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The major focus in America’s public schools today is that of student achievement. Some of the major pressures school districts face is the mandates outlined in the NCLB legislation. High stakes testing, research based best practices and pedagogical principles are the main areas of focus. The literature clearly shows that in order for all of these mandates and best practices to be done effectively, hiring the best most qualified individuals for teaching positions available is paramount.

This study was designed to determine among all school districts in Ohio, what are the most effective hiring practices for teacher vacancies within their schools. A 38 question survey was sent to all 612 school district superintendents in Ohio. The school districts were broken down geographically based on rural, suburban, urban, and town settings. A sample from each of the geographic locations was received. The 38 question survey was developed to assist the researcher in determining best practice. Both descriptive statistics and a Chi Square analysis were used to analyze the data.

Chi Square was the appropriate statistic to use for most of the survey questions since it identified a level of significance for 26 of the 38 survey questions. Descriptive statistics were necessary for 12 of the survey questions in order to describe things such as district performance index, racial and language minority population, percentage of economically disadvantaged, district type (Rural, Urban, Suburban, Town) and student enrollment. For the other survey questions that
descriptive statistics were used, the question asked things such as number of positions vacancies, number of unsolicited and solicited applications were received.
DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my family. My children: Frankie, Vincent, Codi and Mandi. You four are the light of my life and whether you know it or not, you provided me with the motivation needed to complete this endeavor. I love you all very much.

To my parents Fran and Cathy for always supporting and encouraging me in every aspect of my life. To my siblings Debbie, Steve, Andrea and Jai for their encouragement and occasional nudge to stay focused and to keep moving forward. I love all of you.

Lastly, I dedicate this work to my wife Dorothy who supported me through many years and many endeavors. You were always there for me and have always meant the world to me.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Robert Beebe first, for agreeing to chair my committee and second, for his time and expertise in making this project something I can truly be proud of. Through the many ups and downs that I encountered in this project, he was always there to guide and encourage me to keep moving forward. Dr. Beebe, I hold dear the friendship that has developed.

I would like to thank Dr. Joseph Merhaut. He was instrumental in my completion of the first three chapters even before he was actually part of my committee. When the direction of the paper changed and a committee member withdrew, Dr. Merhaut was more than happy to fill the vacancy and then play a major part in the completion of what is now the final product. Joe, you are really a true friend.

Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Charles Vergon, and Dr. Regina Rees for agreeing to be part of my committee and for providing valuable input throughout the dissertation process. All four of you have made a very positive impact on my life! Thank you!
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIGNATURE PAGE</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER I

- Introduction ............................................. 1
- Statement of the Problem ......................... 1
- Purpose of the Study ................................. 3
- Significance of the Study .......................... 4
- Definition of Terms ................................... 5

## CHAPTER II

- Literature Review ................................. 6
- Position Notification and Recruitment ............ 8
- Selection Process: Generating an Interview List . 12
- The First Interview .................................. 25
- Narrowing the List of Candidates-2nd Interview .... 30
- Hiring and Approval of Candidates ................ 32
- Retaining Quality Teachers ....................... 37
- Conclusion ......................................... 38

## CHAPTER III

- Methodology ......................................... 41
- Design of Study ..................................... 41
Research Questions .............................................................. 41
Population Sample .............................................................. 42
Data Collection ................................................................. 42
Data Analysis ................................................................. 43

CHAPTER IV

Results .............................................................................. 44

CHAPTER V

Introduction ......................................................................... 96
Discussion ........................................................................... 96
Recommendations for Future Research ......................... 103
Recommendations for Administrative Practice ............... 104
Conclusion ........................................................................... 106

REFERENCES ................................................................. 107

APPENDICIES

Appendix A  Human Subjects Approval ................................. 113
Appendix B  NIH Certificate .................................................. 115
Appendix C  Survey on Classroom Teacher Hiring Procedures
In Ohio ................................................................................. 117
Appendix D  Invitation to Participate in Study ....................... 125
LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1:........................................................................................................ 45
TABLE 2:........................................................................................................ 46
TABLE 3:........................................................................................................ 47
TABLE 4:........................................................................................................ 48
TABLE 5:........................................................................................................ 49
TABLE 6:........................................................................................................ 50
TABLE 7:........................................................................................................ 51
TABLE 8:........................................................................................................ 53
TABLE 9:........................................................................................................ 55
TABLE 10:.................................................................................................... 56
TABLE 11:.................................................................................................... 58
TABLE 12:.................................................................................................... 60
TABLE 13:.................................................................................................... 61
TABLE 14:.................................................................................................... 66
TABLE 15:.................................................................................................... 67
TABLE 16:.................................................................................................... 69
TABLE 17:.................................................................................................... 70
TABLE 18:.................................................................................................... 72
TABLE 19:.................................................................................................... 74
TABLE 20:.................................................................................................... 75
TABLE 21:.................................................................................................... 77
TABLE 22:.................................................................................................... 78
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, adopted in 2001 by the Bush administration, has created new demands on teacher hiring practices today (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). Each year administrators must fill vacant teaching positions that have resulted from retirements, promotions, expanding enrollments, and the creation of new positions. By far, the two most important variables that influence student achievement are: quality of instruction provided by the teachers and the quality of leadership provided by principals (Reeves, 2007). As concern grows nationally over student achievement, school administrators are faced with the daunting task of finding, recruiting, hiring and retaining quality teachers. The teacher selection process changed because of the ever increasing benchmarks imposed by “No Child Left Behind” legislation. Research has shown that hiring the best teachers is not a difficult task for upper class and middle class schools/districts where student achievement is high. It creates a real problem for districts in poverty or districts where students are low achieving on standardized tests, the measurement tool for NCLB. Today’s principals are under a great deal of pressure from multiple stakeholders to ensure students are provided with high quality education programs and they must also document their achievement (Kersten, 2008). When “No Child Left Behind” legislation was passed in 2001 it placed an emphasis on student achievement by setting benchmarks for the next thirteen years. Ultimately, by the time the 2014 school year arrives, all students in the United States would test proficiently on the various standardized tests which were approved by each of the fifty states. Failure to achieve the yearly benchmarks would result in the school/district being placed on
warning status. Once in warning, the school or district had to develop a plan to get out of warning and implement it the following year. Failure to get out of warning by raising scores to the established benchmark could result in the school/district being taken over by the state. Administrators and/or teachers could be released from their duties and members of a state team would take over the district or school (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001).

The teacher market varies widely depending on subject area, grade level and type, and the location of the school (Kersten, 2008). Some areas of the country have an overabundance of teachers, especially in the subject areas of Elementary Education and secondary Social Studies. The numbers in those two areas have increased over the last ten years.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (2007), found that teacher opportunity throughout the country will range “from good to excellent” over the next ten years. The same study found that Clark County School District in Nevada started the 2006-2007 school year four hundred teachers short. The study also found a severe shortage of teachers in the areas of Special Education, English as a Second Language (ESL), Chemistry and Physics (Keller, 2007).

Since hiring practices are of the utmost importance in education today this study will examine hiring practices in Ohio by building on a 2006 survey of hiring practices developed and used by Dr. Robert Strauss on hiring practices in Pennsylvania (Strauss, 2008). This will be accomplished by refining the Pennsylvania survey to reflect specific Ohio school code and employment law, and administering it to Ohio school districts during the Spring of 2013.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to use a survey of Ohio public school superintendents to determine hiring practices. It examined the selection process including advertisement, recruitment, screening procedures, applicant requirements, who are involved in the interview itself, and the hiring and approval of desired candidates. School districts are placing more and more emphasis on finding, recruiting, hiring and retaining quality teachers. Graduation cohort percentages (following students from 9\textsuperscript{th} grade through graduation), graduation rates and student attendance are included in the NCLB requirements. Another part of NCLB legislation focuses on staffing. All teachers must be “highly qualified” and licensed to be able to teach. Teachers must be certificated or licensed in the subject areas they are assigned to teach (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). Being able to get the most potential out of each and every student requires good, quality teaching from good, quality teachers. Once a teacher is hired he or she can have a positive or negative effect on students for over thirty years, and if a poor teacher gains tenure (permanent certification), the process to remove him or her is tedious and difficult. Districts can no longer wait for good teachers to find them; they must seek out the best teachers and by using a carefully chosen teacher selection process hire quality teachers who will have a positive impact on students for many years.
Significance of the Study

Being able to determine which forms of advertisement are most effective, the most commonly used candidate items/qualities used in generating/narrowing an interview list, which individuals comprise the interview team(s), the number of interviews that are conducted, the importance of teaching sample lessons, what part the Board of Education played in the process, and how the final hiring decision is made, will all play a part in the successful finding, hiring and retaining of good quality teachers. A similar study was conducted in Pennsylvania in 2006 by Dr. Robert Strauss. This survey, inspired by Dr. Strauss’ survey, was conducted in Ohio to determine the most effective hiring practices.

Since Dr. Strauss completed his 2006 Pennsylvania survey the use of the internet in the hiring process has become more prevalent and the survey should provide evidence of this. The No Child Left Behind Act was only enacted four years prior to the 2006 Strauss survey and with the total enactment of the requirement of teachers being “highly qualified” the survey provided proof of the effects that it has had on the hiring process. One of the interesting findings in the Strauss survey was that in Pennsylvania the average district’s teacher workforce was composed of between 38% and 40% of its own high school graduates.
Definition of Terms

Superintendent of Schools – Chief executive/finance officer of a school district.

“No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) – 2001 legislation passed onto law requiring that students be proficient in nation-wide Math and Reading standards in order to graduate from high school. Benchmarks increase over a fourteen year period until 100% of students nation-wide meet proficiency by the year 2014 (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001).
Chapter II

Literature Review

Until the No Child Left Behind law in 2001, teachers, schools and districts were not held legally accountable for the product (graduating student) that they produced. Factors affected by No Child Left Behind were student attendance rates, senior graduation rates, teachers being “highly qualified” meaning that they may only teach subjects listed on their license (certificate), and students meeting benchmarks on standardized tests, which have increased steadily over thirteen years with 100% proficiency required of all students by 2014 (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). The law brought student achievement to the forefront because failure to meet established benchmarks meant the imposition of consequences that could ultimately cost teachers or administrators their jobs. With increased emphasis on student achievement, teacher quality has grown in importance. Improving the quality of teachers has been widely identified as a promising direction for improving student achievement (Rutledge, 2009).

Education is a people-intensive endeavor. Schools need talented and well-prepared teachers and leaders to accomplish current education goals for educating all students (Odden, 2011). Schools and districts can no longer afford to let any student just slide by on the way to graduation. It is vital to have every student achieve to his or her educational potential. More important is that schools and districts must strive to keep all students enrolled until they graduate. A student who drops out has a negative impact on the school/district under the No Child Left Behind law. The quality of the teacher has the most powerful effect on student
achievement (Strong, 2003). The importance of good teachers has placed even more emphasis on the hiring process. As we look at school reform which requires the creation of more challenging curriculum, the adoption of ambitious assessments, the development of new model schools and programs, and the implementation of decentralized management, all depend on highly-skilled teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2009). A student who has a high performing teacher for just one year will remain ahead of his or her peers for at least the next two to three years of schooling. On the other hand, if a student has an ineffective teacher the negative influence on student achievement may not be fully remediated for up to three years (Strong 2003). With so much importance focused on the teacher, how difficult is it to find, hire and retain good quality teachers? What is the best process to fill teaching vacancies with a teacher who can truly have a positive impact on student achievement? What constitutes an effective teacher?

Student achievement could be greatly improved if we could come to an understanding of what constitutes an effective teacher and then seek out teachers who demonstrate those desired qualities and behaviors (Strong, 2003). Teaching is a very complex job that consists of seven components: curriculum, methods and planning, classroom organization and management, homework and grading, meeting students’ needs, communication and professionalism (Clement, 2006). New teachers entering their careers need time and mentoring to master these seven components. This process usually takes between three and five years of experience. A wise Dean of teacher education said, "We don’t graduate finished products, but new teachers who are ready to assume their duties can learn to be master teachers"
Hiring a new teacher who can perform the required duties is critically important because new teachers get their own classrooms and are mostly on their own from the first day of school (Clement, 2007). The entire hiring process is critical in locating the best of the best teachers. Henry Adams once said: “A teacher affects eternity, he can never tell where his influence stops.” (Longo, 2003, p. 35)

The literature review that follows will encompass these topics:

1) Position notification and recruitment.
2) Selection process: Generating an interview list.
3) The first interview.
4) Narrowing the list of candidates – 2nd interview.
5) Hiring and approval of candidates
6) Retaining quality teachers
7) Conclusion

### Position Notification and Recruitment

With today’s increased use of the internet, it is vital that teacher applicants and school districts use this resource to locate the best teachers. In order to put the right person in the right role, principals can no longer rely on happenstance for their staffing decisions (Kimball, 2011).

Aside from the traditional newspaper ads and district postings, prospective teachers have five other options in locating teacher vacancies. The first is college career center sites. All colleges today have placement departments with websites
that are used by school districts to advertise job openings. Effective teacher recruitment should include an outreach to universities who sponsor traditional and alternative teacher certification programs within a 200-mile radius and requires the district development of attractive recruitment materials such as a promotional CD (Williby, 2004). Developing a recruitment message is about marketing the school to prospective talent both inside and outside of the district. An effective message conveys the school’s vision, strategies for improving achievement and competencies teachers and other staff need to possess. The message can be used in informal advertisements, on the school web site, during job fairs or in slogans that principals and staff members use to describe their school (Kimball, 2011).

Second are state-wide websites which serve as a data bank for unemployed teachers to post their credentials. Each state now has its own website for teacher recruitment. School districts have access to the state-wide websites, and by setting parameters such as subject, geographical location, college grade point average, etc., the data base will generate a list of potential candidates.

Third are websites sponsored by professional organizations such as the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA). Membership in organizations such as these permits teachers to gain access to position advertising that they might otherwise not have.

The fourth option for prospective teachers to locate job vacancies is by using for-profit dot-com websites. These sites charge a fee for their use.
Lastly are individual district websites. Practically all school districts have a website today. A prospective teacher can obtain a plethora of information about a district through its website, including job openings (Clement, 2006). A study has shown that more than sixty percent of Pennsylvania school districts advertise outside the local district (Strauss, 2008).

Each district needs to ask: “Has our school district been, or will it be in the future, effective in attracting the best and the brightest teacher candidates as compared to other, possibly neighboring districts?” How can a district consistently hire the very best teacher candidates – those who are an excellent match with the district’s mission, values and vision, as well as those with the requisite teacher skills and knowledge – under these competitive conditions?

The school’s location is key to drawing potential teacher candidates. Recruitment of the best talent available is a strategic imperative, and depending on starting salaries, some districts have a definite edge in hiring (Lee, 2005). Teacher candidates are more likely to apply to schools that reflect their own racial or ethnic background (M.D.A., 2011). These candidates are also attracted to schools with strong leadership and positive working conditions, including a support staff (Kimball, 2011). Some school districts have focused efforts on the development of new recruitment sources and programs which use the internet, hiring bonuses, loan forgiveness programs, competitive compensation career ladders, incentive pay based on demonstrated classroom success, and alternative route programs (Lee, 2005).
Districts which intend to employ online searches should adopt appropriate procedures. The procedures may address the types of positions subject to search, the search format, the targeted sites, methods of reporting the results, applicant notification of the search, results verification and confidentiality (Magee, 2011). Recruitment plans need to be developed in conjunction with district budgets. Development of the budget usually occurs in the spring because district budgets run from July 1st of one year through June 30th of the following year. In Pennsylvania there is typically an excess supply of perspective teachers in the subject areas of elementary, social studies and English, making them the easiest positions to fill. The hardest positions in Pennsylvania to fill are mathematics, chemistry and special education (Strauss, 2008).

Superintendents need to make talent management, including the hiring of the best teacher talent, a top priority. To help with this some superintendents choose to have their employees write a “Teacher Value Proposition.” A “Teacher Value Proposition” answers: Why would a teacher candidate want to accept a position in this particular school or school district? What is it about this school or district that differentiates it from other schools or districts that are hiring from the same pool of applicants and with whom we are likely to be competing for the best teacher talent? To write a Teacher Value Proposition, a committee made up of administrators, teachers, parents and students is formed by the superintendent. The task is to have the group come to consensus.
After answering the two questions the group needs to develop a value position that articulates a compelling reason to work in your district. The group then needs to devise a marketing plan based on the value proposition (Lee, 2005). Once a position has been properly advertised, the crucial task of screening and selecting applicants to interview begins.

**Selection Process: Generating an Interview List**

Once the position is advertised and prospective candidates have applied, it is time to start the selection process by generating a list of candidates to interview. The best way to sort through applications is to form a team and decide which skills, experiences, and education will make an ideal candidate (Williby, 2004). The public expects competent teachers, and the No Child Left Behind law provides guidelines for ensuring that highly qualified teachers work in all schools across the country (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). Staffing a school with quality teachers has never been easy, but the pressure placed on today's administrators to hire and retain well-prepared teachers makes the process even more challenging (Clement, 2007). The hiring process is among the most highly regulated processes in public schools. Policies regarding hiring qualifications fall into two categories: those established by law and those established by the school district (Levin, June 2010). Once a school district establishes qualifications, the district should create a checklist containing all of the qualifications established by law and the district.

Hiring a teacher is an exercise usually consisting of conducting a background check and reviewing transcripts, licensing, test scores and resume. Candidates who
pass those benchmarks are then placed in a pool of candidates when administrators can select for interviews. Several urban districts, like Denver, Pittsburgh, and Tulsa are reorienting their central human-resources offices toward what is being called “strategic hiring.” This effort consists of collecting robust information on prospective candidates, developing stronger relationships with teacher-preparation programs, and tracking new hires to determine their effectiveness in the classroom (Sawchuk, 2011).

The chief human resource officer for the 26,000 student Pittsburgh district has stated: “You can’t afford to bring in just anyone, every single hire is important to bring into the workforce, individuals with the potential to raise the level of effectiveness (Sawchuk, 2011, p. 3).” Sorting through the sometimes hundreds of applicants who apply for a single job opening is both time consuming and vitally important. The initial screening process serves as a filter for the applicant pool by eliminating those who do not meet set requirements. It helps to narrow the pool of applicants to those with the relevant characteristics (Rutledge, 2008).

The first pieces of information to review are considered “low-cost data”: the application, transcripts, the cover letter and the resume. Medium-cost data include: references reviews, telephone contacts, formal interviews and teacher tests. High-cost data include teacher observation (Mason, 2010). Many states have a standard application that can be used for any job in public education. It requests the information usually found on a resume, such as education obtained and from where, past work experience both in education and outside education, criminal conviction
information and references. The cover letter and resume must show a quality of written expression and true interest in the specific job advertised. It must also contain a few relevant facts that make the candidate stand out (Williby, 2004). The application should be approved by board policy or by administrative regulation (Levin, Dec. 2010). The application is also a fundamental component of a personnel file, and it should be a mandatory requirement that the application be kept in the personnel file (Levin, June 2010).

In what has become mandatory in all fifty states, an FBI and State Police criminal background check must be submitted to the hiring district by all prospective teaching candidates (Strauss, 2008). Most states also require a Child Abuse record check. Pennsylvania now requires that an Act 24 statement be signed by all current school district employees in which the employee states that he or she has not been convicted of certain types of crimes, listed on the form since the time of their employment. Prior to Act 24, once an employee submitted clearances in order to be hired, there was no formal accountability measure to ensure employees were not convicted of crimes.

Reference checks are also vital in the hiring process even though they are not legally required; they are highly important (Levin, Dec. 2010). Before offering even the most promising candidate a position, a thorough reference check should be conducted (Tooms, 2004). For candidates entering teaching for the first time, administrators value reference letters from the candidate’s cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The majority placed the highest value on the letter from
the building principal where the candidate completed their clinical experience (Supon & Ryland, 2010). Candidate references should be contacted and conversations should be documented. These reference notes should be kept in the employee’s personnel file for at least two years (Levin, June 2010).

Job preference can also play a role in the hiring process. Job preference can occur in situations involving workers compensation, furloughs and veterans preference. The following four factors can determine if any applicant qualifies for job preference.

**Factor 1:**

- Are there any posting or job appointment provisions in any applicable collective bargaining agreement (Levin, Oct. 2010)?

**Factor 2:**

- Are there any injured workers who are on workers compensation who are qualified for the job? An employer can demonstrate satisfaction of their duty to an employee receiving workers compensation in the following ways:
  1) The employee was notified of the job vacancy and failed to respond;
  2) A specific job vacancy was offered to the employee which the employee refused;
  3) The employer offered a modified job to the employee, which the
employee refused;

4) No vacancy exists within the usual employment area (Levin, Oct. 2010).

Factor 3:

- Are there any suspended (furloughed) professional employees who are eligible for the position? Suspensions or furloughs can occur in the event there is:
  1) Substantial decrease in pupil enrollment in the school district;
  2) Curtailment or alteration of the educational program as a result of substantial decline in class or course enrollments or to conform to the standards of organization of educational activities required by law or recommended by the Department of Education;
  3) Consolidation of schools, whether within a single district, through a merger of districts or as a result of joint board agreements, when such consolidation makes it necessary to retain the full staff of professional employees;
  4) When new school districts are established as the result of reorganization of school districts (Levin, Oct. 2010).

Factor 4:

- Are there any suspended (furloughed) employees of another public school entity who have the right to a particular job because of the transfer of any classes/ programs or the suspension of a school? In the event that a
professional employee was suspended as a result of a program or class being transferred as a unit to another school entity, the suspended employee may have the right to be hired by the receiving school entity when the services of a professional employee are needed to sustain the transferred class or program, as long as there is no suspended employee in the receiving entity who is properly certificated to fill the position (Levin, Oct. 2010).

The No Child Left Behind law required that all teachers be “highly qualified” meaning that they could only teach subjects that were on their license or certificate. There are federal funding consequences for failure to meet “highly qualified” requirements (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). In all states, a public school teacher must be licensed by the state to be employed and only licensed teachers may be placed in the classroom to instruct students (Strauss, 2008). Virtually all states require that a prospective, full-time teacher earn a bachelor’s degree from an accredited four year institution of higher education. Most states also require that prospective teachers pass the general and specialty standardized competency examinations developed and sold by the Educational Testing Service (Strauss, 2008).

In Pennsylvania during a prospective teacher’s senior year in college, they are required to take Praxis exams in math, reading and writing, and one or several specialty areas, and to complete student teaching (Strauss, 2008). In fact, over the last 10 years, Pennsylvania has strengthened their teaching program approval and teacher licensure rules. For example, a high school graduate must demonstrate a “B”
or better grade point average for admission into a teacher preparation specialty area. Prospective teachers exiting college must graduate from college with a 3.0 grade point average and meet benchmark scores on the basic Praxis tests (Strauss, 2008). Research states that grades are indicative of attendance and commitment, as well as effort; so an applicant’s transcripts should be examined closely (Williby, 2004).

Through the application screening process teacher candidates’ overall grade point average has high importance with very significant value placed on the candidate’s grades in one or more designated content areas. Many administrators place high significance on teacher candidates with multiple certifications. This is especially true in smaller districts where a teacher might not have the luxury of teaching a full day of classes in one subject area (Supon & Ryland, 2010). One teacher with multiple certifications provides flexibility in scheduling and also saves the district from hiring two part-time teachers (usually with benefits), just so the various courses can be offered. Today more than ever, teachers need to be technology savvy. Practically all teacher duties such as attendance, grading, lesson planning, curriculum mapping, and test/worksheet development are done on computers. Even lesson delivery involves the use of technology. Many schools today have ceiling mounted LCD projectors which will connect to any laptop computer to show short, subject-related video clips and both teacher and student developed power-point presentations.
Today’s students depend more and more on technology. They want teachers to incorporate the use of technology within their lessons and assignments. The smart phones used by students have internet access and a plethora of downloaded applications that can accomplish any task imaginable. It was not long ago that teacher preparation programs taught prospective teachers how to operate 16mm projectors, overhead projectors, slide projectors and ditto machines. Today, even copy machines require in-service demonstrations because of the many capabilities they possess. The knowledge and use of technology are also important to principals (Supon & Ryland, 2010). Many of today’s schools use a blended approach to expand their course offerings, meaning that they offer cyber courses that students can complete at their own pace, either in school or at home. Teachers of cyber courses are required to provide course materials, communicate with students regarding assignments, collect student work and provide grades and feedback to students online. All of this takes place without the student and teacher having to meet face to face. Some schools have even gone the path of requiring students to take a cyber course for graduation.

The use of technology can be useful for prospective teachers. The applicant can find out important information about the district in which they have applied. They can find out standardized test scores and how those scores rank among other local districts as well as the state. They can research newspaper headlines regarding the school or district, both good and bad. This type of information can definitely influence a candidate’s decision on whether or not to apply. On the other hand, social media sites make personal information available to district personnel that can
benefit the selection process as well as complicate it. Too often, prospective teacher candidates post compromising photos and/or controversial postings on their personal media sites which, when viewed by district hiring personnel, can have a negative impact on their chances to be hired. If done correctly by district personnel, internet searches can be beneficial to the hiring process. The administrator responsible for the hiring decision should not conduct the online search because the search may reveal information about the applicant that is irrelevant or, if used improperly, discriminatory. Once the information is seen, it may influence the decision. The person conducting the internet search should distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information. Before sharing any information discovered in the online search it should be verified. Any information that cannot be verified, both positive and negative, should be discarded (Sciarppa, 2009).

Certain states require as part of the application a written essay. Pennsylvania is one to the states that requires a written essay. The last section of “The Pennsylvania Standard Application For Teaching Positions In Pennsylvania”, (Form PDE-353), gives the applicant the choice of five essay questions. The directions state: “We are interested in your ability to organize and express thoughts on a specific topic in a succinct manner. Please select one of the following topics and write an essay in the space provided on this page.” Administrators rated an essay submission low in importance (Supon & Ryland, 2010). The same type of information may be obtained by the administrator through the use of the cover letter and resume. Both these forms of written communication demonstrate an
applicant's ability to organize thoughts on paper, writing ability, sentence structure, grammar and punctuation.

One item that had gained popularity and then has dropped off in recent years is the portfolio. A typical portfolio contains an applicant's resume, the originals of background checks, professional certificate, official transcripts and letters of reference. If the applicant is a recent college graduate, the portfolio usually contains items from their student teaching experience such as lesson plans complete with handouts, worksheets, student work samples and even assessment samples. The portfolio of a teacher with experience would contain their credential information along with a schedule of classes taught, various lesson plans, curriculum maps and copies of student work. Principals typically found the portfolio's introduction into the interview setting as unimportant and irrelevant to hiring decisions. Principals doubted portfolios' trustworthiness as indicators of teaching knowledge and abilities. Encouraging portfolios on the basis of effectiveness for job acquisition seems unjustifiable at this time. In fact, teacher educators should probably advise most students to refrain from bringing the portfolio to employment interviews (Theel, 2004).

Since teacher quality is one of the most important influences on student learning, any teacher candidate with one or more years of successful experience is more appealing than a candidate who is a recent college graduate (Rutledge, 2009). Prior teaching experience was clearly one of the most influential factors when seeking a teacher to fill a vacancy. The substance of an applicant's responses during
the interview was of great importance to principals and influenced their hiring decisions (Theel, 2004). Of the many ways in which principals obtain information regarding teacher candidates, the following two ways are most valued:

1) Direct observation and

2) Evaluations from previous supervisors.

Through direct observation, if a principal gains a favorable impression of a candidate, s/he remembers and values it when reviewing job applicants. By the same token, if a principal gains an unfavorable impression of a candidate through direct observation, it will definitely influence a principal’s hiring decision (Theel, 2004).

Principals placed high value on contacting references and current/prior supervisors (principals), to obtain information of the candidate’s teaching. During those conversations, principals often ask about attendance records, contributions to the school and a summary of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses (Theel, 2004). In 2007, Clement wrote, “The single best predictor of a candidate’s future job performance is his or her past job behavior” (Clement, 2007, p. 4). She also wrote in 2009 that interviewers should focus on a candidate’s past behavior as the predictor of future performance (Clement, 2009).

With past experience being a strong predictor of future performance it certainly makes a case for “Behavior Based Interviewing.” Teacher interviews, like interviews in any other field, usually start off with an “ice-breaker” question like:
“Tell me about your experiences and how you came to be in this interview today.”

This ice-breaker question can also be in the form of a behavior based interview question. For example: “name one accomplishment from your previous teaching that characterizes your work,” or “tell me about the best teaching experience that you have had” (Clement, 2007, p. 7). Behavior-based interview questions are objective rather than philosophical and can be easily evaluated. Behavior-based interview questions are formed with phrases like: “tell me about a time when,” “describe your experience with,” “how have you,” and “what has your approach been to.” Two popular types of behavior-based interviews are PAR and STAR. PAR stands for Problem–Action-Result and STAR stands for Situation-Task-Action and Result. Behavior-based interviewing has been used for decades in the business world. Based on the premise that past behavior is the best predictor of future performance, behavior-based interviews use specific questions to ascertain a candidate’s knowledge, skills and experience (Clement, 2007). It would be prudent for interviewers to craft questions that explore a candidate’s past experiences, skills and behaviors (Clement, 2009). Green (1996, 49) wrote that behavior-based interviewing is “the most objective, systematic, consistent, and unbiased method for filling jobs with the best people (Clement, 2007, p. 4).” Behavior-based interviews, if used properly, have the potential to improve the teacher hiring process (Clement, 2009).

During the interview part of the process, principals are constantly judging candidates. Statistics show that qualities principals are looking for include: enthusiasm, strong communication skills and the ability to work well with others.
By using proper interview questions, all of these characteristics can be identified during the interview. Aside from the substance of the candidate’s responses, Theel and Tallerico found that “chemistry during the interview” is highly valued by principals (Rutledge, 2008). Does the applicant “fit” our school/district? Some districts prefer hiring past graduates. Through one study, Strauss found that in any given school district in Pennsylvania, approximately forty percent of its employees were former graduates of that district (Strauss, 2008).

Principals in general develop and use professional networks and contacts with outstanding staff members. They use these contacts and networks to help themselves and other principals within their network (Kimball, 2011). A characteristic such as judgment is important, but not easy to develop. Being able to identify the presence of such traits can lead to an increase in an employee’s productivity (Douglas, E.; Khandaker, N., 2012). One subjective item that can play a part in the hiring process is feelings. Principals sometimes rely on gut feelings stating that “the qualities exhibited by this candidate made me feel that s/he was the best choice for the position” (Strong, 2003, p. 48). Unfortunately, an overreliance on gut feelings or intuition can contribute to the selection of a less-than-effective teacher (Kersten, 2010). Roughly 69% of principals in one study recognized involvement in sports and extra-curricular activities as a pathway to a full-time teaching position. Also valued was work experience in an education related field, but not necessarily a teacher in a classroom (Supon & Ryland, 2010).
The First Interview

Historically, the process involved in hiring a teacher has always been pressure-filled due to the large pool of applicants and the short window of time to fill vacancies. Too often, interviews are hastily done and fit into administrator schedules between other administrative tasks. Principals, on average, have only about twenty minutes to determine the potential of a candidate. It is also important to realize that in that same twenty minutes the candidate is sizing up the interviewer and the district (Tooms, 2004). Interviewing on-site is important to the interview process and improving the interview can improve teacher selection (Clement, 2007). When interviewing on-site it is important to convey the right messages to the candidate. Interviews should start promptly at the designated time. The office in which the interview is held should be clean and neat. A messy office conveys to the applicant a messy disorganized leader and perhaps a disorganized school as well (Tooms 2004).

Who should be involved in the actual interviews? What should be the make-up of the interview team? The principal is the pivotal figure in the teacher hiring process. Strauss found that in Pennsylvania, the principal was responsible for choosing applicants to interview 90% of the time. He also found that the principal took part in the first interview 96% of the time. Other participants in the first interview include assistant principals 55% of the time, department chairpersons 46% of the time and selected teachers 42% of the time (Strauss, 2008). The team responsible for interviewing needs to meet prior to the actual interviews to
determine the specific skills needed for the teacher vacancy. Once those skills are identified, questions should be generated so that by answering the questions, applicants who have the needed skill set can be identified (Clement, 2009).

Several studies indicate that teachers should be involved in the interview process. When teachers are present at the interview, candidates see firsthand that teachers are involved in the decision making process and that site-based management exists. Teachers bring a unique perspective to the interview process. They can speak purposefully about class sizes, collaborative planning time, parent volunteers, co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities, and special programs as they question the candidate. Having teachers involved in the interview process can be extremely important in some cases, for example when hiring a Spanish teacher. How can an interview for a Spanish teacher be complete without the candidate being asked to speak Spanish with someone who also speaks the language? Personnel administrators and principals cannot be expected to be knowledgeable in every discipline and its pedagogy (Clement, 2007). Teachers can ask subject specific questions and identify strengths and weaknesses that an administrator might otherwise miss. Their involvement makes the hiring process more credible and also removes the mystique of how and why an applicant was chosen (Longo, 2003).

What types of questions should applicants be asked in order for the interviewer to ascertain enough information to choose an amply qualified candidate? Interviews generally begin with introductory comments such as a
description of the school and or district. This is usually followed by an ice-breaker type question like: “Tell us about your background and what special skills you bring to the position (Theel, 2004, p. 30).” The body of the interview should have a set of pre-established questions for each position or subject. The use of highly specific questions should be asked to determine methods of teaching individual subjects.

Fairness can be established in the interview by ensuring that each candidate is asked the same set of questions, in the same order and is given the same amount of time to answer (Clement, 2007). The questions should be open-ended in nature and require the applicant to describe their past experiences. Behavior-based interview questions such as those from PAR and STAR provide situational information that is based on past experience. A good interview lets the candidate show the interviewer how he or she will be teaching students. Those who cannot explain basic answers to the interviewer, or who have had no previous experience with the topics will not be successful with the necessary demands of the classroom teacher. Since past behavior is the best predictor of future performance, the behavior-based interview will help administrators identify the best, most qualified teachers (Clement, 2009). Interview questions typically take on one of three different forms:

1) Some questions are observational in nature “A parent of one of your students is angry about the lack of progress her child is making in math. What would you most likely be thinking?” (Theel, 2004, p. 30)

2) Other questions focus on candidates’ likely actions in hypothetical situations “One of your students comes to school habitually late and interrupts your teaching. What would you do?” (Theel, 2004, p. 30)
3) A third common type of question is more personal, often designed to reveal candidates' beliefs. “How would you describe your behavior management style?” (Theel, 2004, p. 30)

For all three types of inquiries, principals attend to the substance of responses, as well as the candidate’s communication and nonverbal skills. After interviewing is concluded, principals and team members consider candidates’ responses overall, and discussed their impressions of the candidate’s “social skills.” These include whether the candidate’s dress was “professional”, whether the candidate was “on time for the interview,” how well the candidate was able to express him- or herself, the candidate’s use of eye contact, the level of anxiety displayed, the degree of warmth expressed by the candidate, and other admittedly “fuzzy” interpersonal reactions, including the “depth of thought” that went into the questions posed by the candidate to them (Theel, 2004).

Interviews are extremely important in helping employers make judgments about the applicant’s ability to fit in with their mission and beliefs. The applicant’s verbal and nonverbal responses conveyed during the interview can create a favorable or unfavorable impression. The candidate’s verbal ability strongly correlates with measures of teacher competency identified by principals and other supervisors of teachers; and this is identifiable in an interview (Broadley, 2004). One study states that seventy percent of teacher interview questions should be competency-based, focusing on instructional skills, professional knowledge, classroom behavior and interpersonal skills (Williby, 2004).
It is extremely important that the interview be conducted properly and that only legally permissible questions are asked. Interview notes should be saved for a minimum of two years. The following are types of questions that are illegal to ask of applicants during the interview process:

1) As to race, sex, religion, national origin or age.
2) As to marital status, child care responsibilities, intentions as to pregnancy or birth control.
3) As to height and weight.
4) As to economic status, credit information, prior bankruptcy or garnishments.
5) About associations, church or club memberships.
6) Medical disability questions.
7) Pre-employment medical inquiries. (Levin, June 2010)

Extreme care should be taken when developing interview questions so that none of these topics are inadvertently included. Asking an applicant “illegal” questions can bring legal action against the interviewers and the district.

To help in ensuring that proper interview techniques are followed, all personnel involved in the interview process should undergo some type of training. There should be a designated person on staff, a building administrator or central office professional development person, who is charged with training all who are involved with hiring every year. After being trained on the process of hiring, involved staff members should be made aware of “best practices” in interviewing.
and what constitute legal and illegal questions (Clement, 2007). All training materials should be filed and updated on a yearly basis to ensure that proper, legal hiring practices are adhered to in all interview situations.

**Narrowing the List of Candidates – 2nd Interview**

Once the first round of interviews is complete, the interview committee must discuss which candidates best meet the needs of the vacant position and the school/district so that those candidates can move on to the second interview. Strauss showed that the principal is the pivotal figure 86% of the time in deciding whether or not a candidate will receive a second round interview. The assistant principal played a role 44% of the time and the department chairperson played a role 31% of the time (Strauss, 2008). After the second round interview list is generated many districts have those applicants teach a 20 – 30 minute lesson. In some districts this lesson is taught to a class of students from the school where the vacancy exists. In other districts the lesson may be demonstrated to the interview team or videotaped by the candidate and submitted to the interview team. If the lesson is taught to a class of students, valuable feedback can be obtained by the principal from questioning the students who took part. Teaching the lesson will demonstrate whether or not the candidate can deliver a well-planned lesson, within time constraints, under close scrutiny. Second round interview questions usually focus on the candidate's depth of understanding of children, best practices, curriculum and issues within their field or specialty (Kersten, 2010). If the superintendent does not take part in the second round interview, s/he almost
always meets with the final two candidates. After meeting with the finalists, the superintendent consults with the interview team before recommending a candidate for employment (Longo, 2003).

There are several reasons that superintendents may interview all teacher candidates before an offer is made. First, since the superintendent is the chief administrator in a school district, any positives or negatives associated with personnel hired during his/her tenure will be a reflection on the superintendent. Second, the superintendent’s involvement in the process sends a message to staff that hiring the best teachers is a top priority. Third, it provides a quality check on the entire hiring process and reinforces to the applicant the importance placed on teachers in that district (Lee, 2005). Since teacher hiring decisions directly affect the quality of learning in a district for decades, it is the superintendent’s duty to insure that a consistent and focused selection process is in place that is understood by both staff and community (Longo, 2003).

One factor in Pennsylvania that can influence hiring decisions is called “Veteran’s Preference.” It is essentially a tie-breaker preference not an absolute preference. Pennsylvania’s Veteran’s Preference Act requires that public school entities award any vacancy to a qualified veteran over an equally qualified non-veteran. It should be noted that Pennsylvania’s Veteran’s Preference has been the subject of the most litigation within Pennsylvania (Levin, Oct. 2010).
Hiring the best teachers is not always easy. It is time consuming, labor intensive, sometimes politically unpopular and may be why some districts do not try to do so (Longo, 2003). Some popular practices that facilitate the hiring of subpar teachers include:

1) Some districts hire teachers simply because they were employed as a substitute teacher or instructional assistants within the district.

2) Some teachers are hired after only a brief interview by an administrator or two.

3) Sometimes a mediocre or even dismissed teacher from one district will be hired by a second district without even a reference call to the first district (Kersten, 2010).

Poor hiring practices can lead to subpar work performance, employee turnover, and sometimes lawsuits. These outcomes can result in a negative impact on an organization’s culture which could hurt its chances of attracting future quality applicants (Douglas, E.; Khandaker, N., 2012). Once a subpar teacher is hired and receives tenure (after three successful years in Pennsylvania), it is a complex and time consuming process to remove them. Even the presence of a great curriculum in the hands of a subpar teacher is nothing more than a poor or mediocre curriculum (Pillsbury, 2005). Once a candidate successfully completes the two or three interviews needed to be recommended for employment, the actual hiring is all that is left. For a candidate to be officially hired s/he must have a majority vote by the school board at an open meeting. It should be noted that in many states, elected
school board members are prohibited from voting on employment offers to blood relatives, and most states prohibit an employee in a district from serving as an elected school board member (Strauss, 2008).

In one study, school district personnel were asked to compile a list of components desired for employment consideration. They came up with six components as follows:

1) Honesty must be evidenced throughout the interview process.
2) Candidates who exhibited a “genuine heart” for children.
3) One’s who strongly projected a passion for their subject.
4) Demonstrated excellence in content knowledge.
5) Established a desire and love for life-long learning.
6) Looked for candidates who were driven to make a real difference in a child’s life. (Supon & Ryland, 2010)

Interview teams were asked what qualities candidates exhibited during the interview process that made a strong impression. They came up with four components as follows:

1) Looked professional.
2) Exuded a confident, positive attitude.
3) Demonstrated great enthusiasm about teaching.
4) Communicated effectively by speaking clearly and “appropriately” to adults. (Supon & Ryland, 2010)
The hiring processes of schools and districts have been studied many times over and it was found that these differ widely. Through these studies, researchers have identified three different hiring approaches:

1) **Highly decentralized**, where applicants apply and are hired directly by the school;
2) **Highly centralized**, where the district oversees the screening, selection and assignment process;
3) **Moderately centralized/moderately decentralized process**, in which districts screen applicants and administrators and teachers select them (Rutledge, 2008).

Studies suggest that many school districts lack purposeful, comprehensive hiring practices to fill teaching positions and fail to identify and select quality applicants. Seven “Best Practices” have emerged surrounding teacher hiring and selection processes for schools:

1) **Think strategically about selection criteria.** Hiring decisions should be organizational goals and job-specific factors. Many organizations choose to ground the selection process in sets of core competencies that provide clear guidelines of what to look for in applicants. These core competencies can help in writing job descriptions, develop selection rubrics and interview questions. These core competencies should be a direct reflection of the skills, abilities, knowledge and experiences needed for employees who work in a specific role.
2) Use quality, multiple measures. The applicant selection process should involve gathering multiple data points. These data points include structured interviews, talent-based screening tools, performance interviews that have candidates engage in a job-specific task such as delivering a simple lesson or leading a staff meeting.

3) Consider customer service. Hiring is a two-way street. Candidates are hoping to find a great organization and organizations are hoping to find great candidates. There is no better way to show that an organization cares than by having customer – or candidate - focused hiring practices. This means being considerate, being respectful of a candidate’s time, making candidates feel comfortable, communicating effectively, maintaining confidentiality, and continuously looking for ways to improve the process.

4) Understand the right way to use social media. The Society for Human Resource Management conducted a survey between 2010 and 2011 among HR professionals in various industries on social media and staffing. The survey found that 68% of respondents do not look at social media or social networking profiles in hiring. Four reasons were listed for this practice:

   a) Legal concerns surrounding protected information (race, color, religion, gender, etc.);

   b) The inability to verify information with any confidence;

   c) Information gained is not relevant to a candidate’s performance or
work-related potential;

d) Not everyone has social media.

5) Maximizing time and resources. Having multiple data points is valuable in selecting talent but, it is important to keep the selection process manageable and not too cumbersome to implement. For this reason, many organizations practice funneling. The concept behind funneling is that districts should use low-cost selection tools that require the least amount of effort to narrow the candidate pool. Districts can then focus their time and high-cost resources to gather data from high-potential candidates. An example of these progressive steps is as follows:

a) First round screening;

b) Resume and transcript screening;

c) Phone interviews;

d) Face-to-face interviews;

e) Performance interviews.

6) Prioritize legal compliance. Compliance with equal employment laws and guidelines is very important. The US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has put forth laws regarding anti-discrimination and has played a significant role in establishing guidelines for accepted employee selection practices. Any time an organization is developing a new selection tool they should seek legal counsel for review to ensure that the tool is unbiased and that it complies with anti-discrimination laws.
7) Have and practice a repeatable and reliable process. It is important to train and retain the individual(s) involved in the hiring process to ensure consistency and reliability of the tools. Having an established, repeatable process allows organizations to measure inputs, process steps, and results (Douglas, E.; Khandaker, N., 2012).

**Retaining Quality Teachers**

After the selection process, interview process and hiring process are completed and a highly qualified, well educated, enthusiastic teacher has been hired, how can an administrator be sure that the new teacher will stay? There have been studies that indicate that one-fourth of all beginning teachers leave the classroom within the first four years. In high poverty areas this turnover rate can be as high as fifty percent (Williby, 2004). There are many reasons why teachers leave their positions:

1) Teachers in urban schools are least satisfied with their access to teaching resources and control over curriculum and pedagogy.

2) Teachers in rural schools give reasons related to geography, culture and professional isolation.

3) Teachers in small private schools are dissatisfied with salaries and with their school’s administration (Williby, 2004).

A study conducted by the United States Department of Education in 2000 found that new teachers are often burdened with overwhelming workloads, are frequently assigned the lowest level classes with the most difficult students, are asked to teach
multiple subjects some of which they may not be certified to teach and are often expected to oversee extracurricular activities thus taking away from much needed planning time. While most beginning teachers are assigned a mentor teacher, they find it difficult to find time for interaction with them (Williby, 2004).

To assist in this process all districts in Pennsylvania, as per state law, are required to have a five year Strategic Plan. Within that plan there is required to be an induction program. Induction programs are for new teachers which include orientation, peer observations and evaluations, seminars, support groups and mentoring. As pivotal as the principal is in the hiring process, his or her role in retaining staff is just as important. An effective administrator must be alert to reasons that teachers leave their positions do their best to alleviate them. Proactive administrators attempt to provide their teachers with the instructional materials they need and let them take control of curriculum and pedagogy. They need to do their best to shield their new teachers from the pitfalls of overwhelming workloads and extracurricular responsibilities (Williby, 2004).

Successful administrators must also train and support teachers in the management of student discipline. If discipline is handled effectively, teachers can remain engaged in meaningful work with students. It is this engaging interaction with students that draws talented individuals to the teaching profession.

**Conclusion**

The quality and effectiveness of the teacher is critical to the success of the school, the district and each and every student. The principals play the most
important role in ensuring that quality, effective teaching occurs in their schools (Donaldson, 2005). With the end of No Child Left Behind coming soon, and with new education reforms looming, there must be more focus on the ways in which our education system attracts, prepares, supports and develops master teachers who can provide quality instruction to all students (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

The demands on today’s teachers far outweigh the ones faced twenty years ago. Those demands are encompassing more subject areas than just English and Mathematics. All teachers are accountable for the success and/or failure of our students, our schools and our districts. Research on teacher effectiveness has found the following qualities most important:

1) Strong verbal skills and general intelligence that will aid in their organization of thoughts and their ability to observe and think diagnostically (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

2) Knowledge of how to use their content pedagogy to teach others in that area and how to develop higher order thinking skills by using hands-on techniques (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

3) Understanding of learners and how that learning development takes place. How to support language learning across the curriculum for those less than proficient in the language of instruction (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

4) Flexible expertise that allows teachers to decide what will work best in a given context in response to students’ needs (Darling-Hammond, 2009).
5) Enthusiasm, caring and interpersonal skills. Teaching is more than just the conveyance of material (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

The interview process is critical as a means of identifying the needed qualities of today’s teachers before they are hired. Once hired those teachers must be nurtured and mentored to ensure that they improve and stay in the teaching field. Improved hiring policies and practices could go a long way in improving teacher quality. As of 2008, only fifty percent of Pennsylvania school districts had written hiring policies (Strauss, 2008). Focusing on hiring practices is only one step in the quest for better teachers. One cannot do what has always been done and suddenly expect different results.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Design of Study

This research is considered a quantitative study using the Survey Monkey web tool, with data being obtained through the use of a thirty-eight item survey. The survey instrument was issued to the superintendents of all 612 Ohio Public School Districts via e-mail. Superintendents are the chief executive officers in any school district and are ultimately responsible for all teacher hiring within their district.

By analyzing superintendent responses to the survey, information will be obtained regarding: mechanisms with which teacher vacancies are advertised; which district officials/administrators are involved in the various stages of the hiring process; which certification areas are easiest and most difficult to fill; the part the School Board plays in the hiring process; and whether or not Ohio School Districts have written hiring policies/procedures in place.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What hiring practices are employed by Ohio School Districts?
2. Do hiring practices conform to best practices as described in the professional literature?
3. Do hiring practices vary based on district size, community type, student composition?
Population and Sample

The subjects used in this study consisted of Superintendents of the 612 Ohio School Districts. The School Districts, District Superintendents and their e-mail addresses were obtained through the use of the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) website (www.ode.edu). The survey was sent to all 612 Ohio School Superintendents with the hope of getting between a 30% and 35% response rate. If the desired 30% to 35% response rate is not achieved in 30 days a non-respondent reminder will be sent. A second follow-up reminder after an additional 30 days will be sent if needed. A 21% response rate was achieved and the dissertation committee approved this sample.

Data Collection

Data was collected using the “Survey of Ohio Public School Classroom Teacher recruitment and Hiring Procedures” created for this work. The online survey program www.surveymonkey.com (SurveyMonkey, Inc. 2013) was used as the response tool in this study. The link was: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/teacherhiringpracticesinohio. The respondents were asked thirty-eight quick-response questions. The results were be tabulated through the use of the Survey Monkey online research instrument.
Data Analysis

Superintendent knowledge and opinions as well as the restrictions of policy about how the interview list is generated, the pool narrowed, which people make up the interview team and final selection determined will be evaluated. The use of GraphPad Software’s Chi Square Calculator (Motulsky, 2013) and the tools within Survey Monkey (SurveyMonkey, Inc. 2013) analyzed the data according to the following control variables:

1) the size of the district based on student population.
2) the location of the district (rural, urban, town and suburban).
3) the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in the district.
4) the percentage of racial and language minority students in the district.
5) the district’s performance index as reported on the most recent year’s state report card.

Chi Square was the appropriate statistic to use for most of the survey questions since it identified a level of significance for 26 of the 38 survey questions. Descriptive statistics were necessary for 12 of the survey questions in order to describe things such as district performance index, racial and language minority population, percentage of economically disadvantaged, district type (Rural, Urban, Suburban, Town) and student enrollment. For the other survey questions that descriptive statistics were used, the question asked things such as number of positions vacancies, number of unsolicited and solicited applications were received.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the following pages, information will be presented in several tables that will show the results of the study of classroom teacher hiring practices in Ohio. In order to analyze the data from the survey, both descriptive statistics and a Chi Square test were used to analyze the data from each of the survey items. The purpose of using the Chi Square statistic is to establish a P value for each set of data. The P value answers this question: If the theory that generated the expected values were correct, what is the probability of observing such a large discrepancy (or larger) between observed and expected values? A small P value is evidence that the data are not sampled from the distribution expected.

The data are described by three research questions that were developed by the researcher prior to the development of the survey. The following are the research questions posed:

1. What hiring practices are employed by Ohio School Districts?
2. Do hiring practices conform to best practices as described in the professional literature?
3. Do hiring practices vary based on district size, community type, student composition?

A total 612 surveys were sent to superintendents in the 612 school districts in the state of Ohio. Of the 612 surveys sent, 130 of the surveys were completed. The return rate was 21%. The following pages include multiple tables and charts to assist the reader in understanding the data.
1. Please indicate the approximate number of students enrolled in your School District.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Student Enrollment Within Responding Districts</th>
<th>Number of Responding/Possible Districts Within Each Enrollment Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding/Possible Districts Within Each Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 500 Students</td>
<td>13/19</td>
<td>10.2%/68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 1000 Students</td>
<td>29/119</td>
<td>22.8%/65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 2000 Students</td>
<td>46/217</td>
<td>36.2%/21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 – 3000 Students</td>
<td>17/103</td>
<td>13.4%/16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001 – 4000 Students</td>
<td>6/55</td>
<td>4.7%/10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001 – 5000 Students</td>
<td>9/33</td>
<td>7.1%/20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 – 6000 Students</td>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>3.2%/19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than 6000 Students</td>
<td>3/45</td>
<td>2.4%/6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>127/612</td>
<td>100%/21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

For this survey question the number of students enrolled was 262,900. The mean number of students per school district as per responding superintendents was 2070.

The range of students reported among responding superintendents was 62 total students in a district up to 11,000 students enrolled in the district.

The number of responding districts compared to the number of districts within each range suggests that the sample is reasonably representative of the state total.
2. Please select the District type that best describes your School District.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Number of Responding/Possible Districts Within Each Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding/Possible Districts Within Each Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>78/231</td>
<td>60%/33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11/55</td>
<td>8.5%/20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>33/123</td>
<td>25.4%/26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>8/200</td>
<td>6.1%/4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>130/609</td>
<td>100%/21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select the District type that best describes your School District.
Summary

For this survey question 60.2% of the districts were Rural, 25% of the districts were Suburban; 8.6% of the districts are Urban, and 6.3% of the districts resided in a town.

The number of responding districts compared to the number of districts within each range suggests that the sample is reasonably representative of the state total.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students</th>
<th>Number of Responding/Possible Districts Within Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding/Possible Districts Within Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% - 10%</td>
<td>10/34</td>
<td>7.8%/29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% - 20%</td>
<td>19/60</td>
<td>14.9%/31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% - 30%</td>
<td>15/91</td>
<td>11.7%/16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 40%</td>
<td>27/123</td>
<td>21.1%/21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% - 50%</td>
<td>20/128</td>
<td>15.6%/15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60%</td>
<td>15/87</td>
<td>11.7%/17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 70%</td>
<td>14/46</td>
<td>10.9%/30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% - 80%</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>2.4%/17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% - 90%</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>3.1%/36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% - 100%</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>0.8%/9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>128/608</td>
<td>100%/21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The percentage of economically disadvantaged ranged from <1% to 85%.

The number of responding districts compared to the number of districts within each range suggests that the sample is reasonably representative of the state total.
4. Please indicate the approximate percentage of racial and language minority students enrolled in your School District.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Racial &amp; Language Minority Students</th>
<th>Number of Responding/Possible Districts Within Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding/Possible Districts Within Each Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% - 5%</td>
<td>82/239</td>
<td>64.1%/34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% - 10%</td>
<td>19/162</td>
<td>14.8%/11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% - 20%</td>
<td>15/107</td>
<td>11.7%/14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% - 30%</td>
<td>3/35</td>
<td>2.35%/8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 40%</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>0.8%/4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% - 50%</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>1.5%/25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60%</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>0.8%/9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 70%</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>0.8%/16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% - 80%</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>0.8%/20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% - 90%</td>
<td>0/9</td>
<td>0%/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% - 100%</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>2.35%/60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>128/610</td>
<td>100%/21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The percentage of racial and language minority students enrolled in their districts ranged from <1% to 99%.

The number of responding districts compared to the number of districts within each range suggests that the sample is reasonably representative of the state total.
5. Please indicate your District Performance Index as reported on the most recent year’s state report card.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Performance Index Rating and Range</th>
<th>Number of Districts Within Each Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding Districts Within Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (100 – 120)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective (90 – 99.9)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement (80 – 89.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Watch (70 – 79.9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emergency (0 – 69.9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Responses to this question varied with numerical ratings that range from 86 to 111.8. Instead of providing a numerical rating, some of the responding superintendents described their rating as: effective (5), excellent (10), excellent with distinction (2), not applicable (7), meeting 25/26 indicators (1), academic watch (1), academic emergency (1), met all indicators (1).
6. Does your collective bargaining agreement require that vacant positions be advertised within your School District?

Table 6

Chi Square Analysis for Question #6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>CBA Requirement</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>74.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>74.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 74.087 with 1 degree of freedom. The two-tailed P value was less than .0001; this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=127) = 74.087, p<.0001$ school district collective bargaining agreements require that vacant positions be advertised within their school district.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to the question had enrollments between 5,000 and 11,000 students. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “yes” to question 6 were suburban. Of the respondents who answered “yes” to question 6 based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents had less than 30% racial and language minority students.

7. In which of the following ways does your School District advertise a teaching vacancy? (Please select all that apply)

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Advertising Method</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>District Web. Postings</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newspaper Ads</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College Career Sites</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Statewide Site/Database</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professional Org. Sites</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>For-Profit Dot-Com Web</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Advertise Outside OH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Black Univ/Col</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.4407</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>385.522</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 385.522 with 8 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (8, n=337) = 385.522, p<.0001$ that school districts advertise in a variety of ways for a teaching vacancy.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “District Web Posting” to this question had enrollments between 4,100 and 11,000 students. Based on community type, the majority of districts that responded “District Web Posting” to question 7 were suburban. Of the respondents who answered “District Web Posting” to question 7 based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents had less than 31% racial and language minority students.
8. Approximately what percentage of the district's new hires were:

A. New teachers with no experience? (%)
B. Teachers with experience outside the district? (%)
C. Current School District staff? (%)
D. Long-term substitutes? (%)
E. Teachers of racial and language minority? (%)

Table 8

Chi Square Analysis for Question #8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>% of New Hires Are:</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Teachers w/ No Exp</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>2348.8</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>6911.744</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experience Out of District</td>
<td>4323</td>
<td>2348.8</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>6911.744</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>From w/ in District Staff</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>2348.8</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>6911.744</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Long Term Subs Race &amp; Lang. Minority</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>2348.8</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>6911.744</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2348.8</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>6911.744</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 6911.774 with 4 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2(4, n=11,744) = 6911.77, p < .0001$ the percentage of the new hire’s experience.

For question 8, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 8.
9. Does your School District have a partnership arrangement with a local college or university to help recruit potential teachers?

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>College Partnership</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>34.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>34.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 34.031 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.
The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=128) = 34.031, p<.0001$ school districts have a partnership arrangement with a local college or university to help recruit potential teachers.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents answered “no” to this question. However, the two largest districts responded “yes” to question 9. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 9 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “no” to question 9 had less than 30% racial and language minority students. One observation that may be made was that the district with the highest percentage of racial and ethnic diversity (99%) responded “yes” to this question.

10. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, which areas of certification were easiest to recruit for? (Please select up to three choices.)

Table 10

Chi Square Analysis for Question #10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Easiest Certs. to Hire</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Music/Band</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FACS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>General Scienc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Busness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Technology Ed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Foreign Lang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.312</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>598.411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 598.411 with 14 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (14, n=320) =598.411$, $p<.0001$ for the most recent hiring year, which areas of certification were easiest to recruit for.

For question 10, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 10. One observation that may be made is that “elementary education teaching positions” was the most frequent of the responses in terms of the easiest position to fill.
11. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, which areas of certification were most difficult to recruit for? (Please select up to three choices.)

Table 11

Chi Square Analysis for Question #11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Difficult Cert. to Hire</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreign Lang.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>General Scienc</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Technology Ed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FACS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Band/Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.9134</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>312.701</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 312.701 with 14 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, \( \chi^2 (14, n=299) = 312.701, p<.0001 \) for the most recent hiring year, which areas of certification were most difficult to recruit for.

For question 11, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 11. One observation that may be made is that “Physics,” “Chemistry,” “Foreign Language” and “Mathematics” teaching positions were the most difficult positions to fill.
12. Which of the following methods does your School District use to encourage candidates to apply?

Table 12

Chi Square Analysis for Question #12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Encourage to Apply</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hiring Bonus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loan Forgiveness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compete</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Incentive Pay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reimbursement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>241.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following methods does your School District use to encourage candidates to apply?
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 241.910 with 6 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (6, n=150) =241.910, p<.0001$ school districts encourage applicants to apply.

For question 12, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 12. One observation that may be made is that “recognition of years” was the most frequent method districts use to encourage candidates to apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Written Hiring Proc</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 1.531 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.2159
by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated to be not statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=128) =1.531, p<.2159$ school districts have written hiring procedures.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to this question had enrollments that varied greatly. Based on community type, the majority of districts that responded “yes” to question 13 were rural. Of the respondents who answered “yes” to question 13 based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents had a range from 1% to 99% racial and
language minority students. Therefore, composition had no meaningful relationship to the way this question was answered.

14. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, how many elementary (Grades K – 6) position vacancies were there?

Summary

For question 14, n= 125. The number of vacancies for the superintendents who responded, there were 346 vacancies for elementary positions grades K-6. The mean number of vacancies for the entire population was 2.76.

Based on district size, the largest school districts reported from 2 to 22 elementary openings. The smaller districts had a range of elementary openings from 0 to 8 positions. Based on community type, rural and suburban districts both had a range of elementary openings from 10 to 22. Student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way this question was answered.

15. For the most recent hiring year, how many applications were received for elementary (Grades K – 6) position vacancies?

Summary

For the most recent hiring year n=123 respondents reported that 23,356 applications were received for elementary (grades K-6) vacancies. For the number of responses a mean of 189.886 applications were received for grades K-6 position vacancies.

The range of applications received was from “0” applications to 4000 applications received based on the population sample.

Based on district size, the largest school districts received a number of applications for elementary teaching positions that ranged from 50 to 4,000. Based on district type, suburban school districts received a range of applications from 0-4,000. Districts with a student composition of 50%-99% racial & language minority students received less than 900 applications.
16. How many unsolicited applications did you receive for elementary (Grades K – 6) position vacancies?

Summary

For the most recent hiring year n=121 respondents reported that 14,801 unsolicited applications were received for elementary (grades K-6) vacancies. For the number of responses a mean of 122.322 unsolicited applications were received for grades K-6 position vacancies.

The range of unsolicited applications received was from “0” to 3000 unsolicited applications received state-wide based on the population sample.

Based on district size, the largest school districts received a number of unsolicited applications for teaching positions that ranged from 50 to 4,000. Based on district type, suburban school districts received a range of unsolicited applications from 0-4,000. Districts with a student composition of 50%-99% racial & language minority students received less than 900 applications.

17. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, how many secondary (Grades 7 – 12) position vacancies were there?

Summary

For question 17, n= 124. The number of vacancies for the superintendents who responded, there were 386 vacancies for secondary positions grades 7-12. The mean number of vacancies for the entire population was 3.11.

The range of secondary (Grades 7-12) vacancies received was from “0” to 35 based on the population sample.

For question 17, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 17. One observation that may be made is that a district with 2,000 students, in an urban setting, and with 75% racial and language minority students reported the most secondary teaching vacancies with 35.
18. For the most recent hiring year, how many applications were received for secondary (Grades 7 – 12) position vacancies?

**Summary**

For the most recent hiring year n=121 respondents reported that 16,066 applications were received for secondary (Grades 7-12) vacancies. For the number of responses a mean of 132.776 applications were received for grades 7-12 position vacancies.

The range of applications received was from “0” applications to 1500 applications received based on the population sample.

Based on district size, the largest school districts received a number of applications for secondary teaching positions that ranged from 5 to 1,500. Based on district type, rural school districts received a range of applications from 0-275. Districts with a student composition of 50%-99% racial & language minority received less than 200 applications.

19. How many unsolicited applications did you receive for secondary (Grades 7 – 12) position vacancies?

**Summary**

For the most recent hiring year n=119 respondents reported that 10,210 unsolicited applications were received for secondary (Grades 7-12) vacancies. For the number of responses a mean of 85.798 unsolicited applications were received for grades 7-12 position vacancies.

The range of unsolicited applications received was from “0” to 1200 unsolicited applications received state-wide based on the population sample.

Based on district size, the largest school districts received a number of unsolicited applications for secondary teaching positions that ranged from 0 to 1,500. Based on district type, suburban school districts received a range of applications from 0 to 1,500. Districts with a student composition of 50%-99% racial and language minority received less than 300 applications.
20. Are teachers involved in your School District’s interview process?

Table 14

Chi Square Analysis for Question #20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Teachers in Process</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>26.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most of Time</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>26.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>26.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>26.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 26.752 with 3 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (3, n=129) =26.752, p<.0001$ school districts involve teachers in their interview process.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “sometimes” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. Based on community type, the majority of districts that responded “sometimes” to question 20 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “sometimes” to question 20 had a range of 0% to 94% racial and language minority students.

21. Does your School District use more than one interview team to interview the same applicant?

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>More than 1 Team</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 3.419 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.0645
by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not quite statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a not quite statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=129) =3.419, p<0.0645$ school districts use more than one interview team to interview the same candidate.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. However, the two largest districts responded “no” to question 21. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 21 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “no” to question 21 had less than 30% racial and language minority students. One observation that may be made is that the district with the highest percentage of racial and ethnic diversity (99%) responded “yes” to this question.
22. Does your district conduct a short “screening” interview via phone or face-to-face to help reduce the pool of applicants?

Table 16

Chi Square Analysis for Question #22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Screening Interview</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most of Time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 11.930 with 3 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.0076 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be very statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a very statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (3, n=129) = 11.930, p<0.0076$ school districts conduct a short “screening” interview via phone or face-to-face to help reduce the pool of applicants.

For question 22, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 22.

23. Are graduates of your School District given any special consideration during the interview process?

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Graduates Special</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>9.941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>9.941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 9.941 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.0016
by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be very statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a very statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=153) = 9.941$, $p<.0016$ school district graduates are given any special consideration during the interview process.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. However, the two largest districts responded “no” to question 23. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 23 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “no” to question 23 had less than 40% racial and language minority students.
24. Who participates in a first interview? (Please check all that apply.)

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>In First Interview</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Superintendent Assistant</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personnel Director Chairperson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers Chosen by LEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers Chosen by LTA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community (Parents)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.2698</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>381.628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 381.628 with 10 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than 0.0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, \( \chi^2 (10, n=322) = 381.628, p < .0001 \) of who participates in a first interview.

For question 24, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 24.
25. Does your School District use a pre-established set of interview questions, with the exception of some subject related questions, for all interviews?

Table 19

Chi Square Analysis for Question #25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Pre-Established ?’s</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>9.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>9.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 9.031 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.0027
by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be very statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a very statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=128) =9.031, p<.0027$ school districts use a pre-established set of interview questions, with the exception of some subject related questions, for all interviews.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. However, the two largest districts responded “no” to question 25. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 25 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “no” to question 25 had less than 47% racial and language minority students.


Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Behavior Based ?’s</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>37.488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>37.488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 37.488 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=127) =37.488, p<.0001$ school districts use behavior based interview questions.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “no” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. However, the second and third largest districts responded “no” to question 26. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 26 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents had less than 25% racial and language minority students. One observation that may be made is that the largest school districts answered “yes” to this question.
27. How often does a second interview occur?

Table 21

Chi Square Analysis for Question #27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Second Interview</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42.624</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>76.968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.624</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>76.968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.624</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>76.968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 76.968 with 2 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.
The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, χ² (2, n=128) = 76.968, p < .0001 school districts conduct a second interview.

For question 27, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 27. One observation that may be made is that 8 of the 9 largest school districts responded “sometimes” to this question.

28. Who participates in the second interview? (Please check all that apply.)

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>In 2nd Interview</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>² Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers Chosen by LEA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teachers Chosen by LTA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Community (Parents)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.4514</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>331.392</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 331.392 with 10 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than 0.0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (10, n=346) = 331.392$, $p<.0001$ who participates in the second interview.

For question 28, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 28. One observation that may be made is that 9 out of the 10 largest school districts do not include the “superintendent” in the second interview.
29. Please rank each of the following criteria according to their importance in recommending an applicant for hire.

Table 23

Chi Square Analysis for Question #29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Criteria Importance</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prior Exp (Very)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prior Exp (Moderately)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prior Exp (Unimportant)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Energy (Very)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Energy (Moderately)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Energy (Unimportant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>College GPA (Very)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>College GPA (Mod)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>College GPA (Unimport)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coaching (Very)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Coaching (Mod)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Coaching (Unimport)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>References (Very)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>References (Mod)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>References (Unimport)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sample Lesson (Very)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sample Lesson (Mod)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sample Lesson (Unimp)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Multi Certs (Very)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Multi Certs (Mod)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Multi Certs (Unimport)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Adv Degree (Very)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Adv Degree (Mod)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adv Degree (Unimport)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.5984</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>490.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 490.710 with 23 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than 0.0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2$ (23, n=1024) =490.710, p<.0001 criteria.

For question 29, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 29. However, “very important” was the most frequent of the responses regarding multiple certifications in the largest school district.
30. Please rank each of the following personal qualities according to their importance in recommending an applicant for hire.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Criteria Importance</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Verbal Skills (Very)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Skills (Moderate)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Skills (Unimportant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Think Diagnostic (Very)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think Diagnostic (Moderate)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think Diagnostic (Unimportant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Content Pedagogy (Very)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Pedagogy (Moderate)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Pedagogy (Unimportant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Thinking Skills (Very)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Thinking Skills (Moderate)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Thinking Skills (Unimportant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Understand Learner (Very)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand Learner (Moderate)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand Learner (Unimportant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Support ELS (Very)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support ELS (Moderate)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support ELS (Unimportant)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flexible Skills (Very)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible Skills (Moderate)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible Skills (Unimportant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enthusiasm (Very)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43.1568</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Quality</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Enthusiasm (Mod)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiasm (Unimport)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Caring Skills (Very)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Caring Skills (Mod)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring Skills (Unimport)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Technology (Very)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Technology (Mod)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Technology (Unimport)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.156</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1488.453</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rank each of the following personal qualities according to their importance in recommending an applicant for hire.
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 1488.453 with 29 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.1868 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a not statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (29, n=1296) =1488.453, p<0.1868$ regarding personal qualities.

For question 30, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 30. One observation that may be made is that all 10 criteria regarding personal qualities were ranked as “very important” or “moderately important,” with the exception of support for ELS (English Language Skills).

31. Does a list of approved teacher candidates go to a person(s) other than the superintendent for approval?

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Approved by Other</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>47.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>47.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 47.531 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=128) =47.531, p<.0001$ school districts send a list of approved teacher candidates to a person other than the superintendent for approval.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “no” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. However, the second largest district responded “yes” to question 31. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 31 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “no” to question 31 had less than 22% racial and language minority students.
32. If you answered "yes" for the above question, to whom was the list sent? (List person's title only)

Summary

Of the 28 Ohio superintendent respondents who responded "yes" to question 21, other than the superintendent, the people to whom the list of approved teacher candidates was approved by included: Principal (7); Board of Education (11); Personnel Director (3); Not Applicable (1); CFO (1); Assistant Superintendent (3); Supervisor (2).

For question 32, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 32.

33. Does your School District check references for recommended applicants?

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Check References</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>309.688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most of Time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>309.688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>309.688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>309.688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 309.688 with 3 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (3, n=128) = 309.688$, $p < 0.0001$ school districts check references for recommended applicants.

For question 33, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 33.
34. Does your district have a standard set of questions for reference checks?

Table 27

Chi Square Analysis for Question #34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Standard Set Ref.?'s</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4.921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4.921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 4.921 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled 0.0265
by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=127) =4.921, p<.0265$ school districts use a standard set of questions for reference checks.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. However, the two largest districts responded “no” to question 34. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 34 were suburban. Based on student composition, the most frequent number of respondents who answered “no” to question 34 had less than 20% racial and language minority students.

35. Who reviews references? (Check all that apply.)

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Who Checks Refs</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>* Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44.156</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>211.512</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.156</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>211.512</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HR Director</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.156</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>211.512</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>44.156</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>211.512</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.156</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>211.512</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44.156</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>211.512</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

P value and statistical significance:
Chi squared equaled 211.512 with 5 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than 0.0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (5, n=266) = 211.512, p<.0001$ who reviews references.

For question 35, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 35. One observation that may be made is that 10 out of the top 18 school districts in terms of size, list the “human resource director” as the person most likely to check references.
36. Does your School District require a written essay as part of the application process?

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Require Essay</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5.651</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5.651</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 5.651 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value equaled .0174. By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at a statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1,n=129) =5.651, p<.0174$ school districts require a written essay as part of the application process.

Based on district size, the majority of respondents who answered “yes” to this question had enrollments scattered between 250 and 11,000 students. Of the 18 largest responding districts (4,000-11,000 students) twelve responded “yes” to question 36. Based on community type, the majority of districts responding “no” to question 36 were rural. Based on student composition, there was no meaningful relationship to how this question was answered.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Rejected by Board</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>468.866</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>468.866</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>468.866</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>468.866</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More Than Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>468.866</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 468.866 with 4 degrees of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than .0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (4, n=127) =468.866, p<.0001$ that applicants recommended by the superintendent were also approved by the school board.

For question 37, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 37.
38. Does your district have a program for newly hired teachers to support their work performance?

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>New Hire Support</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected #</th>
<th>Expected %</th>
<th>Chi Squared</th>
<th>° Of Freedom</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>101.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>101.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

**P value and statistical significance:**
Chi squared equaled 101.531 with 1 degree of freedom the two-tailed P value was less than 0.0001 by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

The Ohio Superintendent respondents indicated at an extremely statistically significant level, $\chi^2 (1, n=128) =101.531$, $p<.0001$ school districts have a program for newly hired teachers to support their work performance.

For question 38, the district size, type and student composition had no meaningful relationship to the way that this question was answered. There was no apparent variation between districts relating to their responses to question 38.
CHAPTER V

Introduction

As Reeves (2007) explains, the two most important variables that influence student achievement are: quality of instruction provided by the teachers and the quality of leadership provided by principals. Student achievement is the number one priority in public schools today. A growing concern nationally is indeed achievement of students. Schools are under the microscope to meet ever-increasing benchmarks imposed by NCLB legislation.

Research shows that hiring the best teachers in middle and upper class school districts is not a difficult task. The problem is that schools that reside in lower socio-economic areas or poverty stricken areas have a significant challenge in finding the best, most qualified teachers who are actually willing to teach in those areas.

The purpose of this dissertation study was to: (1) determine what hiring practices are employed by Ohio school districts; (2) determine if hiring practices conform to best practices as described in the professional literature; (3) and finally, determine whether hiring practices vary based on district size, community type and student composition.

Discussion

In order to determine what hiring practices are employed, if those hiring practices conform to best practices based on professional literature and if hiring practices vary based on district size, type of community and student composition in Ohio public schools, a survey was developed by the researcher. The motivation of this study came from research done in Pennsylvania by Strauss (2006). Each of the findings listed below
is defined in the order in the survey using descriptive statistics. However, each of the survey item responses was analyzed using a Chi Square formula in order to determine the level of significance. The following outcomes were the result of the survey completed by 128 Ohio public school superintendents:

Question 6: The literature indicates that it is common for collective bargaining agreements to require that vacant positions be advertised within the district. The research shows that this is true in 88% of the responding Ohio districts.

Question 7: The literature indicates that newspaper ads and district postings once served as the most common ways in which districts posted vacant positions. The research shows that with the increased use of the internet, the three most popular ways in which districts advertise teacher vacancies include: district website postings; state-wide website/data base postings; and college career center sites.

Question 8: The literature indicates that candidates with experience are highly sought after. The research shows that in Ohio districts hires consist mostly of new inexperienced teachers (40%), and teachers with experience outside the advertising district (37%). Current school district staff, long-term
substitutes and teachers of racial & language minority made up a combined total of only 23% of the districts' new hires.

Question 9: Only 24% of the responding school districts have a partnership arrangement with a local college or university to help recruit potential teachers. Although the reason for this was not asked within the survey, the most probable cause for this low percentage is the lack of a college/university in the vicinity of the responding districts.

Question 10: The research reinforced what was found in the literature. The areas of certification easiest to recruit for were elementary, secondary social studies, and English/language arts.

Question 11: The research reinforced what was found in the literature. The areas of certification most difficult to recruit for were chemistry and physics.

Question 12: Although the literature indicated that some districts employ the use of incentive pay and reimbursement of moving expenses, the research found that none of the responding Ohio school districts employ such programs. Both the literature and research showed the use of recognition of years of experience for placement on the pay scale as a method to encourage candidates to apply.
Question 13: Although the literature recommends that districts have written hiring policies the research showed almost a 50-50 split of districts that did have written hiring policies and districts that did not.

Question 20: The literature indicates that teachers should participate in the interview process. The research shows that all but 11% of responding districts use teachers at least some time within the interview process.

Question 21: The literature does not recommend nor discourage the use of more than one interview team to interview a single applicant. The research shows that 58% of the responding Ohio school districts utilize more than one interview team to interview the same applicant.

Question 22: The literature indicates that districts sometimes employ the use of a short “screening” interview to reduce the pool of applicants. The research shows that only 29% of the responding Ohio districts never utilize a short “screening” interview.

Question 23: Both the literature and the research supported the fact that past graduates of a district advertising vacancies are given special consideration during the interview process.

Question 24: Both the literature and the research support that the principal is the pivotal figure in the interview process. Both the literature and the
research show the three other participants in the first interview include the assistant principal, the department chairperson from the department where the vacancy exists and selected teachers.

Question 25: Although the literature indicates that districts should use a pre-established set of interview questions for all interviews, they were only present in 63% of responding Ohio districts.

Question 26: Although the literature showed the value of using behavior based interview questions, the research showed only 23% of responding Ohio districts used these types of questions.

Question 27: The literature indicates that a second interview should take place. The research shows that 65% of responding Ohio school districts always conduct a second interview and another 34% sometimes conduct a second interview.

Question 28: Both the literature and the research indicate that the principal and the superintendent are the key participants in a second round interview.

Question 29: The literature and the research both support the importance of the same criteria in recommending an applicant for hire.
Question 30: The literature and the research both support the importance of the same personal qualities in teacher candidates being recommended for hire.

Question 31: Both the literature and the research indicate that the superintendent gives final approval of a candidate for hire 80% of the time.

Question 33: The literature stated that principals place high value on contacting applicant references, and the research showed overwhelming agreement with this practice.

Question 34: The literature does not recommend nor discourage the use of a standard set of questions for reference checks. The research shows that 40% of the responding Ohio districts use a standard set of questions for reference checks.

Question 35: Both the literature and the research support the fact that the principal and the superintendent are the administrators that most commonly check references.

Question 36: The literature indicates that some states require a written essay as part of the application process. Ohio does not require a written essay, but individual Ohio districts can. The research shows that only 40% of the
responding Ohio districts require a written essay as part of the interview process.

Question 37: The literature indicates that all teacher hiring requires a majority vote by the school board. The research shows that 97% of the time, Ohio school boards approved the candidate/s recommended for hire. It is rare for the school board to reject recommended candidates.

Question 38: The literature indicates that districts should have support programs for new teachers to provide mentoring, peer observation, orientation and seminars. The research shows that 95% of the responding Ohio districts have such programs.

As mentioned above, a Chi Square analysis was used to determine a level of significance for each survey question. The P values ranged from <.0001 to 0.2159 level of significance. One observation that can be made from survey question 30, which asked the respondent to rank personal qualities according to their importance in recommending an applicant for hire, had a P value of 0.1868 which was determined to be not statistically significant. A second observation that can be made was regarding question 21. Question 21 asks “Does your School District use more than one interview team to interview the same applicant?” The Chi Square analysis determined a P value of .0645 to be considered not quite statistically significant.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the information obtained through this study, the following questions are recommendations for one who may be interested in studying hiring practices:

1. Once hired, what are the most effective programs for retaining quality teachers?
2. What are the most effective ways to advertise for teaching positions in order to recruit the most highly qualified teachers?
3. Are interview tools such as STAR (Situation-Task-Action-Result) and PAR (Problem-Action-Result) type questions effective for any part of the interview process?
4. Should there be an emphasis placed on personal qualities of the applicant?
5. Should hiring practices vary based on district size?
6. Should hiring practices vary based on community type?
7. Should hiring practices vary based on student composition?
8. Taking a sampling of school districts nation-wide, what would appear to be the common threads regarding hiring practices?
Recommendations for Administrative Practice

Current Ohio practice based upon responding districts, agrees with the literature that:

1. it is common for collective bargaining agreements to require that vacant positions be advertised within the district;
2. the areas of certification easiest to recruit for are elementary, secondary social studies and English/language arts;
3. the areas of certification most difficult to recruit for are chemistry and physics;
4. teachers should participate in the interview process;
5. past graduates of a district advertising vacancies are given special consideration during the interview process;
6. the principal is the pivotal figure in the interview process;
7. a second interview should take place prior to recommending a candidate for hire;
8. the principal and the superintendent are key participants in the second round interview;
9. the same criteria should be used in recommending a candidate for hire;
10. the same personal qualities should be used in selecting teacher candidates being recommended for hire;
11. the superintendent should give final approval of candidates for hire;
12. principals place high value on contacting applicant references;
13. Ohio districts use a standard set of questions for reference checks;
14. the principal and the superintendent are the administrators that most commonly check references;

15. the school board almost always approves the candidate/s recommended for hire;

16. districts have support programs for new teachers.

It is recommended that administrators continue to follow these practices.

Current Ohio practice based upon responding districts differs greatly with the literature that:

1. districts prefer candidates with experience;

2. districts have partnership arrangements with local colleges/universities to help recruit potential teachers;

3. some districts employ the use of incentive pay and reimbursement of moving expenses to encourage candidates to apply;

4. the use of behavior based interview questions;

Current Ohio practice based upon responding districts differs moderately with the literature that:

1. the ways in which districts advertise vacant teaching positions;

2. districts have written hiring policies;

3. the use of more than one interview team to interview the same candidate;

4. a pre-established set of interview questions should be used for all interviews;

5. the use of a written essay as part of the application process.
Current Ohio practice based upon responding districts differs somewhat with the literature that:

1. the use of a short “screening” interview to reduce the pool of applicants; Administrators should reconsider following the practices recommended in the literature.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to determine hiring practices employed by Ohio public school districts, hiring practices conforming to best practices as described in the professional literature, and if hiring practices vary based on district size, community type and student composition. The results of this study indicated that there were commonalities among school districts in Ohio regarding hiring practices. The study also concluded that among Ohio school districts, hiring practices largely conform to best practices as described in the professional literature with some exceptions. Regardless of district size, community type and student composition, hiring practices did vary among Ohio school districts across these three variables.
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APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL AND
February 4, 2013

Dr. Robert Barbe, Principal Investigator
Mr. Frank Mosier, Jr., Co-Investigator
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology, & Leadership
UNIVERSITY

RE: HSRC PROTOCOL NUMBER: 997.2013

TITLE: Classroom Teacher Hiring Practices in Ohio

Dear Dr. Barbe and Mr. Mosier:

The Human Subjects Research Committee of Youngstown State University has reviewed the aforementioned protocol, and has determined it is exempt from full committee review based on a DHHS Category 3 exemption, not with the following conditions:

1. Only public email address for the school superintendent at each school district will be used for recruitment.

2. The Survey Monkey software is configured to not save the email addresses of those who sent the recruitment email and also to not collect IP addresses of the computer from which the survey is completed.

Any changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Human Subjects Review Committee and may not be altered without HSRC approval except where necessary to eliminate harm to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the Human Subjects Research Committee.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Bidder Parent
Chair, YSU Institutional Review Board

CRP cc

c: Dr. Jake Frick, Chair
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology, & Leadership

www.ysu.edu
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APPENDIX C

SURVEY ON CLASSROOM TEACHER HIRING PROCEDURES IN OHIO
1. Please indicate the approximate number of students enrolled in your School District.

2. Please select the District type that best describes your School District.
   - Rural
   - Urban
   - Suburban
   - Town

3. What is the percentage of your District enrollment that is economically disadvantaged (those qualifying for free or reduced lunch)?

4. Please indicate the approximate percentage of racial and language minority students enrolled in your School District.

5. Please indicate your District Performance Index as reported on the most recent year’s state report card.

6. Does your collective bargaining agreement require that vacant positions be advertised within your School District?
   - A. Yes
   - B. No

7. In which of the following ways does your School District advertise a teaching vacancy? (Please select all that apply)
   - District website posting
   - Newspaper ads
   - College career center sites
   - State-wide website/database
   - Websites sponsored by professional organizations (AFT, NEA, etc.)
   - For-profit dot-com websites
   - Advertisement outside of Ohio
   - Historically black colleges and universities
   - Organizations with predominantly minority membership
8. Approximately what percentage of the district’s new hires were:
   A. New teachers with no experience? (%)
   B. Teachers with experience outside the district? (%)
   C. Current School District staff? (%)
   D. Long-term substitutes? (%)
   E. Teachers of racial and language minority? (%)

9. Does your School District have a partnership arrangement with a local college or university to help recruit potential teachers?
   A. Yes
   B. No

10. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, which areas of certification were easiest to recruit for? (Please select up to three choices.)
    - Elementary
    - English/Language Arts
    - Mathematics
    - General Science
    - Biology
    - Chemistry
    - Physics
    - Social Studies
    - Foreign Languages
    - Family & Consumer Sciences
    - Technology Education
    - Business/Computers
    - Music/Band
    - Art
    - Special Education

11. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, which areas of certification were most difficult to recruit for? (Please select up to three choices.)
    - Elementary
    - English/Language Arts
    - Mathematics
    - General Science
    - Biology
    - Chemistry
    - Physics
    - Social Studies
    - Foreign Languages
    - Family & Consumer Sciences
    - Technology Education
    - Business/Computers
    - Music/Band
    - Art
    - Special Education
12. Which of the following methods does your School District use to encourage candidates to apply?

- [] Hiring bonuses
- [] Loan forgiveness programs
- [] Competitive compensation career ladders
- [] Incentive pay
- [] Reimbursement for moving expenses
- [] Recognition of years of experience for placement on the pay scale
- [] None of the above

13. Does your School District have written hiring procedures?
- [] A. Yes
- [] B. No

14. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, how many elementary (Grades K – 6) position vacancies were there?

15. For the most recent hiring year, how many applications were received for elementary (Grades K – 6) position vacancies?

16. How many unsolicited applications did you receive for elementary (Grades K – 6) position vacancies?

17. For the most recent hiring year of your School District, how many secondary (Grades 7 – 12) position vacancies were there?

18. For the most recent hiring year, how many applications were received for secondary (Grades 7 – 12) position vacancies?

19. How many unsolicited applications did you receive for secondary (Grades 7 – 12) position vacancies?
20. Are teachers involved in your School District's interview process?
- [ ] A. Always
- [ ] B. Most of the time
- [ ] C. Sometimes
- [ ] D. Never

21. Does your School District use more than one interview team to interview the same applicant?
- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No

22. Does your district conduct a short “screening” interview via phone or face-to-face to help reduce the pool of applicants?
- [ ] A. Always
- [ ] B. Most of the time
- [ ] C. Sometimes
- [ ] D. Never

23. Are graduates of your School District given any special consideration during the interview process?
- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No

24. Who participates in a first interview? (Please check all that apply.)
- [ ] A. Superintendent
- [ ] B. Assistant Superintendent
- [ ] C. Principal
- [ ] D. Assistant Principal
- [ ] E. Personnel Director
- [ ] F. Head of Department
- [ ] G. Members of the School Board
- [ ] H. Other Teachers Chosen by Local Education Agency
- [ ] I. Other Teachers Chosen by Local Teachers Association
- [ ] J. Community (Parents)
- [ ] K. Other

Other (please specify) ____________________________

25. Does your School District use a pre-established set of interview questions, with the exception of some subject related questions, for all interviews?
- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No

☐ A. Yes
☐ B. No

27. How often does a second interview occur?

☐ A. Always
☐ B. Sometimes
☐ C. Never

28. Who participates in the second interview? (Please check all that apply.)

☐ A. Superintendent
☐ B. Assistant Superintendent
☐ C. Principal
☐ D. Assistant Principal
☐ E. Personnel Director
☐ F. Head of Department
☐ G. Members of the School Board
☐ H. Other Teachers Chosen by Local Education Agency
☐ I. Other Teachers Chosen by Local Teachers Association
☐ J. Community (Parents)
☐ K. Other

Other (please specify) __________________________

29. Please rank each of the following criteria according to their importance in recommending an applicant for hire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior teaching experience</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy exhibited during interview</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grade point averages</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra curricular sponsor/coaching potential</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model teaching/Teaching a sample lesson</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple certifications</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 30. Please rank each of the following personal qualities according to their importance in recommending an applicant for hire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Quality</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong verbal skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to observe and think diagnostically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content pedagogy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to develop higher order thinking skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to support language learning across the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible expertise that allows the teacher to decide what will work best to meet student needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring and interpersonal skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology knowledge (Education software, electronic grading, mapping, lesson plans and the ability to incorporate technology in lessons).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 31. Does a list of approved teacher candidates go to a person(s) other than the superintendent for approval?

- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No

### 32. If you answered “yes” for the above question, to whom was the list sent? (List person’s title only)

- [ ]

### 33. Does your School District check references for recommended applicants?

- [ ] A. Always
- [ ] B. Most of the time
- [ ] C. Sometimes
- [ ] D. Never

### 34. Does your district have a standard set of questions for reference checks?

- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No
35. **Who reviews references? (Check all that apply.)**

- [ ] A. Superintendent
- [ ] B. Assistant Superintendent
- [ ] C. Human Resource Director
- [ ] D. Principal
- [ ] E. Assistant Principal
- [ ] F. Other

Other (please specify) 

36. **Does your School District require a written essay as part of the application process?**

- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No

37. **In the last year, of those applicants recommended by the superintendent for employment, how many were rejected by the board?**

- [ ] None
- [ ] One
- [ ] Two
- [ ] Three

If more than three, how many?

38. **Does your district have a program for newly hired teachers to support their work performance?**

- [ ] A. Yes
- [ ] B. No
APPENDIX D

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY
March 5, 2013

Dear Superintendent,

I am currently the Principal of Knoch Middle School in the South Butler County School District in Saxonburg, Pennsylvania. I am also a doctoral student at Youngstown State University. I am working on my dissertation which has a focus on teacher hiring practices in Ohio public school districts. I am examining the process involved in finding, attracting and hiring quality teachers and have created a short survey that I am asking all superintendents in the state to complete by accessing the following link:

survey monkey web address removed

The survey consists of 38 multiple choice questions and should take you no more than 20 minutes to complete. The study poses no risks to participants, and the results of the study will be provided upon request. Jerry Klenke of BASA stated that he “encourages the completion of this survey. The results will provide data of significance to our profession.”

All results and data pertaining to this study will be kept confidential in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. Data generated by the survey may be reviewed by personnel at Youngstown State University. If any presentations or publications result from this research, your district will not be identified by name. It is my intention to complete the research for this study within the next three months and present and defend my findings within the next six months.

Participation in this study is voluntary; you may refuse to participate simply by not responding to my e-mail request. By responding to the survey you are giving your consent to participate in the study. Should you have any questions about this research, feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Robert Beebe, at rjbeebe@ysu.edu or (330) 941-2128 or Dr. Edward Orona, Director of Grants and Sponsored Programs at eorona@ysu.edu or (330) 941-2377.

Please respond to this survey as promptly as possible. I thank you for your assistance and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Frank Moxie Jr.

Frank Moxie Jr.
March 8, 2013    SECOND NOTICE

Dear Superintendent,

On February 26th an e-mail was sent to you seeking your participation in a study addressing current hiring practices in education. The purpose of this second notice is to again encourage your support in this study by completing a brief online survey that can be accessed by using the following link:

survey monkey web address removed

If you have already completed the survey I would like to thank you for doing so. The survey consists of 38 multiple choice questions and should take 15-20 minutes to complete. All results and data pertaining to this study will be kept confidential in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

While I realize the scope of the daily demands of your position, your willingness to share your knowledge of and experience with hiring practices is of the utmost importance. With the far-reaching impact of No Child Left Behind on student instructional needs and achievement, the processes implemented to identify the successful teacher candidate are of paramount significance to all educators

Participation in this study is voluntary; you may refuse to participate simply by not responding to my e-mail request. By responding to the survey you are giving your consent to participate in the study. Should you have any questions about this research, feel free to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Robert Beebe, at rjbeebe@ysu.edu or (330) 941-2128 or Dr. Edward Orona, Director of Grants and Sponsored Programs at eorona@ysu.edu or (330) 941-2377.

Please respond to this survey no later than Monday March 18, 2013. I thank you for your assistance and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Frank Moxie Jr.
March 19, 2013

Dear Superintendent:

I am a doctoral student at Youngstown State University. On February 26 and again on March 8 an e-mail was sent to you and all Ohio superintendents seeking your participation in a dissertation study addressing current hiring practices in the state's public schools. Your participation is crucial to this research and will ensure a more representative sample.

The survey can be accessed by using the following link:

survey monkey web address removed

If you have already completed the survey, I would like to thank you for doing so. The survey should take 15-20 minutes to complete and all results will be kept confidential.

Participation in this study is voluntary. By responding to the survey, you are giving your consent to participate in the study.

Should you have any questions about this research, please do not hesitate to contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Robert Beebe, at rjbeebe@ysu.edu or (330) 941-2128 or Dr. Edward Orona, Director of Grants and Sponsored Programs at eorona@ysu.edu or (330) 941-2377.

Please respond to this survey no later than Friday March 22, 2013. Thank you for your assistance, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Frank Moxie Jr.