Student Work

4-1-1987

The Evaluation of a Mid-Western Suburban School District's Teacher Selection Model

Steven Charles Moore
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork

THE EVALUATION OF A MID-WESTERN SUBURBAN
SCHOOL DISTRICT'S TEACHER SELECTION MODEL

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty

University of Nebraska

at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Steven Charles Moore

April 1987

UMI Number: EP74126

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the Graduate Faculty, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name   Department

_Norman _____   _Ed Ad_____

_Edward Hallee_____   _Teacher Educ._____

_Darrell Kellams_____
Chairman

_4-14-'87_____
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The success of any organization is closely related to the quality of personnel employed to achieve the purposes of the organization. This is certainly true in a labor intensive organization such as the public schools. While available financial support, adequate facilities, community support, and a well defined organizational purpose are important to achieve quality education, the most crucial single element in the education process is the people engaged to help students learn (Castetter, 1986).

Selecting the best employees is a complex task. It must be well organized and executed. Typical purposes of a selection procedure are :

1. to determine specific needs of the school district in terms of the number of and general nature of the positions,

2. to determine specific person attributes for each position,

3. to recruit desirable applicants for each position,

4. to collect and process data about each applicant,

5. to select and place the best qualified applicants, and,

6. to establish controls over the entire process to determine any sources of errors (Bolton, 1973).

The specific nature of the recruitment and selection

process varies from school district to school district. The process can be centralized, de-centralized, or a combination of both. A centralized recruitment and selection process requires that all screening and decision making be done from the central office without involving principals or supervisors. A totally de-centralized process places the responsibility solely with supervisors and principals. De-centralized recruitment and selection gives the principal autonomy as a building leader but could ignore district-wide personnel needs and long-range goals.

Selection tools used to identify the most qualified candidates vary as widely as the selection process. The tools used to select teachers range from a single informal interview to elaborate screening, testing, and interviewing techniques.

This study reviewed the recruitment and selection model used by one mid-western suburban school district to hire its instructional personnel. Several features of the district's recruitment and selection model are:

1. The Board of Education has developed a set of personnel policies which allow the superintendent to design and implement appropriate administrative procedures to attract and hold the highest qualified personnel for all positions.

2. Personnel needs are continually reviewed. This review includes: (a) determining the types of positions

needed, and (b) determining the number of staff needed in each type of position.

3. Positions are analyzed prior to recruiting and selecting candidates. The position analysis includes: (a) specifying the duties and responsibilities associated with each position, and (b) determining the desirable employee qualifications for each position.

4. The recruiting practices of the district vary according to the available number of candidates. Most positions have applicants which are secured by: (a) interviewing potential first year teachers on college campuses located within the state, (b) participating in university and college job seminars where students are instructed about how to find jobs, (c) developing brochures about teaching in the district and distributing them to colleges, universities and potential candidates, (d) maintaining a file of completed application forms and credentials on all who desire employment in the district, and (e) promoting the district as a desirable place to work. For positions that do not have an adequate supply of candidates, the district advertises in local and regional newspapers, college placement bulletins, and professional organization placement bulletins.

5. Applications are complete when specific data have been provided to the district. The data collected on each applicant includes: (a) optional letters of application,

(b) optional personal resumes, (c) a completed district application form, (d) certification information, (e) professional references, and (f) personal interviews.

6. The selection procedure of the district is: (a) review the files of all applicants properly certificated for each vacant position, (b) conduct initial central office interviews of the most qualified candidates, (c) principals or supervisors interview 2 or 3 candidates for each vacant position, and (d) offer the position to the most qualified candidate.

7. Formal and informal evaluations are conducted to insure that errors in the recruitment and selection process are minimized.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the recruitment, and selection procedures used by a mid-western suburban school district.

Most personnel administrators agree that the recruitment and selection process of a school district should be evaluated but seldom is formally evaluated (Vanderheiden, 1981). The problem is that little or no guidance is available for conducting an evaluation. This study will create an evaluation model. Therefore this study may serve as a guide for other school districts that desire to formally evaluate their teacher recruitment and selection process.

Methodology

The researcher used the following questions as a guide to determine the effectiveness of the procedures used to recruit, select, and retain teachers in the school district:

1. Are the selected teachers successful?

2. Are the selected teachers retained?

3. Are the selected teachers satisfied with their position?

4. Are the building principals satisfied with the performance of the selected teachers?

5. Is the district's recruitment and selection model consistently followed when hiring teachers?

6. Does the date a position is filled affect the ability of the district to select a qualified teacher?

7. What changes are needed in the model which will allow the district to better meet its personnel needs?

The methodology used to gather data for the study was formulated to include the several strategies. Review the literature to identify quality instructional personnel needs assessment, recruitment practices, and selection processes. Synthesize a model for determining instructional personnel needs, recruitment, and selection into a checklist. Randomly select 30 instructional personnel hired for the school years 1983-84 through 1985-86 and determine the extent to which the identified model was followed. Develop a questionnaire for teachers to assess their satisfaction

with the teacher recruitment, selection and assignment process. Develop a questionnaire to assess principals' satisfaction with teacher recruitment, the selection process and the teachers' job performance. Review each selected teacher's final evaluation form to determine the formal job performance rating of the teacher.

Delimitations

The selected teachers' success will not be personally judged by the researcher. Teachers will not be observed in the classroom beyond the normal evaluation done by the building principal.

Only regular classroom instructional personnel are included in the study. Specialty teachers such as psychologists, counselors and special education instructors are not included in this study. The recruitment and selection model used with administrative, secretarial, instructional aides, custodial, maintenance, student, substitute, and food service personnel is not being studied.

The group of teachers to be studied is a random sample of teachers hired by the district between April 1983 and September 1985. The teachers in the sample are still employed as teachers in the district.

Limitations

This study will not follow up on those candidates who were not selected for positions. Information collected concerning teachers during the application process will be

derived from the employees' files and administrators' notes.

Assumptions

A significant number of unqualified candidates self select out of the process because they do not posses the proper degrees, certification, or endorsement necessary to be considered for employment as a public school teacher. Teachers hired after July are selected from a reduced pool of candidates and are likely to be among the weakest teachers selected.

Definition of Terms

1. Personnel selection - a decision making process in which one individual is chosen over another to fill a position on the basis of how well characteristics of the individual match the requirements of the position.

2. Credentials - a set of information about a candidate which includes (a) academic preparation, (b) previous employment history, (c) involvement in community and professional activities and organizations, and (d) references.

3. Application form - a form to be completed by all applicants. It provides specific information in a consistent format for easy utilization by administrators.

4. Teachers - those certificated personnel involved in the direct instruction of students.

5. The district - the mid-western suburban school district being studied. The district had an enrollment of

approximately 15,000 students in grades kindergarten through twelve. The district employed more than 1,400 people, with approximately 900 of those employees being teachers.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I contains an introduction to the study. Chapter II contains a review of related research and literature concerning teacher recruitment and selection. Chapter III contains a discussion of the methods used in the gathering and treating the data. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Millions of decisions concerned with the selection of teachers are being made annually. Each of these decisions has a potential impact on school children because teachers are so vital to the education process (Bolton, 1973). The consequences of poor teaching are so serious that the selection process in education is a matter of critical concern (Castetter, 1986). The consensus among administrators was that selecting the best teachers solves many potential problems (Harris, 1985). Ineffective selection procedures result in more parental and student discontent, increased student discipline problems, a more urgent need to supervise and evaluate, reduced student achievement, and increased teacher dismissals (Engel, 1984).

Selection procedures for teachers as well as requirements for entry into the teaching profession have changed considerably since the early days of education in the United States. From the colonial period to the early part of the twentieth century, the only requirements for a person to teach were a knowledge of the subject matter and a desire to teach (Cubberley, 1920). It was a time when people believed that anyone could teach; the prospective teacher only needed some influence to obtain a position (Yeager, 1954).

The teacher's unique position in the educational

process was critically important to the achievement of excellence in our nation's schools (Bredeson, 1985). Every school administrator responsible for or involved with the selection of personnel would concur that the selection of staff was the most important aspect of his or her job (Engel, 1984). One reason for this belief appeared to be a contention that it was more effective to use administrator time to recruit and select well qualified candidates than to transform weak teachers into strong teachers (Harris, 1985).

Processes Involved in Selecting Teachers

Many people considered the teacher selection process as a single activity consisting of interviewing applicants and selecting one of those applicants. A review of the literature for this study indicated that this was not the case. The literature revealed that teacher selection was a complex process involving many separate yet interrelated activities.

The personnel screening and selection was a complicated decision-making process involving the perception, assessment, and evaluation of a variety of types of information which were made available to a decision-maker (Gips, 1984). This information may be accurate, inaccurate, incomplete, or irrelevant. The decision-maker must filter information through a perceptual screen and make a judgment based on an impression which has been formed (Bredeson,

1985).

Several teacher selection processes have been identified in the literature. A survey of members of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators was conducted in 1981. Vanderheiden (1981) used these results to describe the typical teacher recruitment and selection process consisting of several distinct steps, including: (a) determining policies, (b) determining needs, (c) classification and description, (d) recruitment, (e) selection and, (f) evaluation.

Benjamin Harris (1985) described a selection process that consisted of the following functions: (a) conducting a needs assessment, (b) developing job descriptions, (c) identifying and attracting potential recruits, (d) initial screening of candidates, (e) developing selection tools and processes, (f) decision making, and (g) validating of the selection process.

William Castetter (1986) has defined the personnel selection process in three basic parts, pre-selection, selection, and post-selection. Pre-selection involved the development of selection policies and the formulation of procedures for implementing that policy. These procedures included: complying with laws and regulations, developing position and person specifications, and defining effectiveness criteria, performance predictors, and process responsibilities.

The second part of Castetter's selection process was the selection itself. The selection involved the application of the selection policies and procedures. This involved the appraising of data and the applicants. Castetter's final step was post-selection, which included writing of the contract and specifying the terms of employment (Castetter, 1986).

A model of staff selection identified by Ronald Rebore (1982) listed the following ten steps: (a) write the job description, (b) establish the selection criteria, (c) write the vacancy announcement and advertise the position, (d) receive applications, (e) select the candidates to be interviewed, (f) interview candidates, (g) check references and credentials, (h) select the best candidate, (i) implement the job offer and acceptance, and (j) notify unsuccessful candidates.

Another selection model was addressed by Dale Bolton (1973). Bolton's teacher selection process included the following eight activities:

1. Determining the total number of teachers needed and making a complete position analysis for each vacancy.

2. Establishing standards for teacher performance appropriate to the situation being considered.

3. Recruiting applicants for the positions.

4. Describing the applicants accurately in terms of a variety of factors, after acquiring various types of

information from different sources.

5. Predicting the behavior of each applicant in the situation for which he or she is applying.

6. Comparing the predicted behavior of each applicant with the desired standards of teacher performance in order to judge the degree to which each standard would be satisfied.

7. Making choices among applicants.

8. Establishing controls for the total process by analyzing sources of error.

There were several similarities among the processes identified by various writers. The remainder of this chapter contains a review the literature on six commonly identified selection processes for school personnel. These six processes are: (a) selection policy, (b) staff needs assessment, (c) position analysis, (d) recruitment, (e) selection procedure and criteria, and (f) validation of the selection process.

Selection Policy

The local board of education was the only agent legally authorized to employ school personnel. In most districts, however, it was logistically difficult for the board to be directly involved in selecting teacher candidates. Therefore, teachers were hired upon the recommendation of the superintendent or other administrative personnel (Vanderheiden, 1981).

The basis for developing a unified system of plans for selecting personnel originated with the board of education. Board policy, in the form of a written statement, indicated to the community, the school staff, and to all who apply for employment in the system the intent of the board regarding personnel selection; it served as a guide in the selection process (Castetter, 1986). Policy may address such factors as preparation, experience, eligibility for certification, personnel qualities, health, who was actually to do the selection or to participate in it, and the steps to be completed before an individual was eligible for employment (Moore, 1966).

No service in education generated more serious challenges to policy and procedures than did personnel selection, assignment, contracts, and evaluation. Even student problems were second to personnel problems as a source of court cases (Harris, 1985). Therefore, Harris (1985) suggested that board's policy should be broad; it should serve as the basis for more detailed administrative regulations. Effective personnel administrators know that keeping policies and procedures current is a never-ending task (Harris, 1985). However, written policies for the selection of new teachers in a district were found to be all but nonexistent (Kahl, 1980). If selection policies did not exist, the board of education needed to adopt policy that would guide administrative employment practices to the end

that the board would approve the recommendations of the superintendent and his assistants concerning personnel (Moore, 1966).

Selection policies have included public employment policy (anti-discrimination) and policies negotiated with the union regarding any aspect of personnel selection (e.g. promotion from within). The following sample selection policy was included in Castetter's book on personnel administration.

1. Choose the person best qualified for the position, with a view toward suitability for further advancement.

2. Adhere to federal, state, and local regulations regarding equal employment opportunity.

3. Establish personnel procedures whereby race, color, religion, age, sex, national origin, or membership in any lawful organization shall not be a consideration in (a) employment, promotion, or transfer; (b) recruitment or recruitment advertising; (c) rates of pay or other forms of compensation; (d) selection for training; and (e) demotion or termination.

4. Employ, promote, develop personnel on the basis of sex or age only where these factors are essential to the position performance.

5. Employ women on a basis equal to that of men without restriction as to type of work except as to limitations imposed by physical ability.

6. Permit employment of persons related by blood or marriage to any member of the Board of Education on consent of two thirds of the Board membership.

7. Fill vacancies by upgrading or promoting from within whenever present staff members are qualified (Castetter, 1986).

Staff Needs Assessment

One of the first tasks to be done in the teacher selection process was to identify the number of teachers needed to meet its goals. Schools, like every organization, needed to identify the personnel, materials, and facilities needed to accomplish its goals and purposes (Bolton, 1973).

A staff needs assessment was a systematic way of determining the difference between what an organization is accomplishing with its personnel and what it would like to accomplish. Needs were assessed first with respect to the mission and goals of the total organization and then with respect to the particular unit or job assignment (Harris, 1985).

A systems model for determining school personnel needs could be expressed in six steps: (a) determining finances available, (b) establishing enrollment projections, (c) determining curriculum needs, (d) conducting a self-inventory of staff, (e) determining class size, and (f) producing a needs study (Vanderheiden, 1981). As

Vanderheiden's model suggested, determination of school personnel needs must included a consideration of the number and types of individuals needed to match personnel with the unique aspects of each position so that organizational goals can be accomplished and individuals hired can attain satisfaction (Bolton, 1973).

Approximately 80% of the large public school systems studied by Gilbert (1966) reported that they took an inventory of personal and professional characteristics of their currently employed staff members as a part of their needs assessment. This included the analysis of their staff in terms of amount of professional preparation, amount of teaching experience and age. Analyzing the current staff prior to reassigning current employees and assigning new employees was necessary to assure balanced staff groups from school to school, from level to level within schools, or from program to program. Balance needed to be maintained in all aspects of staff characteristics that could substantially affect the quality of instruction or the equality of educational opportunity. Staff load, competence of personnel, race, ethnicity, sex, and even certain attitudes toward matters such as maintenance versus change were worthy of careful consideration in balancing staff groups (Harris, 1985).

Position Analysis

Two components that formed the backbone of the

selection process were the establishment of the position and person requirements for the position. If the selection process was to field people who could perform effectively in a position, then the requirements of that position needed to be prescribed in advance (Faucett, 1964). The use of job descriptions could reduce pressures to employ unqualified personnel. Their use could also make it possible to administer the selection process more objectively and openly (Castetter, 1986).

A written job description is the end product of a process that was commonly referred to as position analysis. A number of recognized techniques could be used in position analysis. These included:

1. Observation. The person conducting the analysis directly observes the employee as he or she was performing his or her job.

2. Individual interviews. Certain employees were extensively interviewed. The analyzed results from a number of these interviews were added to the job analysis.

3. Group interviews. This technique was similar to individual interviews except that a number of employees were interviewed at the same time.

4. Job questionnaire. Employees check or rate tasks which they performed from a pre-established list of possible job tasks.

5. Consulting. Expert consultants were employed to

describe specific tasks that should be performed by certain categories of employees.

6. Supervisor analysis. Those who supervised certain categories of employees are consulted on the tasks which were appropriate to the job classification under study.

7. Diary method. Certain employees were required to maintain a diary of their daily activities for a given period of time (Rebore, 1982).

In addition to guiding administrators, job descriptions should provide information necessary for candidates to assess the position (Harris, 1985). Job descriptions should include title (Sybouts, 1976), definition, typical duties and responsibilities (Moore, 1966), primary function, special assignments, areas of authority (Castetter, 1986), physical requirements (Bolton, 1973), relationships to others in the school system, and terms of employment including type and length of contract, salary, vacations, and other benefits (Harris, 1985). Also specified by the job description are the required and/or desirable qualifications for the position such as education, experience, skills, knowledge, abilities, initiative, judgment, and personal characteristics needed by the position holder to perform effectively (Castetter, 1986).

Administrators must consider situational factors that affect a position to develop fully the teacher requirements for specific positions. The major situational factors

affecting teacher performance are: (a) pupil characteristics, including interests, abilities, motivation, and prior learning; (b) principal characteristics, including orientation to change, ability and interest in helping teachers, human relations and organizational skills, and decision-making style; and (c) colleague characteristics, including attitude, willingness to help new teachers, and willingness to plan programs cooperatively (Bolton, 1973).

One note of caution by Harris was that often job descriptions overemphasize specialized competencies to the neglect of common ones or of even basic personal characteristics that may be of overwhelming importance. For example, the teacher employed because of competence in diagnostic-prescriptive approaches to teaching reading whose human relations skills are such that no parent, child, or staff group can work with him or her effectively represents a poor selection decision (Harris, 1985).

Recruitment

Recruitment was one of the duties of the personnel administrator. It usually occupied a large percent of his or her time and energy. The recruitment of teachers into a school district may take many forms. Three primary resources used in the recruitment of applicants were: (a) placement bureaus of colleges and universities, (b) applications sent in voluntarily by applicants, and (c)

direct recruitment on college and university campuses (Gilbert, 1966).

Some personnel offices provided simple publications on recruitment that gave information to young people, parents, and prospective teachers who were interested in the school system. Recruitment aids included information on school enrollment, class sizes, salary, fringe benefits, required qualifications, geographic location, population of community, living accommodations, tenure provisions, and educational, cultural or recreational opportunities (Greene, 1971).

A good recruitment plan appeared to take into consideration ways to efficiently process the volume of correspondence. For every inquiry from an applicant a response was needed. Many good candidates were lost to organizations because of correspondence problems (Castetter, 1986).

The recruitment program was also one of the most important public relations activities in which the school system participated, including: (a) traveling to college campus placement offices to interest prospective teachers in the district through talks, interviews, and participation in career days, (b) developing and maintaining effective contact with college professors and placement officers, (c) encouraging student teacher programs and related activities, and (d) advertising openings and preparing promotional

brochures and literature (Moore, 1966).

One way to attract able people was to make the school system appealing to candidates. Once it was evident that exciting educational opportunities exist in the school district, then individuals would like excitement would be likely to show an interest in employment there (Harris, 1985). If the climate of the school and community was conducive to high staff morale and performance, recruitment of quality teachers would be enhanced through increased applications (Greene, 1971).

Generally, the intensity of recruitment activity was related to the availability of candidates in the teacher market. When a surplus of teachers existed, school systems used rigorous selection procedures. When there are shortages of candidates, district personnel developed and maintained more active recruitment programs. Certainly no selection program could be effective unless the number of candidates was substantially greater than the number of positions. A systematic selection process could not compensate for an inadequate number of qualified candidates (Bolton, 1973).

Selection Procedure and Criteria

The actual selection of the person to fill a position could be divided into two parts: procedure and criteria. The procedure concerned a sequence of steps to be followed in choosing the employee. The criteria involved the

qualities being assessed and the tools used in the assessment (Kahl, 1980).

Selection criteria differed from the procedure in that the selection criteria described those ideal characteristics that, if possessed by an individual to the fullest extent possible, would ensure the successful performance of the job. Conceptualization of what was wanted in an outstanding teacher was just as critical to the entire selection process as the procedures (Schneier, 1976). The use of selection criteria was also a method of quantifying the expert opinion of those who interviewed candidates (Rebore, 1982).

<u>Selection</u> <u>Criteria</u>

Since selection criteria varied for different communities (Hendrix, 1970), school districts used job descriptions as the basis for determining the selection criteria. The criteria included the types of information to be gathered and weighed against the qualifications identified in the job description. The literature indicated that relevant information could be obtained from many sources including: (a) applications, (b) professional credential files, (c) examinations, and (d) interviews (Vornberg, 1983).

<u>Application</u> <u>for</u> <u>employment</u>

Applications for employment included letters of inquiry, letters of application, personal resumes' and application forms developed by the school system (Bolton,

1973). Application forms were similar to letters of application and resumes' in that they both provided needed information about the candidates background and their specific employment interests in the school district (Lowell, 1982). They could be analyzed for completeness and provided evidence of literacy (Webster, 1980). Application forms were more useful for a personnel administrator because the required information about candidates was logically and consistently arranged for all candidates. Furthermore, application forms could be designed to secure information that would be helpful in predicting success or failure in a position (Castetter, 1986).

Application forms were constructed in one of two basic formats. The first style emphasized detailed and extensive factual information about the individual, with little or no attention given to the person's attitudes, opinions, and values. Conversely, the second style emphasized the applicant's attitudes, opinions, and values and asked for less factual information (Hershey, 1971). Application forms commonly requested the following information: educational background, personal data, teaching and related experiences, the kind of position desired, names of references, and the applicant's interests in extra-curricular activities, e.g. music, drama, clubs, athletics, and student publications (Gilbert, 1966).

The basic principle in constructing application forms

was to ask only for needed information. Irrelevant, inappropriate, and/or illegal information included: (a) maiden name; (b) marital status; (c) name and occupation of spouse; (d) number and age of children; (e) physical handicaps; (f) arrest record, asking about convictions was appropriate; (g) height and weight unless these were bona fide occupational qualifications; (h) if applicant owned a home or rented; (i) if applicant has relatives employed by the school district; a policy against hiring relatives of present employees was questionable; (j) if the applicant had an automobile and a driver's license unless this was a bona fide occupational qualification; (k) where the applicant attended elementary and high school; this was irrelevant for professional positions; (l) religion; (m) national origin; (n) race; (o) sex; and (p) date and place of birth (Harris, 1985 and Rebore, 1982).

Professional credential files

A candidates credentials included such items as a college or university transcript, teaching certification or license, and professional references. These items should be a part of every candidates file. It was important for the school district to inform a candidate that the application file was not completed until these documents were received (Rebore, 1982).

Teaching certificates were nearly always prerequisites for any teaching position. They served to screen out

applicants who did not possess proper certification (Bolton, 1973).

Copies of transcripts provided evidence of a candidate's professional preparation (Gilbert, 1966), as well as an indication of knowledge of their subject matter (Harris, 1985). College grade point averages were often used by school administrators when selecting teachers. There was some disagreement as to there worth however. Don Baker found that they were not reliable predictors of success for experienced teachers, but were useful when hiring inexperienced teachers (Baker, 1977). Nancy Perry (1981) found that schools generally ignored the research done by Jenkins, Fratiani, and Morsh and Wilder. Their research indicated that those who hired teachers ought to look carefully at academic grades when selecting teachers. She found however, that there was no significant differences in GPA between her students at North Texas State University who found teaching positions and those who did not.

References were usually requested from former education employers and college or university professors (Gilbert, 1966). Colleges of education were engaged in developing student teaching evaluations so that they can be more predictive of first year teaching performances. The problem was that no single rating scale would ever exist which would predict the future success of teachers (Adams, 1967).

The best reference sources were prior employers; the

worst were personal friends. A free form reference letter was not as predictable as the reference check form. References should be provided with a list of questions which could be answered by a check or with one or two words (Interviewing Teacher Candidates, 1976). This allowed people to respond more quickly and to provide the inquiring district with more meaningful data. A reference check should ask for specific information, such as dates of employment, salary, whether the former employer would rehire the applicant, and the basis of the employer's judgment. The reference check should seek an appraisal of the former employee's performance (Bolton, 1973).

According to a national survey of school administrators conducted by the Association for School, College and University Staffing, employers were looking for maturity, initiative, interest, enthusiasm, poise, ability to work with people, successful previous employment, and versatility (the ability to teach in more than one subject field area) (Bryant, 1978).

Examinations

There was a strong debate over whether tests are worthwhile or necessary to ensure teacher competency (Hathaway, 1980). In 1978, New York's School Personnel Assessment Council surveyed large city school systems and found that one-third gave examinations as part of their selection process, including the nations five largest cities

(McLaughlin, 1979 and Teitelbaum, 1979). With the current excellence in education drive, 30 states either required or have set a date to require applicants for teacher certification to be tested for competency in some combination of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, or pedagogical knowledge (No panaceas, 1984).

Typical examinations required by school districts included: physical examinations, the National Teacher Examination, oral examinations, locally prepared essay questions, locally prepared tests for each subject area, teaching demonstrations, and psychological or personality inventories (Gilbert, 1966). The New York City School System itself had been using examinations in teacher selection for more than 80 years; New York had created over 1,000 different license and certificate examinations for educators (Hathaway, 1980).

Physical examinations were the most frequently required test of newly employed teachers. Some schools did not require a physical examination of applicants but did require them when an offer of employment was extended. Rebore (1982) recommended that schools state on the application form that a health exam would be required as a condition of employment when health exams were not required of applicants. This avoided legal problems that resulted when physical requirements for the position were unknown to the candidate.

The most popular test battery across the nation was the National Teachers Examination (NTE). The NTE was required by 200 school districts and eight states. The NTE was designed to measure academic preparation in four domains: communication and skills, general education, professional education, and subject field specialization. Neither the new version nor the previous version, which had been in use for over 40 years had been proven to have predictive validity for identifying good teachers (No panaceas, 1984).

Legal rulings were beginning to significantly hinder the use of many teacher selection tests. Teacher selection procedures needed to comply with the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment: any written examination must be directly related to the job of teaching. Those seeking to put testing programs into effect needed to do their own careful validation studies in accordance with EEOC guidelines (Hathaway, 1980).

Tests would be employed only for gross screening purposes if they were to be used at all. They would serve as a red flag, just as would poor transcripts or references (Engel, 1984). Since many testing programs assessed general academic achievement, districts should not equate the results with teaching skills but rather as essential in order that other teaching competencies could be realized (Tocco, 1980).

The teacher assessment center supplemented the

traditional interview process used to hire teachers. The goal of a teacher assessment center was to provide a one or two day standardized assessment of teaching behaviors based on an individual's performance of classroom task simulations. Instead of asking teachers to tell what they could do, the assessment center had teachers show what they can do (Bond, 1985). The expense in establishing and operating an assessment center made them prohibitive to all but very large metropolitan school districts (Rebore, 1982).

Another type of test similar to the teacher assessment center was the teaching demonstration. The vast majority of districts did not observe candidates in the classroom (Gilbert, 1966). One district that did was the Elmont Union Free School District, a K-6 system of approximately 3,000 students located in New York. Candidates were asked to respond to four questions developed by administrators. Those who passed the written test were asked to plan and teach a 20-minute lesson of their own choice in one of the district's classrooms. Interviews of the candidates took place immediately following the lesson. The candidates were observed and interviewed by two building principals. The interviewers focused on teacher decisions made during the observed lesson. A follow-up study indicated that two-thirds of the teachers who were hired using this process were rated as highly desirable professionals (Caliendo, 1986).

Interviews

An interview was a conversation with form and direction; it had a beginning, middle, and conclusion. The interview was conducted by an individual who was prepared to move it in a direction dictated by the occasion (Rebore, 1982). The interview was a two-way process: The school district could learn more about the qualifications of available candidates, and the candidates could determine if they want to work for the school system (Hobart, 1979). The purpose of the interview was to clarify and verify the candidate's unique skills, attributes, and suitability for the position, as identified in the initial screening (Engel, 1984).

One common concern among administrators was knowing what appropriate questions to ask teacher candidates during an interview (Reutzel, 1983). A good way to improve the selection process was to use a structured interview. This was a series of predetermined questions arranged in such a way that the administrator was able to gather information about a prospective teacher in areas deemed to be essential to successful performance. Structured interviews were the interviews most strongly supported by practitioners and researchers (Stanton, 1977).

Structured interviews provided a higher inter-rater reliability than other interview forms; provided greater opportunity for interviewees to talk; covered intended

material consistently; and helped interviewers withhold judgment until the close of the interview (Engel, 1984). When all candidates were asked the same questions, they were treated equally and the interviewer had a common base upon which applicants were evaluated (Ferguson, 1983).

It was important that any systematic interviewing procedure demonstrate validity by discriminating between superior and less effective personnel. This was accomplished only through competent, intensive and repeated research (Muller, 1981). Two such validated interviews were the Teacher Perceiver Interview developed by Selection Research, Inc. to measure effective teaching personalities (Pellicer, 1981) and Project EMPATHY (Emphasizing More Personalized Attitudes Toward Helping Youth) for which the Omaha Public Schools received federal development funds (Thayer, 1978). The challenge to interviewers was to constantly refine the interview through careful examination and research to increase its validity and reliability (Anderson, 1977).

The good interview was an attempt to understand how the candidate functioned; how the candidate solved problems, how he or she related to others, how he or she was motivated and how he or she applied their aptitudes and skills (Engel, 1980). Characteristics of the candidate most likely to be rated by the interviewers were: personal appearance, speech, attitudes toward his or her work, interest in children,

philosophy of education (Gilbert, 1966), previous position-related experience, and career goals (Castetter, 1986). Brannon (1975) particularly observed poise, posture, facial expressions, dress and mannerisms. He believed these were indications of how the candidate would operate in the classroom.

Experienced interviewers knew what not to do or say as well as what to do or say. Engel (1980) identified nine common interview errors to avoid: (a) poorly phrased questions were not understood by the applicant; (b) purposeless questions did not yield information about the characteristics of the applicant; (c) interviewers talked too much; (d) interviewers reacted emotionally to the applicant, making biased judgments; (e) interviewers became antagonistic toward the applicant, so that the applicant was inhibited from presenting a typical response; (f) interviewers failed to follow up revealing leads; (g) questions went beyond the limits of proper interrogation; (h) interviewers jumped to conclusions; and (i) interviewers suggested the "right" answer.

Many of these common interviewer errors could have been avoided by training the interviewer; however most administrators received little training in the proper techniques of interviewing (McKenna, 1968).

Selection Procedures

Many selection procedures were determined by the size

of the school district and the nature of the position to be filled (Engel, 1984). Research showed that in some districts (especially large ones) central office personnel selected and assigned teachers with no input from those with whom the new teachers were to work (Fuhr, 1977). However, many different groups had a stake in securing quality personnel for the district and desired to have a role in selecting its employees. Those wished to be involved were parents, students, teachers, department heads, and principals (Gips, 1984). Parents indicated what expectations they had for their children; students indicated what motivates them; and teachers indicated behaviors desirable for a given position (Bolton, 1973).

One of the initial procedure decisions a district needed to make was that of defining each person's role in the selection process. In larger school districts, the role of the superintendency was in part to provide services that could not be supplied by attendance units themselves or that could be carried out more effectively from the central office (Castetter, 1986).

Modern school systems were more frequently delegating a major share of personnel activities to a central unit. Personnel departments were often formed when organizations contained 200 or more employees (Beach, 1980). One role of the personnel department which had gained acceptance was that of recruiting and screening applicants for attendance

units (Castetter, 1986), who had been reluctant to yield this responsibility to the personnel office (Moore, 1966). Unfortunately, when principals alone selected their own teachers it was mostly based on intuition; principals looked for characteristics in teachers similar to their own (Neu, 1978).

Although no universal model of selection procedures existed, there was considerable agreement among practitioners and theorists to include all levels of affected groups to some extent (Fuhr, 1977). They also agreed that the process must clearly define and differentiate the responsibilities of those involved (Castetter, 1986).

Teacher selection procedures included: receiving and reviewing applications, checking references and credentials, selecting candidates to be interviewed, interviewing the candidates, selecting the best candidate, implementing the job offer, and notifying unsuccessful candidates.

Receiving and reviewing applications

The central office received and process all applications for the school district. As applications were received they were dated and placed in a file folder along with transcripts, certificates and reference forms. This provided integrity to the process and provided a method of monitoring the progress towards filling vacancies. The entire file folder was be given to a personnel administrator

who performed the initial screening (Rebore, 1982).

Checking references and credentials

The initial screening involved reviewing the candidates complete application file. Dale Beach (1980) strongly supported scrutinizing references and previous work experience; he contended that the most accurate insight into how a person would perform in the future could be determined by reviewing what he or she had done in the past. Written reference checks were most often followed up with a telephone call to verify accuracy of the written references (Gilbert, 1966).

A study by Paul Arend (1973) sought to determine the relationship between the rated performance effectiveness of newly employed teachers in their second year of teaching and selected characteristics of data available in their credentials utilized for their selection. One significant finding was that a higher proportion of ineffective teachers were hired when complete credentials were not available.

Selecting candidates to be interviewed

Selection procedures included a statement about interviewing candidates. The district determined if it intended to interview all candidates who apply or a selected few. Since appraising data about applicants was a complex process, Berg (1978) recommended that when there were large numbers of applicants, the process should be simplified by completing preliminary screening prior to interviewing.

This greatly reduced the number of interviews to be scheduled.

Interviewing the candidates

Interviewing candidates was often a shared responsibility between the personnel department and other school district employees. Acknowledging that the personality of the interviewer often had a strong influence on selection, Greene (1971) recommended that at least two or three interviewers appraise the applicant. These interviewers may sit as a committee or preferably in separate interviews.

Many believed it was important to include not only those who would supervise the new employee but also others who had expert knowledge about the duties to be performed by the successful candidate (Rebore, 1982). Staff contributions were most valuable during the selection of teachers in specialized areas such as art, music, counseling or school psychology (Engel, 1984).

Nicholas Fischer (1981) an elementary principal in Florida found that involving teachers and parents provided these benefits: (a) parents said that the experience makes them more familiar with school operations and problems, and (b) the process boosted staff morale and cohesion, by allowing teachers to help choose the colleagues with whom they would have to work closely.

McLaughlin (1979) found that administrators viewed

teachers as being much more involved in selection than teachers did. It was therefore important that administrators and teachers communicate their expectations and desires as they related to personnel selection decisions.

Regardless of how many interviews were conducted or who did the interviewing, research demonstrated that teachers selected by raters using a predetermined interview format were ultimately more successful in teaching than those selected by raters using no predetermined interview format (Shoemaker, 1974), as long as it was developed locally or tailored to fit the particular needs, values, attitudes and priorities of the district (Millard, 1974).

Selection was a two way proposition. The interview left each party with an understanding of how he/she stood. The employer indicated future employment prospects and procedures and the candidate made clear an interest or lack of interest in being considered further (Moore, 1966). The candidate was given as much information about the position as possible. Self-selection on the part of candidates simplified and improved teacher selection (Kahl, 1980).

Selecting the best candidate

Actual selection decisions were made by a small number of highly trained, competent, responsible people who could document their decisions effectively (Harris, 1985). The personnel administrator responsible organized all relevant

data in such a manner that a choice could be made (Rebore, 1982). The most important reason for documenting the decision was to provide clear data to the board of education supporting the recommendation of the best candidate for the position. Since unsuccessful candidates for a position had a right to lodge a formal complaint, documentation of the steps and criteria involved in the decision became very important (Jinks, 1985).

Perhaps the best means to ensure that no criterion was overlooked or inappropriately weighted in the selection process was to develop a profile sheet for each applicant (Engel, 1984). This enabled the selection to proceed in a systematic, more objective manner.

The practitioner always kept in mind the ultimate placement of the teacher, for a teacher may be an outstanding success in one situation and a near failure in another regardless of the kinds and quality of information available for decision making. A study by Kenneth Underwood concluded that a poor placement may reduce the effectiveness of a good teacher (Gerwin, 1974).

Implementing the job offer

When the final decision had been made, the selected candidate was formally offered the job. If the individual accepted the offer, a contract was signed contingent upon the approval of the board of education (Rebore, 1982). In order to avoid future misunderstanding, the two parties had

a contract that specified the terms of employment and the new employee was given an employee handbook which identified operating procedures of the district.

One of the difficulties in the selection process was the time factor. Many desirable candidates were lost to competing systems because of the time lag between the initial interview and an offer of employment (Castetter, 1986). Every effort was made to keep the time involved in filling a position to a minimum.

Notifying unsuccessful candidates

The final step in the selection process was to notify all applicants that the position had been filled. This was only initiated after the offer of employment had been accepted by the selected candidate since there may have been a need to offer the position to another candidate if the first refused the offer (Rebore, 1982). It was important for all candidates to be kept informed of their status, since many applicants would be candidates for several positions and their continued good will was desired.

Validation of the Selection Process

The ultimate purpose of evaluating the selection process was to determine how well the system was succeeding in attracting and holding a competent staff (Castetter, 1986). For a selection procedure to be valuable, it was both reliable and valid. A reliable process was one that

was consistent among users. For example, different users arrived at the same conclusions with respect to the same teacher candidates and the same user arrived at the same results when he or she repeated the procedure. A valid procedure accomplished its purpose. If a procedure generally resulted in the selection of effective teachers, it was considered valid (Kahl, 1980).

Prior to the 1960's, few districts attempted an evaluation of the effectiveness of their selection process. Increasing concern with fair employment practice issues however, had brought about a closer examination of the effectiveness of the selection process (Kirkland, 1979).

When evaluating the predictive quality of a teacher selection process, teacher candidates' status with respect to process were weighed against some ultimate criterion of teaching effectiveness. Validity studies focused on analyzing teachers who were superior on measurable criteria such as student ratings, supervisor ratings, administrator ratings, expert observations, parent ratings, or student achievement (Muller, 1981 and Vanderheiden, 1981).

Castetter (1986) recommended comparing the rank differences between personnel ratings of teachers prior to employment and their performance ratings after one year of service. This was accomplished by rating each teacher from high to low on teacher performance and on individual selection predictors (interviews, credentials). Although

association may or may not have indicated a cause-and-effect relation, it did indicate which parts of the selection model needed further study.

The Elmont school district in New York validated their selection process by asking principals to evaluate a lesson using their lesson rating scale; the majority of the new teachers were rated as highly successful and there were no requests for termination. The teachers also were asked to rate the selection process as recommended by Gilbert (1966). Their opinion was that the best predictors of their own success as a teacher was the interview, teaching a lesson, completing essay questions about teaching strategies, references, and academic records (Caliendo, 1986).

One serious limitation to evaluating the teacher selection process had to do with what is referred to by Kahl (1980) as the restriction-of-range phenomenon as it affected correlation coefficients. When there was little variance in either of two variables being correlated, a sizable correlation coefficient was not likely to be obtained. Since the correlation between predictors and latter effectiveness could only be based on data from individuals who had completed teacher education programs and actually been hired as teachers, the dice were loaded against finding any selection process to be effective (No panaceas, 1984). In most studies the people who failed the process were no longer evaluated because they did not get hired.

Regardless of the limitations, an evaluation of the teacher selection process answered these questions in order to assess both efficiency and effectiveness (Vanderheiden, 1981):

1. Was the process providing an adequate number of applicants?

2. Was the process providing the needed quality of teachers?

3. What were the costs in relation to the number of individuals hired?

4. What was the tenure record of the individuals hired?

5. What was the number hired in relation to the number interviewed.

Summary

Teacher recruitment and selection was a complex task consisting of many parts. The literature identified several ingredients of an effective selection process. These included:

1. Boards of Education established personnel policies. These policies served as a guide for the administrator during the selection process.

2. A staff needs assessments was conducted prior to recruiting candidates. This assessment identified available finances, curriculum needs, enrollment projections, class size, and an inventory of current staff.

3. A position analysis resulted in a job description

being written. It described the position and the desirable qualities of the person to be hired.

4. Successful recruiting efforts resulted in a significant number of qualified candidates applying for positions in the district.

5. Selection criteria included the type of information that would be gathered and weighed against the qualifications identified in the job description.

6. A selection procedure was a sequence of steps to be followed in choosing the new employee. The procedure also identified lines of authority and responsibility; and

7. The success of the entire process could only be judged by a formal evaluation. Such evaluations were conducted too infrequently.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the recruitment and selection procedures used by a mid-western suburban school district. A review of the literature indicated that few school districts attempted a formal evaluation of their procedures. Therefore, most school districts either could not or did not know for certain how well their recruitment and selection procedures were working.

If teachers were found to be satisfied, evaluated as effective by their principals, and were retained by the district for a period of years, it would reflect on the recruitment and selection process of the district. This study identified a model evaluation plan to be used by districts to determine the success of their recruitment and selection process.

The Setting

The study reviewed the recruitment and selection process used by a mid-western suburban school district. The district had an enrollment of approximately 15,000 students in grades kindergarten through twelve. The district employed more than 1,400 people. Approximately 900 of those employees were teachers. The district had been growing in student population and was expecting further growth in the

years ahead.

The Population

The teachers in the study were regular classroom instructional personnel. The group included elementary and secondary classroom teachers. Those teachers taught grades kindergarten through six in elementary classrooms. In secondary schools they taught subject areas of math, science, language arts, social sciences, cultural arts, and practical arts. The group did not include specialists such as counselors, psychologists, special education instructors, media specialists, or district curriculum specialists. Specialists were not included because of the study's limitations. The selection process was better defined for regular classroom teachers; regular classroom teachers usually had one supervisor, making the questionnaires more manageable; and the vast majority of teachers hired by the district were regular classroom teachers.

The district modified its selection process prior to recruiting and hiring teachers for the 1983-84 school year. Therefore, the study evaluated the process as it was used to recruit and hire teachers for the 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86 school years. The district hired 313 teachers for those school years using that selection process. The district continued to employ 273 of those teachers at the time of the study. The teachers hired for the 1986-87 school year were not included in the study since that was

the year of the study.

The Sample

The sample consisted of thirty teachers randomly selected from teachers hired for the 1983-84 through 1985-86 school year who were still employed by the district. Forty teachers no longer employed were analyzed to determine the extent or type of variance with the sample. Sample selection techniques outlined in _Elementary Statistics, Data Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences_ were followed (Games, 1967). The table of random numbers from that book was used to draw the sample.

The Instruments

Two instruments were used in the study to test the model of teacher recruitment and selection and answer the following questions: a) Do teachers think that the selection and recruitment process used to hire them was satisfactory? (b) Are teachers satisfied with their current job? (c) Are principals satisfied with the performance of the selected teachers?; and (d) Are principals satisfied with the selection and recruitment process?

The Teacher Questionnaire

This questionnaire was composed of thirty questions (see Appendix B for a sample). Each question required a yes or no response. Questions 1 through 10 pertained to information sources available to candidates. These sources

could have provided them information about potential employment opportunities in the district. Questions 11 through 15 addressed information communicated to the candidates by district personnel. Questions 16 through 20 concerned the interviews conducted through the personnel office. Interviews conducted by building principals were addressed by questions 21 through 27; and job satisfaction was addressed by questions 28 through 30.

The Principal Questionnaire

The principal questionnaire contained 4 questions (see Appendix C). Those questions required a Likert-type response. Principals were asked to respond to each question with an A (Strongly Agree), B (Agree), C (Disagree), D (Strongly Disagree), or E (No Opinion). Question 1 addressed the extent of success of the recruitment process in providing qualified candidates. Question 2 concerned the principals' satisfaction with the building interview process. The decision to hire the teacher was addressed by question 3; and the adequacy of performance of the teacher was the focus of question 4.

Data Collection

There were five sources of data: The Teacher Questionnaire, The Principal Questionnaire, the personnel files of teachers not currently employed by the district, the personnel files of teachers in the sample, and the

literature on teacher selection.

The Literature

The literature relevant to teacher recruitment and selection was used to create a model for recruitment and selection. This model was written in the form of a checklist. The checklist is contained in Appendix A.

The Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire was distributed to the selected teachers during the month of March, 1987. Each teacher was sent a cover letter that explained the study and the process for completing and returning the questionnaire. A sample of the questionnaire is located in Appendix B.

Each teacher was asked to respond to the questionnaire within one week. A self addressed envelop was enclosed for their use. A personal call was made to those teachers who did not respond to the initial request for information. Follow-up materials were sent to those agreed to participate.

The Principal Questionnaire

The principal of each teacher selected for the study received the Principal Questionnaire. A cover letter explaining the study and a self-addressed envelope were enclosed with the questionnaire. This request was made at the same time as the teacher request. Appendix C contains a sample Principal Questionnaire. Follow-up telephone calls were made to those principals who failed to respond to the

initial request.

Former Teachers' Personnel Files

The personnel files of those teachers who were hired for the 1983-84 through 1985-86 school years but were no longer employed by the district were reviewed. The review attempted to determine why they were no longer employed. The fact of non-employment needed to be examined to determine, within obvious limitations, the extent to which the non-employment was due to an inadequate recruitment and selection process.

Selected Teachers' Personnel Files

The personnel files of the selected teachers were reviewed. The review was to establish the extent to which the district followed the selection model when hiring those teachers. The file review also identified ratings assigned during the selection process and ratings given by principals on final annual performance evaluations.

Data Analysis

The procedures used by the district to hire its teachers were compared to the checklist to determine the extent to which a relationship existed between the model and the district's procedures. The formal evaluations completed annually by principals were compared to the pre-employment ratings used to select the teachers. The comparison of those ratings was used to indicate the extent to which the recruitment and selection procedure yielded teachers who

performed well in the classroom as measured by principal ratings.

The questionnaire responses were collected on computer bubble sheets and scanned with an NCS Sentry 3000 optical scanner. Data was entered into a Digital Equipment Corporation's VAX computer and organized for analysis by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software program. Frequencies, correlations, and analyses of variance were used to treat the data.

The findings and analysis of those findings are contained in Chapter IV. A discussion of the findings, implications of the study, and recommendations are contained in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the recruitment and selection procedures used by a mid-western suburban school district. To address the problem and answer the questions posed by the study, the procedures described in Chapter III were conducted. Questionnaires were sent to principals and teachers. All 30 questionnaires were returned. Therefore, in the discussions that follow, N = 30 for teachers. All percentages sited have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary and analysis of the information that was gathered during the research. The first contains general demographic data collected by reviewing the personnel files of the sample population. This data includes age, sex, teaching assignment, professional preparation, professional experience, performance rating, and date of hire. The second section contains the model for recruitment and selection of teachers and a discussion of how the model compares to the school district's practice. The third section contains a summary and analysis of the information collected from the Principal Questionnaire. The data and findings from the Teacher Questionnaire are presented in the fourth section. Finally, the data collected by reviewing the personnel files of those teachers who were no longer

employed by the district are presented.

General Demograhpics

The sample population consisted of 11 (37%) males and 19 (63%) females. This represents a greater number of males than was found in the general teaching population of the district. The district's total teaching staff was 24% male. The ages of the selected teachers at the time they were hired are contained in Table 1. One objective of a sound recruitment and selection process was to maintain an age-balanced teaching staff. The district hired teachers of varying ages. The mean age at time of hire was 30. The data indicated that the district does not hire many young first-year teachers.

Table 1
Teachers' Age at Time of Hire

Age	Frequency	%
22	1	3
23	3	10
24	3	10
25	3	10
27	2	7
28	2	7
29	1	3
31	6	20
32	1	3

33	1	3
35	1	3
36	1	3
37	1	3
40	2	7
42	2	7
N =	30	100

The sample population consisted of teachers who were assigned to a variety of positions (Table 2). The elementary teachers were evenly distributed across all grade levels. In the secondary schools, the district hired a number of English, math, science and social studies teachers. The selected teachers were placed in three types of schools: 10 teachers (33%) in elementary grades K-6, 5 teachers (17%) in junior high grades 7-8, and 15 teachers (50%) in high school grades 9-12.

Table 2
Teaching Assignment

Assignment	Frequency	%
Grade 1	1	3
Grade 2	1	3
Grade 3	2	7
Grade 4	2	7
Grade 5	1	3
Grade 6	2	7
Montessori 5-6	1	3

Business	1	3
English	5	17
Foreign Language	1	3
Math	5	17
Science	3	10
Social Studies	4	13
Physical Education	1	3
N =	30	100

The district re-employed several of its former teachers. Table 3 shows that 5 of the selected teachers (17%) had been formerly employed by the district as regular teachers.

Table 3
Previous Teaching Experience in the District

Years	Frequency	%
0	25	83
2	2	7
4	1	3
5	1	3
6	1	3
N =	30	100

The majority (63%) of the teachers hired by the district had previous experience (see Table 4). Almost half (47%) taught more than two years and 20% taught more than 8 years before their employment with the district. The mean was 3.2 years of previous experience.

Table 4
Previous Teaching Experience

Years	Frequency	%
0	11	37
1	2	7
2	3	10
3	1	3
4	3	10
5	1	3
6	2	7
7	1	3
8	4	13
9	2	7
N =	30	100

The district hired 7 teachers (23%) who had master's degrees. The other 23 (77%) were bachelor degreed teachers. None of the teachers in the sample had degrees higher than a masters. Of the total district teacher population, 49% had advanced degrees. The low percentage of teachers hired who had advanced degrees was due to the limitation of the study. Specialists such as counselors, media specialists, and psychologists were required to earn degrees beyond a bachelors. However, specialists were not included in the study.

The study included teachers hired for the 1983-84,

1984-85, and 1985-86 school years. Table 5 indicates that the sample group consisted of a nearly even distribution of teachers hired during each of those years.

Table 5
Year Employment Began

School Year	Frequency	%
1983-84	9	30
1984-85	9	30
1985-86	12	40
N =	30	100

Table 6 identifies the month during which the selected teachers were offered teaching contracts. The district was able to hire the majority (60%) of its teachers prior to July. The literature revealed that more quality candidates are available during those months. Five teachers (17%) were hired in August just prior to the beginning of school. August was a month during which it was often difficult to have a large pool of quality teaching candidates. The district had done a good job of keeping its August hires to a minimum. Contrary to an assumption of the study, those teachers hired in August were quality teachers. A Pearson r correlation between the month teachers were offered contracts and the principals' ratings of the teachers yielded an r of .05. This extremely low positive correlation is regarded as insignificant. Taken as a group, the month during which a teacher was hired did not

positively correlate with their performance at a significant level; but those teachers hired after July 1 were selected from a reduced pool of candidates making the selection a more difficult one.   One teacher was hired in December to begin work during the second semester, which indicated a low turn-over rate during the school year.

Table 6
Contract Offer Month

Month	Frequency	%
April	5	17
May	3	10
June	10	33
July	6	20
August	5	17
December	1	3
N =	30	100

The teachers who were hired were judged by their principals to be successful teachers.   The personnel files of the teachers were reviewed to determine how the principals rated them on the final evaluation completed at the end of the 1985-86 school year.   Table 7 shows that all of the teachers were judged to be average (17%) or above average (83%) teachers.   The district's evaluation system did not contain a rating scale.   Therefore, the ratings of above average, average, and below average were assigned by

the researcher based upon the types of written comments and recommendations which were made by the principals.

Table 7
1985-86 Final Evaluation

Rating	Frequency	%
Above Average	25	83
Average	5	17
Below Average	0	0
N =	30	100

Teacher Recruitment and Selection Model

The literature revealed several steps that a school district might take in recruiting and selecting teachers. Those steps were written in the form of a checklist. A copy of the checklist is located in Appendix A.

The files of the selected teachers were reviewed to determine the extent to which the school district followed the steps outlined in the model when recruiting and hiring its teachers. The information collected by this review is presented in Table 8. The district consistently followed the model when hiring its teachers, except for advertising vacancies. Since the district maintained a file of applications year-around, it did not believe in advertising its vacancies. However, the district was consistent in advertising vacant positions when its normal pool of applicants was not sufficient to insure that a choice could be made among qualified candidates.

Table 8
The District's Conformity with Model Recruitment and
Selection Procedures

Procedure	Frequency Accomplished	%
1. Position is needed; re-assignment of current employees and/or alternative staffing considered	30	100
2. Job description and selection criteria developed	30	100
3. Candidates available	30	100
4. Vacancy announced	2	7
5. Review of candidates' files, ratings given	30	100
6. Selected candidates are interviewed by personnel administrator	30	100
7. Finalists are interviewed by the principal	30	100
8. Final selection made by principal and personnel administrator	30	100
9. Final check of references and certificate	30	100
10. Terms of employment set and position offered	30	100
11. Contract signed	30	100
12. Unsuccessful candidates notified	30	100

Tables 9 and 10 contain data indicating that the district had been consistent in hiring those candidates whose credentials and interviews had been rated as average or above average. No candidates whose ratings were below average were hired. This supported the belief that the

recruitment process provided an adequate supply of candidates.

Table 9
Credential Ratings

Rating	Frequency	%
Above Average	25	83
Average	5	17
Below Average	0	0
N =	30	100

Table 10
Interview Ratings

Rating	Frequency	%
Above Average	23	77
Average	7	23
Below Average	0	0
N =	30	100

Principal Questionnaire

The Principal Questionnaire contained four questions. A sample of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix C. The responses to the questions are included in Tables 11 through 14. Question 1 dealt with the recruiting practices of the school district. Nearly all (97%) of the principals agreed or strongly agreed that the recruiting practices of the district provided a pool of well qualified candidates from which to select a teacher for their vacant position

(see Table 11). One principal did not have an opinion.

Table 11
Principal Questionnaire Item #1
Recruiting Practices

Response	Frequency	%
Strongly Agree	24	80
Agree	5	17
Disagree	0	0
Strongly Disagree	0	0
No Opinion	1	3
N =	30	100

All principals either agreed or strongly agreed with item 2 (see Table 12). They were pleased with the building level interview process. Principals were allowed to conduct their own individual interviews. The personnel administrators had encouraged but had not mandated that principals use a structured interview.

Table 12
Principal Questionnaire Item #2
Building Interview Process

Response	Frequency	%
Strongly Agree	26	87
Agree	4	13
Disagree	0	0
Strongly Disagree	0	0
No Opinion	0	0
N =	30	100

Table 13 contains the results to principal questionnaire item 3. Ninety-seven percent of the principals agreed or strongly agreed that the decision to hire the teacher was good. One principal was not satisfied with the decision.

Table 13
Principal Questionnaire Item #3
Selection Decision

Response	Frequency	%
Strongly Agree	23	77
Agree	6	20
Disagree	1	3
Strongly Disagree	0	0
No Opinion	0	0
N =	30	100

Principal questionnaire item 4 (see Table 14) asked the principals to rate the teachers as above average, average, or below average. Twenty-two (73%) of the teachers were rated above average; and 7 (23%) were rated average. One teacher was rated as below average. This was the same teacher identified by the principal in question 3 as having been a poor hiring decision. However, the review of that teachers 1985-86 final evaluation did not clearly reflect a teacher whose performance was below average. The teacher's performance had either declined since the evaluation was

written or the true rating by the principal was not expressed clearly on the evaluation.

Table 14
Principal Questionnaire Item #4
Teacher Rating

Rating	Frequency	%
Above Average	22	73
Average	7	23
Below Average	1	3
N =	30	100

Teacher Questionnaire

The Teacher Questionnaire was divided into five sections. The results of the questionnaire are discussed by section. The five sections are: (a) recruitment, (b) application, (c) interview - personnel office, (d) interview - principal, and (e) job satisfaction.

Recruitment

Teachers were asked to identify sources which provided them information about potential employment opportunities in the district. The results of are shown in Table 15. The teachers hired by the district learned about possible employment opportunities with the district from all listed sources. Generally, news stories (Item 1), newspaper and professional organization help wanted advertisements (Items 3 and 4), and college campus recruiting trips by school administrators (Item 7) were not widely used information sources. The most common source of information (60%) about

the school district was school district employees (Item 8). 27% had been student teachers in the district and 23% had been substitute teachers. Student teaching and substitute teaching allowed the district and the teachers to more thoroughly examine one another.

Table 15
Information Sources for Candidates

Item		Yes	%	No	%
1	News Coverage	1	3	29	97
2	Placement Office	9	30	21	70
3	Newspaper Ad	3	10	27	90
4	Professional Ad	1	3	29	97
5	Student Teaching	8	27	22	73
6	Substitute Teaching	7	23	23	77
7	Campus Recruiting	3	10	27	90
8	District Employees	18	60	12	40
9	District Residents	8	27	22	73
10	Other	7	23	23	77

Additional information sources were requested in Item 10; 23% of the teachers responded positively to this item. Sources of information provided by them were: (a) former employees, (b) State Department of Education, (c) State Education Association, (d) "hear-say", (e) had a child enrolled in a district school, and (f) no information, applied to all area school districts.

<u>Application</u>

Teacher Questionnaire items 11 through 15 asked the teachers about the communication provided by the personnel office staff during the application process. The results of these questions are contained in Table 16. Almost all of the teachers responded yes to all items. The lowest yes response was to Item 15. On this item, 13% of the teachers said that they had not received confirmation that their application had been received.

Table 16
Communication with Applicants

Item		Yes	%	No	%
11	Selection process	27	90	3	10
12	Materials needed	29	97.	1	3
13	Salary and benefits	28	93	2	7
14	General information	27	90	3	10
15	Application received	26	87	4	13

<u>Interview</u> – <u>Personnel</u> <u>Office</u>

Section C of the Teacher Questionnaire (Items 16 through 20) concentrated on the interview that the teacher was given by a personnel office administrator. The district used a structured interview process. The administrator asked the same questions of all candidates and wrote down the candidates responses to the questions in a space provided on the interview form.

The teachers surveyed were positive about the personnel

office interview process (see Table 17). They felt that they were treated in a courteous and fair manner (100%); questions asked of them were adequate and relevant (97% and 93% respectively); and, their questions about the position and conditions of employment were adequately answered (100%). 17% were not adequately informed about what to expect during the remainder of the selection process.

Table 17
Interview with Personnel Administrator

Item		Yes	%	No	%
16	Treated Fairly	30	100	0	0
17	Professional Experience	29	97	1	3
18	Questions Relevant	28	93	2	7
19	My Questions Answered	30	100	0	0
20	Informed About Process	25	83	5	17

Interview - Principal

The interview conducted by the Principal was the subject of Section D (Items 21 through 27). Table 18 shows that teachers were adequately informed about the specific duties of the position (Item 1, 93%), and the Principals' expectations (Item 2, 87%). The questions asked by Principals were relevant (Item 26, 90%); and Principals adequately answered the questions asked by candidates (Item 27, 100%). Items 23 through 25 indicate that teachers were less satisfied with the information they received about

students, parents and teachers. 23% were not adequately informed about those people with whom they would be working. Job Satisfaction

Table 18
Interview with Principal

Item		Yes	%	No	%
21	Specific Duties	28	93	2	7
22	Principal Expectations	26	87	4	13
23	Told About Students	23	77	7	23
24	Told About Teachers	23	77	7	23
25	Told About Parents	23	77	7	23
26	Questions Relevant	27	90	3	10
27	My Questions Answered	30	100	0	0

For a teacher to be effective and work up to his or her potential, the teacher must be qualified for and satisfied with his or her position. Table 19 (Items 28 through 30) shows that all teachers (100%) felt qualified for and satisfied with their positions. They felt they could make a contribution to the district while working in those positions.

Table 19
Job Satisfaction

Item		Yes	%	No	%
28	Qualified	30	100	0	0
29	Satisfied	30	100	0	0
30	Contribute	30	100	0	0

Teachers were asked to make written comments on their satisfaction with their jobs. Several comments were received. One high school teacher expressed a desire to teach advanced level courses and wanted to move up the ladder in coaching. One teacher expressed a desire to teach in both of her endorsed subject areas instead of just one; and one teacher complained that the bureaucracy of the district sometimes made it difficult to complete teaching duties. None of these comments indicated a misassignment of a teacher. They did represent the need for the district to continue to review the assignment of current staff prior to recruiting and selecting new staff members.

Teachers No Longer Employed by the District

The last source of information was the personnel files of those teachers who were hired for the 1983-84 through 1985-86 school years but were no longer employed by the district. The purpose of the review was to establish the reason for the termination of employment. School districts expended a large amount of time and money in recruiting, selecting, and training their staff. The researcher wanted to know if rapid turn-over of staff existed in the district and if the recruitment and selection process was somehow responsible.

The district hired 313 teachers for the school years under study; 40 (13%) were no longer employed at the time of

the study.   This is an acceptable re-employment rate for the district.

Table 20 lists the reason for termination of the teachers hired for the school years under study.   The majority (65%) of the teachers no longer employed had left the district because of some kind of family responsibility. These teachers left because the family was leaving the area, usually because of the transfer of a spouse, or because of responsibilities at home.   Some teachers left because they found other jobs; 20% found other jobs in education and 5% found jobs outside of education.   The district chose to not re-employ 8% of the terminated teachers because of poor performance in the classroom.   This group represents 1% of all the teachers who were hired for the 1983-84 through 1985-86 school years.   The termination of employment was not related to the selection process.

Table 20
Reason for Termination

Reason	Frequency	%
Leaving City or State	18	45
Other Job in Education	8	20
Family Responsibilities	8	20
Poor Performance	3	8
Other Employment	2	5
Health	1	2
N =	40	100

Summary

The study revealed that the district had an effective teacher recruitment and selection plan. The district consistently followed the model of teacher recruitment and selection that was identified through a review of the literature. The district hired teachers of varying ages, professional preparation, and experience to serve in a variety of positions.

The teachers and principals were pleased with the recruitment and selection process. The teachers were satisfied with their assignments; they felt that they could make a contribution to the district. 23% of the teachers indicated a desire to know more about the students, teachers, and parents with whom they would be working as they interviewed with building principals. The district was able to hire quality teachers. All selected teachers were rated as above average or average during the selection process, and all but one of the teachers continued to be so rated by the principal. The district was able to retain the teachers it hired; 88% of the teachers selected continued to be employed by the district.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the recruitment and selection procedures used by a mid-western suburban school district. The study was divided into 5 Chapters. Chapter I contained the introduction to the study. Chapter II contained a review of related research and literature concerning teacher recruitment and selection. Chapter III contained a discussion of the methods used in the gathering and treating the data. The findings of the study were presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

Personnel decisions completely permeate every aspect of the school system and are so vitally related to educational outcomes that they must be regarded as the administrators primary concern (Castetter, 1986). Sharing this belief, a growing mid-western suburban school district wanted to know if its teacher recruitment and selection process was effective. The district employed approximately 900 teachers and hired approximately 100 teachers annually. The district had modified its selection process prior to recruiting and hiring teachers for the 1983-84 school year. Therefore, the district wanted to know how this process was working.

A review of the literature revealed that teacher

selection was a complex task consisting of many parts. The literature identified several ingredients of an effective selection process. These ingredients were summarized and reduced into a model checklist (see Appendix A).

The teachers being studied were regular classroom instructional personnel. The group included elementary and secondary classroom teachers. The group did not include specialists such as counselors, psychologists, special education instructors, media specialists, or district curriculum specialists. The sample consisted of thirty teachers randomly selected from teachers hired for the 1983-84 through 1985-86 school years who were still employed by the district.

Two instruments were used in the study to test the model of teacher recruitment and selection. The instruments were a Teacher Questionnaire located in Appendix B, and a Principal Questionnaire located in Appendix C. The questionnaires were distributed to the 30 randomly selected teachers and to each teacher's principal. The questionnaire were used to answer the questions: Do teachers think that the selection and recruitment process used to hire them was satisfactory? Are teachers satisfied with their current job? Are principals satisfied with the performance of the selected teachers? Are principals satisfied with the selection and recruitment process?

The personnel files of the selected teachers were

reviewed. The review established the extent to which the district followed the selection model when hiring teachers. The file review also identified ratings assigned during the selection process and ratings given by principals on final annual performance evaluations.

The personnel files of teachers hired for 1983-84 through 1985-86 but no longer employed by the district were also reviewed. The review determined why they were no longer employed. The fact of non-employment was examined to determine, within obvious limitations, the extent to which the non-employment was due to an inadequate recruitment and selection process. The data showed that the majority of teachers no longer employed had left the district because they were moving out of the area, or because of some other family responsibility.

The study revealed that the district had a recruitment and selection plan which allowed it to recruit and keep quality teachers. The district consistently followed the model of teacher recruitment and selection that was identified through a review of the literature. The district hired teachers of varying ages, professional preparation, and experience to serve in a variety of positions.

The teachers and principals were pleased with the recruitment and selection process. The teachers were satisfied with their assignments; they felt that they could make a contribution to the district. 23% of the teachers

indicated a desire to know more about the students, teachers, and parents with whom they would be working as they interviewed with building principals. All selected teachers were rated as above average or average during the selection process, and 97% of the teachers continued to be so rated by their principals. The district was able to retain 88% of the teachers selected.

Conclusions

The literature revealed that a weak spot in teacher recruitment and selection was the general absence of formal evaluations by districts of their recruitment and selection process. Yet, the success of the entire process could only be judged by a formal evaluation. During the study a model evaluation plan was developed that could be used by other districts to determine the effectiveness of their recruitment and selection process. The evaluation model revealed that the district was successful in recruiting and selecting its teachers.

Recommendations

This study evaluated the recruitment and selection process of one mid-western suburban school district. Since the district will undoubtedly continue to refine its recruitment and selection process and since the district will continue to hire many teachers each year, the district should continue to formally evaluate the effectiveness of

its recruitment and selection efforts in future years. This evaluation model should be expanded in the future to include the specialists hired by the district.

The recruitment and selection goal of the district was to hire and keep the best teachers available. Only through formal evaluations of the process did the district know for certain how well it had accomplished this goal. Since the literature revealed that few districts attempt to formally evaluate their recruitment and selection process, other districts are encouraged to conduct formal evaluations. This study can serve as a model which other districts may use as a starting point to design their own evaluation system.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. M. (1967). The application of a special approach to teacher selection and appraisal. New York: Vantage Press.

Anderson, R. L. (1977). The inter-instrument reliability of two interviewing sequences used by Selection Research, Incorporated (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38(5), 3076A.

Arend, P. J. (1973). Teacher Selection: The Relationship between Selected Factor and Rated Effectiveness of Second-Year Teachers. Towson, MD: Baltimore County Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087 102).

Baker, R. E. (1977). A comparison of four information sources used in teacher selection (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38(3), 1137A.

Beach, D. S. (1980). Personnel: The Management of People at Work. New York: Macmillian.

Berg, K. A. and Brimm, P. R. (1978). Screening Teacher Applicants. NASSP Bulletin, 62, 32-35.

Bolton, D. L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bond, K. (1985, November/December). The teacher assessment center. Thrust, pp. 19-20.

Brannon, C. J. (1975). The Interview and What It Can Yield. The Clearing House, 49, 166-167.

Bredeson, P. V. (1985). The teacher screening and selection process: A decision making model for school administrators. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18(3) 8-15.

Bryant, B. J. (1978). What employers consider important in hiring teachers. (ASCUS Research Report). Madison, WI: Association for School, College, and University Staffing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 838)

Caliendo, R. J. (1986) Selecting capable teachers. ERS Spectrum, 4(1), 22-26.

Castetter, W. B. (1986). The personnel function in educational administration (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Cubberley, E. P. (1920). The History of Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Engel, R. A., & Erion L. (1984). A comprehensive review of interviewing strategies for the '80s. The Clearing House, 57 304-308.

Engel, R. A., & Freidrichs, D. (1980). The emergence approach: The interview can be a reliable process. NASSP Bulletin, 64(432), 85-91.

Ferguson, J. E. (1983). Interviewing teacher candidates: 100 questions to ask. NASSP Bulletin, 67, 118-120.

Fischer, N. A. (1981). Parents: Effective partners in faculty selection, hiring. Phi Delta Kappan, 62(6), 442.

Faucett, C. W. (1964). School Personnel Administration. New York: Macmillan.

Fuhr, D. L. (1977). Selecting First-Year Teachers. NASSP Bulletin, 61(406), 57-59.

Games, P. A., & Klare, G. R. (1967). Elementary Statistics. Data Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill.

Gerwin, D. (Ed.). (1974). The employment of teachers: Some analytical views. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Gilbert, H. B., Isidore B., & Gerhard L. (1966). Teacher selection policies and procedures in large public school systems in the United States (Project No. 5-344). Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Gips, C. J., & Bredeson, P. V. (1984). The selection of teachers and principals: A model for faculty participation in personnel selection decisions in public schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 974).

Greene, J. E. (1971). School Personnel Administration. Philadelphia: Chilton.

Harris, B. M., McIntyre, K. E., Littleton, V. C., Jr., &

Long, D. F. (1985). Personnel administration in education (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hathaway, W. E. (1980). Testing teachers. Educational Leadership, 38(3), 210-215.

Hendrix, H. (1970). A Model Program for Selection and Training of Teacher Candidates for Service in Inner-City Schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 283A.

Hershey, R. (1971). Employees Going and Going: The Application Form. Personnel, 48 36-39.

Hobart, R. A. (1979). Effective interviewing key to selecting qualified staff. NASSP Bulletin, 63(431), 29-34.

Interviewing teacher candidates. (1976). Insights, and Perspectives, 1(3), 1-4.

Jinks, M. W. (1985). To hire the right teachers, hone your interview skills. Executive Education, 7(10), 23-25.

Kahl, S. R. (1980). The selection of teachers and school administrators: A synthesis of the literature. Denver, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Educational Lab., Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 917)

Kirkland, S. E. (1979). The development and implementation of a system to facilitate the interviewing of potential teachers by heads of elementary administrative units in the Sacramento City Unified School District. Practicum submitted for Ed.D program, Nova University, Fort

Lauderdale, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 821)

Lowell, R. S. and DeLoach, J. A. (1982). Equal Opportunity: Are You Overlooking the Application Blank. Personnel, 59(4), 49-55.

McKenna, B. H. and McKenna, C. D. (1968). How to Interview Teachers. American School Board Journal, 55 8-9.

McLaughlin, J. H. (1979). Pilot survey of teacher and supervisor selection procedures in fifty-four states and possessions of the United States. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 183 535)

Millard J. and Brooks, R. (1974). Selection Research Project Evaluation: A Three Year Study. Final Report. Ankeny, IA: Polk and Story Joint County School System. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 100 842).

Moore, H. E. (1966). The administration of public school personnel. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education.

Muller, G. D. (1981). Teacher selection: A response. Educational Leadership, 38(6), 494.

Neu, B. H. (1978). Informal Organizational Structure and Its Influence on Teacher Selection. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 3288A.

No panaceas: A brief discussion of teacher selection instruments. Austin Independent School District.

(1984). Austin, TX: Texas Office of Research and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 569).

Pellicer, L. O. (1981). Improving teacher selection with the structured interview. Educational Leadership, 38(6), 492.

Perry, N. C. (1981). New teachers: Do the 'best' get hired? Phi Delta Kappan, 63(2) 113-114.

Rebore, R. W. (1982). Personnel administration in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Reutzel, D. R. (1983, November). Interviewing: How to hire a good classroom teacher of reading" The Reading Teacher, pp. 122-126.

Ryans, D. C. (1949). Procedures Employed in Teacher Selection. Teachers College Journal, 20 56-60.

Schneier, C.E. (1976, February). Content Validity: The Necessity for a Behavioral Job Description, Personnel Administrator.

Shoemaker, J. F. (1974). The Development of a Teacher Selection Interview System to Be Productive to Certain Criteria In Predicting Teacher Success. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36 656A.

Stanton, E. S. (1977). Successful Personnel Recruiting and Selection, New York: AMA COM.

Sybouts, W. (1976). Developing Job Descriptions, Selected Readings in: Management Theory, Organization Theory

and Management by Objectives, Lincoln: University of
Nebraska.

Teitelbaum, D., & McLaughlin, J. H. (1979) National survey
of teacher and supervisor selection procedures in
fifty-four large public school systems in the United
States New York: New York City Board of Education, N.Y.
Board of Examiners. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service
No. ED 182 271)

Tocco, T. S., & Elligett, J. K. (1980). ... And in Pinellas
County. Educational Leadership, 38(3), 217.

Thayer, V. (1978). Project EMPATHY - An alternative way to
hire teachers. North Central Association Quarterly,
52(4), 438-442.

Vanderheiden, D. L. (1981). A Study of the Processes
Utilized in Recruitment and Selection of Teachers in
Selected School Districts: A Planning Model.
(Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska Lincoln,
1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42,
4683A.

Vornberg, J. A., & Liles, K. (1983). Improving the process:
Taking inventory of your interviewing techniques. NASSP
Bulletin, 67, 88-91.

Webster, W. J. (1980). Teacher testing in Dallas.
Educational Leadership, 38(3), 216.

Yeager, W. A. (1954). Administration and the Teacher. New
York: Harper.

APPENDIX A

CHECKLIST

1. Position is needed; re-assignment of current employees and/or Alternative staffing considered

2. Job description and Selection Criteria developed

3. Candidates available

4. Vacancy announced

5. Review of candidates' files, ratings given
        application form
        references
        transcripts
        certificate

6. Selected candidates are interviewed by personnel administrator

7. Finalists are interviewed by the principal

8. Final selection made by principal and personnel administrator

9. Final check of references and certificate

10. Terms of employment set and Position offered

11. Contract signed

12. Unsuccessful candidates notified

APPENDIX B

6 March 1987

Dear

     I am currently in a graduate program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Part of my program includes a study of our school district's teacher selection model. I want to evaluate our ability to recruit, select, assign, and retain quality teachers.

     You have been randomly selected from among those teachers who were hired by our district for the school years 1983-84 through 1985-86. I am asking that you assist me by participating in the study by responding to the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope.

     Any information acquired during the study will be known only to me and will be kept strictly confidential. Only group statistics will be reported in the study. Your anonymity is assured.

     If you have any questions, please call me at 8251.

     Thanking you in advance for all your efforts to make my study a success, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Steve Moore
Administrative Assistant to Associate Superintendent

P.S. I would appreciate the return of your questionnaire in the pre-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience before March 13, 1987.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire has 30 items. Each item requires that you respond with a YES (Y) or a NO (N) on the attached survey form. Bubble in the Y or the N depending upon your response to each item.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please carefully fold the bubble sheet and return it using the pre-addressed envelope.

Thank you.

SECTION A. RECRUITMENT: Several information sources are listed below. Any or all of these sources could have provided you information about the potential employment opportunities of the district. Bubble in a Y if an item below was a source of information for you. Bubble in an N if an item was not a source of information for you.

Items

1. Media news coverage (newspaper, radio and/or television story)

2. College or University Placement Offices or Bulletins

3. Newspaper advertisement (not a story as in 1. above)

4. Professional organization advertisement

5. As as result of student teaching in the district

6. As a result of substitute teaching in the district

7. College campus recruiting by school administrators

8. School district employees

9. School district residents other than employees in 8. above

.10. Other: Specify by using Write-In Area 1 on the bubble sheet

(continued)

Teacher Survey Continued

SECTION B. APPLICATION: The personnel office attempted to provide you with information after your initial contact with the district. Please respond with a **Y** if the information you received on the items listed below were adequate. Please respond with an **N** if you received inadequate information on any items below, or if you did not receive the information.

Items.:

11. The application and selection process

12. The materials needed to establish a completed application file

13. Salary and benefit information

14. General information about the school district

15. Confirmation that an application had been received

SECTION C. INTERVIEW-PERSONNEL OFFICE: The items below concentrate on the interview that you were given by an administrator in the personnel office. If you agree with the item, bubble a **Y**. If you disagree with the item, bubble an **N**.

Items

During the interview with the personnel administrator:

16. I was treated in a courteous and fair manner

17. I was adequately questioned about my professional preparation and previous experience

18. Questions asked of me were relevant to the position for which I was interviewing

19. My questions about the position and conditions of employment were adequately answered.

20. I was adequately informed about what to expect during the remainder of the selection process

(continued)

Teacher Survey Continued

SECTION D.   INTERVIEW-PRINCIPAL: The items below concentrate on the interview that you were given by a building principal. If you agree with the item, bubble the **Y.** If you disagree with the item, bubble the **N.**

Items

During the interview with the principal:

21. I was adequately informed about the specific duties of the position

22. I was made aware of the principal's expectations

23. I was adequately informed about the students with whom I would be working

24. I was adequately informed about the staff with whom I would be working

25. I was adequately informed about the parents and community with whom I would be working

26. Questions put to me were relevant to the position for which I was interviewing

27. My questions about the position were adequately answered by the principal

SECTION E.   JOB SATISFACTION: The items below reflect the satisfaction you feel about your position. If you agree with the item, bubble the **Y.** If you disagree with the item, bubble the N.

Items

28. I feel well qualified for my current position

29. I feel quite satisfied with my current position

30. I feel that I can make a contribution to the district in my current position

Please use Write-In Area 2 on the bubble sheet for needed comments to clarify items 28 through 30.

Return the bubble sheet in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Thank you.

APPENDIX C

6 March 1987

Dear

      I am currently in a graduate program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Part of my program includes a study of our school district's teacher selection model. I want to evaluate our ability to recruit, select, assign, and retain quality teachers.

      I have randomly selected 30 teachers who were hired by our district for the school years 1983-84 through 1985-86. One or more of your teachers was selected to be a part of the study. I am asking that you complete the following questionnaire and return it to me.

      Any information acquired during the study will be known only to me and will be kept strictly confidential. Only group statistics will be reported in the study. Your anonymity is assured.

      If you have any questions, please call me at 8251.

      Thanking you in advance for all your efforts to make my study a success, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Steve Moore
Administrative Assistant to Associate Superintendent

P.S. I would appreciate the return of your questionnaire in the pre-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience before March 13, 1987.

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire has 4 items. Each item requires that you respond with an A,B,C,D, or E on the attached survey form. Bubble in your response to each item.

A = Strongly Agree
B = Agree
C = Disagree
D = Strongly Disagree
E = No opinion

When you have completed the questionnaire, please carefully fold the bubble sheet and return it using the pre-addressed envelope.

Thank you.

Please respond to each item as it relates to _____ and the position for which he/she was hired.

Items

1.   I believe that the recruiting practices of our school district provided me with a pool of well qualified candidates from which to select this teacher for this position.

     Please use Write-In Area 1 on the bubble sheet for needed comments.

2.   I am pleased with the building level interview process.

     Please use Write-In Area 2 on the bubble sheet for needed comments.

3.   The decision to hire this teacher was a good one.

     Please use Write-In Area 3 on the bubble sheet for needed comments.

4.   I would judge the performance of this teacher as:

     A. Above Average
     B. Average
     C. Below Average

     Please use Write-In Area 4 on the bubble sheet for needed comments.

Return the bubble sheet in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Thank you.