasonable prudence, inherently dangerous situations, foreseeability, in loco parentis and proximate cause.

A violation of one or more of the five basic principles of liability may result in a case against a teacher. They are: 1) to purchase personal liability or group liability insurance for payment of tort litigation

rendered against him, 2) to use reasonable and prudent judgement to minimize his exposure to tort liability suit.

The following recommendations are made to reduce the possibility of a liability suit being brought against a teacher:

1. It is recommended that the industrial education class load be limited to twenty-four students.
2. It is recommended that faulty equipment be eliminated from the industrial education laboratories.
3. It is recommended that adequate supervision be maintained at all times in the industrial education laboratories.
4. It is recommended that safety education be an on-going process.
5. It is recommended that each industrial educator have a current first aid card and seek immediate medical help when the need arises.
6. It is recommended that each laboratory be color coded according to the American Standard Color Code.
7. It is recommended that each school district have a standardized accident handling and reporting procedure.
8. It is recommended that parent permission slips be used only as a tool to inform the parent of equipment the student will be using in the laboratory.
9. It is recommended that teachers and administrators contact the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries for assistance in checking laboratories for safety hazards and procedures in reporting accidents.
10. It is recommended that industrial educators work closely with architects in developing plans for new shop facilities, especially in those areas regarding safety.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Washington State Laws compel children to attend school and obey the school districts' regulations. Also, the state Laws compel the instructor to use due care with respect to the safety of the student.

Any failure to exercise due care by the instructor leaves him open for a tort liability suit.

Liability hazards of an individual are a great unknown since every tort liability claim is unique. Rules cannot be standardized since each claim is different, but the instructor can make every effort to protect the students entrusted to him by eliminating existing hazards.

The most practical way of protecting the instructor from financial loss is to be safety conscious and have liability insurance. There is practically no safe upper limit where liability insurance is involved due to the uncertainty of how a civil court will rule on tort liability cases.

It would benefit each industrial education teacher to investigate his district's liability insurance and determine whether the upper limits of that insurance is in his opinion adequate. If it is determined that the insurance is inadequate, he should investigate the possibility of either personal liability or group liability insurance.

In the future, the teacher organizations should push for state legislation which would require the school districts to provide tort liability insurance for all educators with unrestricted upper limits.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, J. T., Guide for Industrial Arts Education, Columbia, South Carolina, State Department of Education, p. 9.
2. Babcock, Teddy Lee, Respondent, v. School District No. 17 of Clallam County, Appellant No. 35538 Department One, Supreme Court of Washington, January 19, 1961.
3. Banks v. Seattle School District No. 1 of Seattle, King County No. 27003 80 P. 2d 835, Supreme Court of Washington, June 29, 1938.
4. Briscoe v. School District No. 123, 32 Wn. 2d 353, 362, 201 P., 2d 697, Supreme Court of Washington, 1949.
5. Bruno, Louis, "Tort Liability" (Chapter 164, Laws of 1967), Olympia, Washington; State Superintendent of Public Instruction Office, 1967 (mimeographed).
6. Casper, John, Individually and as Administrator, Respondent, v. Longview School District No. 122, No. 28005, 403 P., Supreme Court of Washington, September, 1940.
7. Christian, Floyd T., A Guide for Planning Industrial Arts Facilities, Tallahassee, Florida: Commissioner State Department of Education, p. 7.
8. Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. Legal Rights and Responsibilities of Washington Teachers, Seattle, Washington: Education Association, 1967, p. 37.
9. Hoffman, George, Industrial Arts Guide for School Administrators, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, p. 9.
10. Humpal, W. M., "Courts Abrogate Doctrine of Immunity", American School Board Journal, 188:35-37, June, 1964.
11. Hughes, Thomas A., "Industrial Arts for the Seventies," Richmond, Virginia: Department of Education, p. 14.
12. Johnson, Erling O., "Guide for Instruction in Industrial Arts," St. Paul, Minnesota: Office of Commissioner of Education, p. 119.
13. Kigin, Denis J., Teacher Liability in School-Shop Accidents, p. 39, Prakken Publications, Inc., 1963.

14. Letter from Garth A. Hill, Specialist Trade and Industrial Education, Utah: State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, July 30, 1971.
15. Letter from Manuel A. Hernandez, Director Industrial Arts Program, Department of Education, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Hato Rey, July 23, 1971.
16. Letter from Robert B. Gates, State Consultant Industrial Arts Education, State of Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, July 20, 1971.
17. Letter from Richard K. Klein, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck, July 16, 1971.
18. Letter from Andrew H. Gasperecz, Director Industrial Arts Education, State of Louisiana Department of Education, July 15, 1971.
19. Letter from James H. Disney, Supervisor Industrial Arts Education, Commonwealth of Kentucky, Department of Education, July 19, 1971.
20. Letter from Waymond Smith, State of New Mexico Vocational-Technical Education Division, Santa Fe, July 19, 1971.
21. Letter from Carl W. Butler, State of Maine Department of Education, Augusta, August 3, 1971.
22. Letter from Lee Carter, State of Idaho, State Board for Vocational Education, Boise, July 19, 1971.
23. Letter from Raymond S. Ginn Jr., Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta, July 21, 1971.
24. Miller, Jerome S., Your Personal Insurance Guide, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955. 332 pp.
25. North Eastern Reporter, Second Series, St. Paul: West Publishing Company 163:89.
26. O'Connell, John J., "School Law and Teacher Responsibility and Liability," Olympia, Washington: Washington State Attorney General's Office 1967 (mimeographed).
27. Olson, T. A., "Student Injuries and Teacher Liability," School Shop.
28. Policies and Procedures for Industrial Arts Education in New Mexico, Santa Fe, New Mexico: State Department of Education, p. 7.
29. Polley, Ira, "Industrial Arts Programing," Lansing, Michigan: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, p. 8.

30. Shapiro, Freida S., "Your Liability for Student Accidents," N.E.A. Journal, 54:46-47, March, 1955.
31. Stephens, T. N., "Career Exploration," Raleigh, North Carolina, Division of Occupational Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, p. 7.
32. "Suing a School," The Machinist, p. 4, March 4, 1971.
33. Swanson v. School District No. 15 Pierce County, 187 p. 386, Washington Supreme Court, 1920.
34. Swartley, Walter E., Respondent, v. Seattle School District No. 1 Appellant No. 38361, Department One, Washington State Supreme Court, December 22, 1966.

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL STANDARD SCHOOL SHOP SAFETY INSPECTION CHECK LIST

NATIONAL STANDARD SCHOOL SHOP SAFETY INSPECTION CHECK LIST

Prepared by the Joint Safety Committee of the
AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION — NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

Date _____

INTRODUCTION

A safe environment is an essential part of the school shop safety education program. The safe environment will exist only if hazards are discovered and corrected through *regular* and *frequent* inspections by school personnel—administrators, teachers and students. Safety inspections are to determine if everything is satisfactory.

Inspections may be made at the request of the board of education, the school administration or upon the initiative of the teacher. Some

communities have drawn upon the cooperative service of professional safety engineers, inspectors of state labor departments, insurance companies and local safety councils to supplement and confirm inspections by school personnel.

The National Standard School Shop Safety Inspection Check List, recommended by the President's Conference on Industrial Safety is an objective inspection procedure for the school shop.

DIRECTIONS

WHO INSPECTS?

This will depend upon local policies. It is recommended, however, that shop teachers, and students—the student safety engineer and/or student safety committee—participate in making regular inspections.

WHEN TO INSPECT?

As a minimum, a safety inspection should be made at the beginning of every school term or semester. More frequent inspections may

HOW TO INSPECT?

Inspections should be well planned in advance.

Inspections should be systematic and thorough. No location that may contain a hazard should be overlooked.

FOLLOW-UP

The current report should be compared with previous records to determine progress. The report should be studied in terms of the accident situation so that special attention can be given to those conditions and locations which are accident producers.

Each unsafe condition should be corrected as soon as possible in

This not only tends to share responsibility but stimulates a broader interest in the maintenance of a safe school shop.

be advisable.

Inspection reports should be clear and concise, but with sufficient explanation to make each recommendation for improvement understandable.

accordance with accepted local procedures.

A definite policy should be established in regard to taking materials and equipment out of service because of unsafe conditions.

The inspection report can be used to advantage as the subject for staff and class discussion.

CHECKING PROCEDURE

Draw a circle around the appropriate letter, using the following letter scheme:

S — Satisfactory (needs no attention)

A — Acceptable (needs some attention)

U — Unsatisfactory (needs immediate attention)

Recommendations should be made in all cases where a "U" is circled. Space is provided at the end of the form for such comments. Designate the items covered by the recommendations, using the code

number applicable (as B-2).

In most categories, space is provided for listing of standards, requirements or regulations which have local application only.

A. GENERAL PHYSICAL CONDITION

1. Machines, benches, and other equipment are arranged so as to conform to good safety practices. S A U
2. Condition of stairways. S A U
3. Condition of aisles S A U
4. Condition of floors S A U
5. Condition of walls, windows, and ceiling. S A U
6. Illumination is safe, sufficient, and well placed. S A U
7. Ventilation is adequate and proper for conditions. S A U
8. Temperature control S A U
9. Fire extinguishers are of proper type, adequately supplied, properly located and maintained. S A U
10. Teacher and pupils know location of and how to use proper type for various fires. S A U
11. Number and location of exits is adequate and properly identified S A U

12. Proper procedures have been formulated for emptying the room of pupils and taking adequate precautions in case of emergencies S A U
13. Lockers are inspected regularly for cleanliness and fire hazards. S A U
14. Locker doors are kept closed. S A U
15. Walls are clear of objects that might fall. S A U
16. Utility lines are properly identified. S A U
17. Teachers know the procedure in the event of fire including notification of the fire department and the evacuation of the building. S A U
18. Air in shop is free from excessive dust, smoke, etc. S A U
19. _____ S A U
20. _____ S A U
21. _____ S A U
22. _____ S A U
23. Evaluation for the total rating of A. GENERAL PHYSICAL CONDITION S A U

B. HOUSEKEEPING

- 1. General appearance as to orderliness..... S A U
- 2. Adequate and proper storage space for tools and materials. S A U
- 3. Benches are kept orderly..... S A U
- 4. Corners are clean and clear..... S A U
- 5. Special tool racks, in orderly condition, and provided at benches and machines S A U
- 6. Tool, supply, and/or material room is orderly..... S A U
- 7. Sufficient scrap boxes are provided..... S A U
- 8. Scrap stock is put in scrap boxes promptly..... S A U
- 9. Materials are stored in an orderly and safe condition.. S A U
- 10. A spring lid metal container is provided for waste and oily rags. S A U
- 11. All waste materials and oily rags are promptly placed in the containers S A U
- 12. Containers for oily rags and waste materials are frequently and regularly emptied S A U
- 13. Dangerous materials are stored in metal cabinets..... S A U
- 14. Machines have been color conditioned..... S A U
- 15. Safety cans are provided for flammable liquids..... S A U
- 16. Bulk storage of dangerous materials is provided outside of the main building S A U
- 17. A toe-board or railing around a mezzanine used for storage or washing facilities S A U
- 18. Materials are stored in an orderly and safe condition on this mezzanine S A U
- 19. Flammable liquids are not used for cleaning purposes S A U
- 20. Floors are free of oil, water and foreign material..... S A U
- 21. Floors, walls, windows, and ceilings are cleaned periodically. S A U
- 22. _____ S A U
- 23. _____ S A U
- 24. _____ S A U
- 25. _____ S A U
- 26. Evaluation for the total rating for B. HOUSEKEEPING S A U

C. EQUIPMENT

- 1. Machines are arranged so that workers are protected from hazards of other machines, passing students, etc..... S A U
- 2. Danger zones are properly indicated and guarded..... S A U
- 3. All gears, moving belts, etc., are protected by permanent enclosure guards S A U
- 4. All guards are used as much as possible..... S A U

C. EQUIPMENT (continued)

- 5. All equipment control switches are easily available to operator. S A U
- 6. All machines are "locked off" when instructor is out of the room. S A U
- 7. Brushes are used for cleaning equipment..... S A U
- 8. Nonskid areas are provided around machines..... S A U
- 9. Machines are in safe working condition..... S A U
- 10. Machines are guarded to comply with American Standards Association and local state code..... S A U
- 11. Adequate supervision is maintained when students are using machines and dangerous tools..... S A U
- 12. Tools are kept sharp, clean and in safe working order S A U
- 13. All hoisting devices are in safe operating condition... S A U
- 14. Machines are shut off while unattended..... S A U
- 15. Adequate storage facilities for tools, equipment, etc., not in immediate use S A U
- 16. _____ S A U
- 17. _____ S A U
- 18. _____ S A U
- 19. _____ S A U
- 20. Evaluation for the total rating for C. EQUIPMENT.. S A U

D. ELECTRICAL INSTALLATION

- 1. All switches are enclosed..... S A U
- 2. There is a master control switch for all of the electrical installations S A U
- 3. Electrical outlets and circuits are properly identified.. S A U
- 4. All electrical extension cords are in safe condition and are not carrying excessive loads..... S A U
- 5. All machine switches are within easy reach of the operators. S A U
- 6. Electrical motors and equipment are wired to comply with the National Electric Code..... S A U
- 7. Individual cut-off switches are provided for each machine. S A U
- 8. Machines are provided with overload and underload controls by magnetic pushbutton controls..... S A U
- 9. No temporary wiring in evidence..... S A U
- 10. _____ S A U
- 11. _____ S A U
- 12. _____ S A U
- 13. _____ S A U
- 14. Evaluation for the total rating for D. ELECTRICAL INSTALLATION S A U

E. GAS

1. Gas flow to appliances is regulated, so that when appliance valve is turned on full, the flames are not too high. S A U
2. Gas appliances are properly insulated with asbestos or other insulating material from tables, benches, adjacent walls, or other flammable materials S A U
3. No gas hose is used where pipe connections could be made. S A U
4. Gas appliances have been adjusted so that they may be lighted without undue hazard. S A U
5. Students have been instructed when lighting gas appliances to light the match first before turning on the gas. S A U
6. There are no gas leaks, nor is any odor of gas detectable in any part of the shop. S A U
7. Shop instruction has been given concerning the lighting of gas furnaces operating with both air and gas under pressure. . . S A U
8. When lighting the gas forge, goggles are worn. S A U
9. When lighting the gas furnace, the following procedure is used: (a) light the match; (b) turn on the gas; (c) drop the match in the hole in top of the furnace. S A U
10. In shutting down the gas furnace, the gas valve is closed before the air valve. S A U
11. _____ S A U
12. _____ S A U
13. _____ S A U
14. _____ S A U
15. Evaluation for the total rating for E. GAS. S A U

F. PERSONAL PROTECTION

1. Goggles or protective shields are provided and required for all work where eye hazards exist. S A U
2. If individual goggles are not provided, hoods and goggles are properly disinfected before use. S A U
3. Shields and goggles are provided for electric welding. . . S A U
4. Rings and other jewelry are removed by pupils when working in the shop. S A U
5. Proper kind of wearing apparel is worn and worn properly for the job being done. S A U
6. Leggings, safety shoes, etc., are worn in special classes such as foundry, etc., when needed. S A U
7. Respirators are provided for dusty or toxic atmospheric conditions such as when spraying in the finishing room. S A U
8. Provisions are made for cleaning and sterilizing respirators. S A U
9. Students are examined for safety knowledge ability. . . S A U
10. Sleeves are rolled above elbows when operating machines. S A U
11. Clothing of students is free from loose sleeves, flopping ties, loose coats, etc. S A U
12. _____ S A U

F. PERSONAL PROTECTION (continued)

13. _____ S A U
14. _____ S A U
15. _____ S A U
16. Evaluation for the total rating for F. PERSONAL PROTECTION. S A U

G. INSTRUCTION

1. Shop Safety is taught as an integral part of each teaching unit. S A U
2. Safety rules are posted particularly at each danger station. S A U
3. Printed safety rules are given each student. S A U
4. Pupils take a safety pledge. S A U
5. Use of a safety inspector. S A U
6. Use of a student shop safety committee. S A U
7. Use of safety contests. S A U
8. Motion and/or slide films on safety are used in the instruction. S A U
9. Use of suggestion box. S A U
10. Use of safety tests. S A U
11. Use of safety posters. S A U
12. Talks on safety are given to the classes by industrial men. S A U
13. Tours are taken of industrial plants as a means of studying safety practices S A U
14. Periodic safety inspections of the shop are made by a student committee S A U
15. Men from industry make safety inspections of the shop . . . S A U
16. Student shop safety committee investigates all accidents . . . S A U
17. A proper record is kept of safety instructions which are given, preferably showing the signature of student on tests given in this area S A U
18. Rotate students on the Shop Safety Committee so that as many students as possible have an opportunity to participate. . . . S A U
19. _____ S A U
20. _____ S A U
21. _____ S A U
22. _____ S A U
23. Evaluation for the total rating of G. INSTRUCTION S A U

H. ACCIDENT RECORDS

1. There is a written statement outlining the proper procedure when and if a student is seriously hurt. S A U
2. Adequate accident statistics are kept. S A U
3. Accidents are reported to the proper administrative authority by the instructor S A U

H. ACCIDENT RECORD (continued)

4. A copy of each accident report is filed with the State Department of Education S A U
5. Accident reports are analyzed for instructional purposes and to furnish the basis for elimination of hazards..... S A U
6. _____ S A U
7. _____ S A U
8. _____ S A U
9. _____ S A U
10. Evaluation for the total rating of H. ACCIDENT RECORDS.
S A U

I. FIRST AID

1. An adequately stocked first aid cabinet is provided... S A U
2. The first aid is administered by a qualified individual S A U
3. The school has individuals qualified to administer first aid.
S A U
4. _____ S A U
5. _____ S A U
6. _____ S A U
7. _____ S A U
8. Evaluation for the total rating of I. FIRST AID.... S A U

RECOMMENDATIONS

Code No.	

APPENDIX B

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES ACCIDENT REPORT

P 972752

STATE OF WASHINGTON
Department of
Labor and Industries



ACCIDENT REPORT

CLAIM NUMBER

**ALL QUESTIONS
MUST BE ANSWERED**

Employer Must Complete This Report by Filling in and Signing Employer's Section Below. Then Mail Report at Once to
Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington 98504. ATTACH LETTER IF MORE SPACE NEEDED.

PART I. EMPLOYER'S REPORT

TEAR ON
PERFORATION

EMPLOYER'S FIRM NAME _____ ADDRESS _____ CITY & STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

EMPLOYER'S BUSINESS (STATE TYPE OR NATURE OF): _____ EMPLOYER'S TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

CHECK TYPE OF ORGANIZATION: INDIVIDUAL PARTNERSHIP CORPORATION NAME OF INJURED EMPLOYEE _____ SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER _____

IS INJURED EMPLOYEE AN OWNER, PARTNER OR CORPORATE OFFICER? YES NO IF YES, STATE WHICH AND GIVE TITLE _____ EMPLOYER'S LAB & IND. FIRM NUMBER _____ IN WHAT CLASS WILL THIS EMPLOYEE'S HOURS BE REPORTED? _____

EMPLOYEE EMPLOYED IN WHICH DEPARTMENT? CONSTRUCTION OPERATION REPAIR ON LAUNCHED BOAT ADDRESS OR LOCATION, INCLUDING COUNTY, WHERE ACCIDENT OCCURRED _____ STATE WHERE ACCIDENT OCCURRED _____ EMPLOYER'S PREMISES JOB SITE OTHER

WAS THIS ACCIDENT CAUSED BY SOMEONE NOT EMPLOYED BY YOU? YES NO IF YES, ATTACH EXPLANATION _____ DATE OF ACCIDENT _____ TIME _____ A.M. _____ P.M. DATE REPORTED TO YOU _____ TIME _____ A.M. _____ P.M. CHECK HERE IF ACCIDENT NOT REPORTED _____

LAST DATE WORKED _____ DATE RETURNED TO WORK _____ WAS EMPLOYEE ENGAGED IN THE REGULAR COURSE OF HIS EMPLOYMENT WHEN INJURED? YES NO SHIFT HOURS _____ DO YOU QUESTION VALIDITY OF CLAIM? YES NO IF YES, WHY? (ATTACH EXPLANATION) _____

WILL YOU PAY THIS EMPLOYEE FULL SALARY OR WAGES DURING PERIOD OF DISABILITY? YES NO IF YES, EXPLAIN _____ ENTER EMPLOYEE'S RATE OF PAY (NO OVERTIME) \$ _____ PER HOUR DAY WEEK MONTH

AVERAGE WAGE PER DAY IF PIECEWORK \$ _____ HOW MANY DAYS PER WEEK IS EMPLOYEE EMPLOYED? _____ NAME SCHEDULED DAYS OFF _____

DESCRIBE ACCIDENT FULLY, STATING IF EMPLOYEE FELL OR WAS STRUCK. IF MACHINERY WAS INVOLVED, NAME MACHINERY AND DESCRIBE ITS FUNCTION. WAS EMPLOYEE LIFTING, PULLING, PUSHING OR CARRYING? FALLS SHOULD BE DESCRIBED AS INDOORS OR OUTDOORS. AND LAST OBJECT STRUCK SHOULD BE NAMED. NAME CHEMICAL INVOLVED, IF APPROPRIATE.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING STATEMENTS ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. SIGNED _____ EMPLOYER _____ POSITION _____ DATE _____ BY _____

TEAR ALONG THIS PERFORATION ONLY

SHADED AREA FOR DEPARTMENTAL USE ONLY

(NOT CLAIM NUMBER) P 972752

NON-COMPENSABLE CLAIMS EXAMINER BY _____ COMPENSABLE CLAIMS EXAMINER BY _____ CLAIM NUMBER _____

MEDICAL AID AWARDS AMOUNT COMPUTED DATE NOTICE SENT FIRM NUMBER

CLASS CONT. NON CONT.

PART II. EMPLOYEE'S REPORT

KEEP THESE TWO
PARTS INTACT

NAME OF INJURED EMPLOYEE (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE) FIRST _____ MIDDLE _____ LAST _____ TELEPHONE NUMBER _____ SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER _____

MAILING ADDRESS _____ CITY & STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

DATE OF ACCIDENT _____ HOUR ACCIDENT OCCURRED _____ A.M. _____ P.M. SHIFT HOURS _____ YOUR JOB TITLE WHEN INJURED _____ SEX _____ DATE OF BIRTH _____ HEIGHT _____ WEIGHT _____

GIVE DATE LAST WORKED _____ GIVE DATE RETURNED TO WORK, IF SO _____ WERE YOU DOING YOUR REGULAR WORK AT TIME OF ACCIDENT? YES NO STATE WHERE ACCIDENT OCCURRED _____ EMPLOYER'S PREMISES JOB SITE OTHER

NAME OF EMPLOYER _____ STREET ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ ZIP CODE _____ HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED FOR THIS EMPLOYER? _____

EMPLOYER'S BUSINESS (STATE TYPE OR NATURE OF): _____ ADDRESS OR LOCATION, INCLUDING COUNTY, WHERE ACCIDENT OCCURRED _____

DESCRIBE ACCIDENT FULLY, STATING IF YOU FELL OR WERE STRUCK. IF MACHINERY WAS INVOLVED, NAME MACHINE AND DESCRIBE ITS FUNCTION. WERE YOU LIFTING, PULLING, PUSHING OR CARRYING? FALLS SHOULD BE DESCRIBED AS INDOORS OR OUTDOORS AND LAST OBJECT STRUCK SHOULD BE NAMED. NAME CHEMICAL INVOLVED, IF APPROPRIATE.

WAS THE ACCIDENT IN YOUR OPINION CAUSED IN ANY WAY BY SOMEONE NOT EMPLOYED BY YOUR EMPLOYER? YES NO DATE YOU REPORTED ACCIDENT TO YOUR EMPLOYER _____ TO WHOM REPORTED: (NAME & TITLE) _____

IF EMPLOYER WAS NOT NOTIFIED THE SAME DATE AS THE ACCIDENT GIVE REASON _____ ENTER YOUR RATE OF PAY IN APPLICABLE BOX BELOW. DO NOT INCLUDE OVERTIME. PER HOUR _____ PER DAY _____ PER WEEK _____ PER MONTH _____

FULL NAME OF WIFE OR HUSBAND AT TIME OF INJURY _____ IF DIVORCED, GIVE FINAL DECREE DATE _____ IF DIVORCED AND YOU HAVE MINOR CHILDREN SUBMIT A COPY OF THE COURT ORDER SHOWING LEGAL CUSTODIAN OF SUCH CHILDREN. ALSO GIVE PRESENT ADDRESS OF SUCH CUSTODIAN.

GIVE NAME AND BIRTH DATES OF YOUR CHILDREN UNDER 18 SUPPORTED BY YOU

NAME	RELATIONSHIP	AGE	NAME	RELATIONSHIP	AGE

THE FOREGOING STATEMENTS ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I UNDERSTAND THAT ANY MISREPRESENTATION BY ME MAY RESULT IN CIVIL OR CRIMINAL PENALTIES. DATE _____

EMPLOYEE SIGN HERE

DATE OF FIRST TREATMENT _____ HISTORY _____

COMPLAINTS AND PHYSICAL FINDINGS IN DETAIL (IF EXTREMITIES INVOLVED, GIVE RIGHT OR LEFT.)

DIAGNOSIS _____

GIVE TREATMENT USED _____ X-RAY FINDINGS _____

HAS EMPLOYEE HAD PREVIOUS INJURY TO AREA? YES NO HAS EMPLOYEE EVER BEEN TREATED BY ANYONE FOR PRESENT OR SIMILAR CONDITION? YES NO IF YES, EXPLAIN _____

IF CASE REFERRED TO ANOTHER DOCTOR, GIVE NAME AND ADDRESS: _____

IS THERE ANY PRE-EXISTING DISEASE OF THE AREA INJURED? YES NO WILL THIS OR ANY OTHER PRE-EXISTING CONDITION COMPLICATE TREATMENT OR RETARD RECOVERY? YES NO COULD THE CONDITION DIAGNOSED BE THE RESULT OF THE INCIDENT DESCRIBED? YES PROBABLY POSSIBLY

IF HOSPITALIZED: IN PATIENT OUT PATIENT NAME OF HOSPITAL _____ CITY _____ ZIP CODE _____

WILL THIS EMPLOYEE BE OFF WORK DUE TO THIS INJURY? YES NO **ESTIMATED TIME LOSS DUE TO INJURY** _____ DAYS **WILL THERE BE ANY PERMANENT DISABILITY?** YES NO UNDETERMINED

ATTENDING PHYSICIAN: (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.) _____ ADDRESS _____ ZIP CODE _____ TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

PART III. PHYSICIAN'S REPORT

THIS REPORT CAN BE ACCEPTED ONLY WHEN SIGNED BY A LICENSED PHYSICIAN

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ PAYEE ACCOUNT NUMBER _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

EMPLOYEE: COMPLETE PART II., "EMPLOYEE'S REPORT."
PHYSICIAN: COMPLETE PART III., "PHYSICIAN'S REPORT."
 DETACH THE "EMPLOYEE-PHYSICIAN" SECTION OF PAGE 1 AT THE PERFORATION ABOVE THE SHADED AREA AND IMMEDIATELY MAIL DIRECT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRIES, OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504.
 DETACH PAGE 3 FOR YOUR RECORDS AND PROMPTLY MAIL THE BALANCE OF THE FORM INTACT (EMPLOYER'S REPORT AND PAGE 2) TO THE EMPLOYER.

(USE DEPT. PAYEE ACCOUNT NUMBER STAMP)

P 972752 PA

