

**Hiring Teachers in New York's Public Schools:
Can the Principal Make a Difference?**

4/29/03

**Frank Papa, Hamp Lankford and Jim Wyckoff
University at Albany, SUNY**

The research reported in this paper has been supported by the New York State Education Department and the RAND Corporation. However, the views expressed are solely those of the authors and may not reflect the New York State Education Department or the RAND Corporation

1. Introduction

Schools across the nation are searching for ways to improve student performance. Rightfully, much has been written on the important role that teachers play in this process. We know relatively less about the role of principals in altering student outcomes. The principal's position has evolved so that in addition to being a leader in curriculum and instruction, the principal often is responsible for managing the human, physical and financial resources of the building, representing the school to the public with respect to a variety of issues including assessment and accountability, and representing the interests of the school within the district. So, effective principals have the potential to affect student outcomes through a variety of paths. Arguably, the hiring of new teachers has the potential to affect student outcomes as much as any decision made within a school system. What are the teacher hiring practices of schools and what role do principals play in this decision? This paper provides information on these issues by addressing the following questions.

- What are the teacher hiring practices employed by public schools in New York State? How do these practices vary by the type of school or principal?
- How do the qualifications of teachers hired vary by the hiring practices employed and the attributes of principals?

A better understanding of these issues may provide insights to the improvement of student outcomes.

2. Background

Much of the research on school effectiveness argues that strong principal leadership is related to better student performance.¹ For example, Zigarelli (1996) examines five prominent literature reviews² on effective schools and finds that the effective school variables identified in these reviews collapse into six constructs; three of these constructs are related to the principal: principal leadership and involvement; employment of teachers, and school culture. In addition, Zigarelli (1996) uses a regression analysis to test the independent effect of each of these six constructs on

¹ See, for example, Anderson, 1997; Andrews & Sober, 1987; Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986.

² Edmonds, 1979; Block, 1983; Purkey and Smith, 1983; Downer, 1991; and Coyle and Witcher, 1992.

student achievement levels. The results show that principal autonomy in hiring and firing decisions, school culture, and high teacher morale are the three most important factors.

Other research indicates that principals are not able affect change in student performance measures.³ These apparent contradictions give rise to more questions than answers. The best explanations for these apparent contradictions involve methodological issues. For example, much of the earlier research employs data with small samples of very select populations. In addition, establishing an operational definition of an effective principal is problematic.⁴ This is due, in large part, to the multifaceted role of the principal. Previous studies show that different perspectives, for example that of school board members, parents, teachers, students, and principals themselves, lead to very different conceptualizations of what makes an effective principal.⁵ Other studies show that the leadership skills required to be an effective principal can vary greatly depending on the system and community in which the principal must function.⁶ Moreover, this issue of context can interact with the issue of perspective to complicate matters further.⁷

Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) describe six different approaches to school leadership: instructional leadership, transformational leadership, moral leadership, participative leadership, managerial leadership, and contingent leadership. Each of these approaches vary with regard to its focus: instructional leadership focuses on the leader's attention to actions of teachers in so far as they directly relate to the education of students; transformational leadership focuses on the leader's charismatic, visionary, cultural, and empowering abilities and her attention to the commitments and capacities of staff members; moral leadership focuses on the leader's values, participative leadership focuses on decision-making as a group dynamic, managerial leadership focuses the leader's attention on the functions and tasks at hand (this would include transactional leadership); and contingent leadership focuses on the leader's ability to respond to a wide array of unique circumstances. Each of these approaches has some supporting evidence of its usefulness and/or relevance in the study of school

³ See, for example, McCarthy, 1980; Ayres, 1984; Mack, 1984; Adie, 1986; LaMarr, 1986; and Landis, 1987.

⁴ See, for example, Yukl, 1994.

⁵ See, for example, Criwsib, Porter, & Gehriem, 1980; Larsen, 1985, 1987; Larsen & Harty, 1987; Gantner, Daresh, Dunlap, & Newsom, 1999; Scott & Christy, 1990.

⁶ See, for example, Moorhead, Roslyn, Nediger, and William, 1989; Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., and Steinbach, R., 1999.

⁷ For example, see Winter, McCabe, & Newton, 1998.

leadership behavior. Depending on the author, each these approaches has considerable variation within an approach. In the end, we are left with a very long list of possible approaches to effective leadership.

Thus, the application of the model that best fits the context in which the leadership will take place becomes crucial. This context will include a plethora of important considerations including, but not limited to, individual characteristics of the leader and sub-ordinates, characteristics of the students and parents, characteristics of other leadership within the school and district, organizational culture and its imposed restrictions, and the main problems facing the school at a particular time. Even when the analysis is limited to only newly hired principals, there are two basic views of the transition to the new principal (Hart, 1993): one focuses on the school and district effects on the new principal (Duke, 1987; Hart, 1988; Ogawa, 1991) and the other focuses on the new principal's effect on the school (Miskel and Cosgrove, 1985).

Yet again, the literature shows great diversity in the instruments used to assess effective principals. The methods include case studies, questionnaires, interviews, rating scales, and correlation design. They vary in scope ranging from a focus on one particular aspect of the principal's role e.g., instructional leadership, to a broad, more general view of leadership.

Bossert et al. (1982) develops a framework to test for a causal relationship between a principal and student outcomes; the model divides this relationship into two sections: the effects of individual and organizational characteristics on principal behavior and the effect of principal behavior on student outcomes. By the authors' own admission, the model is filled with methodological obstacles.

Since the development of this model in 1982, researchers have tried to test its usefulness in empirical settings.⁸ More recently, research in the area of leader succession uses changeover in leadership positions to isolate the impact of leadership behavior on organizational outcomes⁹. While these studies make significant advancement beyond the anecdotal evidence provided by earlier case studies, data constraints still impede full specification of the models. As a result, answers to questions regarding the impact of leader behavior on outcomes remain ambiguous.

⁸ See, for example, Heck, Marcoulides, & Glasman, 1989 and Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990.

⁹ See, for example, Ogawa and Hart, 1985 and Hart and Ogawa, 1987.

Based on this review of relevant research, we explore three aspects of the role of principals in teacher hiring:

- The process and structure teacher hiring,
- The attributes and qualifications sought in teachers, and
- The ways in which the qualifications of teachers varies with respect to attributes of the hiring process and the attributes of principals.

3. Data and Methods

This study employs data collected from a survey of New York State principals inquiring about the hiring practices of public school teachers. The survey instrument is based on the review of the literature with particular attention paid to the results of an analysis by Strauss (2000) and field-testing of the draft instrument. The survey instrument consists of 102 multiple choice and 5 short answer questions (see Appendix D).

The sample consisted of 1208 schools, which varied by region, urbanicity, and grade level¹⁰. The initial mailing was done early in January 2002; a follow-up reminder post card was sent in early February. Overall, there were 254 respondents; the response rate outside New York City (NYC) was 27 percent and the response rate within NYC was only 8 percent. Ultimately, hiring teachers is seen as phenomenon that occurs within a labor market; NYC, including its suburbs and Yonkers, is viewed as a likely labor market for hiring teachers. Due to low response rates for New York City, responses from New York City and its suburbs are eliminated from the following analysis.

In an effort to identify any meaningful response bias, differences between various individual and school attributes of survey respondents were compared to those of non-respondents; each of the resulting differences were small and statistically insignificant at the $p=0.10$ level (Table C-3).

We employ the principal survey to describe the process that schools use in hiring principals. The survey results are merged with other data on the attributes of the schools and principals contained in an administrative database. The administrative

¹⁰ Schools were chosen randomly with the exception that all non-NYC urban schools were included. This was done because we anticipated a lower response rate from urban schools and because there are only a total of 250 non-NYC urban schools. A complete categorical breakdown of the schools sampled and those that responded can be found in Appendix C (Tables C-1 and C-2).

database includes information on the attributes of the students, teachers and principals in each school. A summary of that information is contained in Appendix B. Our intent here is descriptive. Ultimately, we want to examine behavioral relationships that assess the role of the principal in the teacher hiring process. However, too little is known about this process to begin building behavioral models. This analysis proceeds in two phases. First, a descriptive analysis of the practices used by schools to hire teachers is provided. Particular attention is paid to differences across urbanicity, student performance, grade level, and number of enrolled students. The second phase of the research uses descriptive analysis to examine the ways in which the qualifications of teachers actually hired (based on personnel records in the administrative database) vary across attributes of the principals hiring them (e.g., gender, ranking of institution granting bachelor degree and experience as a principal). A factor analysis is used to produce a single metric measure for teacher qualifications from four separate measures: not certified in any classes taught, failed the General Knowledge Exam or the LAST Exam (or both), first-time teacher, and Barron's ranking of the college from which one earned a bachelor's degree. This measure of teacher qualifications is employed to examine relationships between teacher qualifications and principal attributes.

4. Teacher Hiring Practices

How do schools structure the teacher hiring process and what practices are employed when hiring teachers? The results of the survey of principals described below often confirm anecdotal reports, both in the general responses and in the differences in structure and process across schools differentiated with respect to urbanicity, student performance, grade level and student enrollment. We first describe our findings with respect to the control that principals have in the teacher hiring process. Then we examine the practices employed by schools to hire teachers, followed by the content of candidate interviews. Finally, we describe the attributes that principals desire in new teachers and their views of factors that limit their ability to hire teachers.

Principal Autonomy

As expected, principals are heavily involved in the hiring of teachers, but principals of urban schools believe they have, on average, less autonomy than their suburban and rural counterparts. This was true for each of the five different aspects of autonomy examined (Table 1a). In general, about half of the principals report that they

have primary responsibility for teacher hiring and over 70 percent indicate that they decide who moves on to later stages in the process. However, only 30 percent of urban principals indicate that they have primary responsibility for hiring and 38 percent report choosing which applicants move on to latter stages in the process. In addition, over 70 percent indicate that they must accept teachers from other schools in their district to fill vacancies, while this is true for only 41 percent of suburban principals and 21 percent of rural principals. These differences are somewhat more striking when compared by the level of student performance of the school as measured by the proportion of students scoring at level 1 in the fourth and eighth grade English Language Arts exam.¹¹ Nineteen percent of the principals in lowest performing schools report that they have primary responsibility for hiring compared to over well 50 percent in the higher performing schools.

Results delineated by grade level of the school and enrollments are shown in Table 1b. While some differences exist, most of these are not statistically significant.

Even though it is not surprising that principals in urban and low-performing schools have less autonomy in teacher hiring than do other principals, it is nonetheless an important finding. In an environment where principals and schools are being held accountable for the performance of students, it is problematic holding principals accountable when they do not have substantial control and involvement in the process by which teachers are hired.

Hiring Practices

The process of hiring teachers varies widely across schools with respect to recruitment, selection, and hiring. Again, we examine how each of these aspects of the hiring process vary across schools grouped with respect to urbanicity, student performance, grade level and enrollment, as shown in Tables 2a and 2b.

¹¹ New York's student achievement data for 4th and 8th grade English Language Arts and Math place each student's test results in one of four performance levels. The school data indicate the number of students in each level. To examine low-performing students we employed the portion of the students tested whose results place them in the lowest performance group, Level 1. Level 1 for 4th grade ELA is described by the New York State Education Department as, "These students have serious academic deficiencies. They show no evidence of any proficiency in one or more of the elementary standards and incomplete proficiency in all three standards."

Recruitment. Principals of urban schools report that they are much more likely to advertise outside the state for new teachers than suburban or rural teachers.¹² Over 70 percent of urban principals advertise for teachers out of state, while less than 25 percent of suburban principals do so. Most schools work with a college preparation program in the recruitment process, although this practice is somewhat more prevalent among suburban and rural schools than urban schools. Three-quarters of all schools work with a college preparation program. However, although 80 percent of the principals in rural schools report doing so, only 65 percent of urban principals indicate that they do. Similar differences hold when recruitment practices are examined by level of student performance. Only half of the lowest performing schools work with a teacher preparation program in the recruitment of teachers, while 80 percent of the highest performing schools do. Since our survey inquired about hiring practices in schools, we can not be sure whether districts have relationships with teacher preparation programs that are unreported by principals. It may be these district level relationships are more likely to go unreported in larger urban districts where it is more likely that human resource departments are the initial contact for hiring. That said, the finding described above suggests that partnerships with preparation programs may be an effective strategy to improve hiring in urban and low-performing schools.

Selection. The process of selecting candidates appears to be similar across schools. Most schools have candidates perform a mock teaching exercise and return for a second interview, although less than half report that candidates write an essay during their first interview (Table 2a). Although urban principals report that first interviews were shorter than what was reported by suburban and rural principals (30 minutes versus about 40 minutes), there are few significant differences with respect to whether applicants write essays or perform a mock teaching exercise. In addition, suburban and rural schools are more likely to invite candidates for second interview than are urban schools (about 90 percent versus 70 percent). Personnel hiring is often an involved process that can involve many participants and several stages. Thus, our results are suggestive that urban principals appear to devote less effort to a couple of aspects of the hiring process, but more in depth analysis would be required to draw conclusions.

¹² Contrast this practice with the finding that over 80 percent of new teachers for urban schools in New York grew up within 40 miles of where they take their first position (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2002).

When examined by student performance there are virtually no differences in the process by which principals report selecting candidates (Table 2a). Neither are there differences when schools are aggregated by grade level or enrollment size.

In general there is remarkable consistency across the topics that principals report being discussed during first interviews with teachers (Tables 3a and 3b). Urban principals are somewhat less likely to discuss group interactions and career goals with teachers than their suburban and rural counterparts. However, they report being somewhat more likely to discuss issues of diversity.

Hiring. The hiring process, as reported by principals, reflects commonly understood attributes of teacher labor markets. For example, nearly half of urban principals indicate that some hires are made after July 31st, while less than 10 percent of suburban and rural principals report late hiring (Table 2a). Urban principals report that new hires are given more credit for prior teaching experience than is the case in suburban and rural schools. On average, urban principals provide three-quarters of a year credit for each year of prior experience, while suburban schools provide slightly over a half-year credit for each year of experience.

In addition, urban principals are much more likely to report that some job candidates turned down offers than suburban principals (50 percent versus 16 percent). Interestingly, less than half of the principals reported that salary is a limitation in hiring. Urban and rural principals were more likely to do so than suburban principals, although the differences are relatively small (49 percent versus 34 percent). However, urban principals are much more likely to indicate that the socioeconomic status of their students limits their ability to hire teachers than are suburban or rural principals (64 percent versus 11 and 28 percent respectively). Thus, principals perceive that this aspect of working conditions is an important limitation on their ability to hire teachers.

Attributes Sought for in New Teachers

What are the criteria on which candidates are judged and how do these criteria vary across schools? As might be expected, past teaching performance, bachelor's degree major in teaching area, and references are the criteria most often cited as being important to principals in evaluating prospective teachers. More than two-thirds of all respondents listed these three criteria as being either important or extremely important in

determining which candidates to interview (Tables 5a through 5c).¹³ Identified somewhat less often were prior experience, the candidate's grade-point average (GPA) in their major area and their level of certification (e.g., provisional or permanent). Interestingly, urban principals placed less emphasis on GPA in major than did suburban or rural principals (Tables 5a through 5c). However, urban principals listed past or present school district residency as an important criteria much more frequently than suburban or rural principals. Forty-four percent of urban principals listed district residency as either extremely important or important. In contrast, suburban and rural principals identified it as such 11 and 8 percent of the time, respectively. These differences may reflect district requirements but nonetheless are an important indication of criteria used to judge applicants. Although commonly employed, principals rely less heavily on the quality of the undergraduate institution, GPA in major, essays, certification test scores, or portfolios in judging candidates.

Not only is there variation across urbanicity, there is also variation within each of the urbanicity categories (Tables 5a through 5c). For example, within urban schools, none of the five Lykert ranking categories (not important to extremely important) contained more than 45 percent of principals' responses. Moreover, for most of the individual indicators, each of the five categorical rankings contained at least ten percent of the principals' responses. Results were similar, albeit a bit less dramatic, within the suburban and rural schools. This indicates that different principals frequently employ different criteria in evaluating candidates.

Finally, a factor analysis of the level of importance of the 13 indicators used to generate an initial interview indicate that these group into four factors (Table 6). Three factors are suggestive of measures of ability and/or performance; each of these three factors differs with regard to its level of specificity with respect to teaching ability and/or performance. Loading on one factor, the least specific ability/performance factor, there are two measures: overall GPA and GPA within major. There are three measures on a second factor, a more specific ability/performance factor: essays, test scores, and portfolios.

¹³ Principals responded to the question "Which of the following were considered important in narrowing the applicant pool? Respondents may be reflecting views that represent their views of important criteria in judging applicants or factors that distinguished some applicants from others. If the later, all applicants may have a particular attribute that the principal views as important but since this did not distinguish among applicants it was not considered important.

There are also three measures on a third factor, the most specific ability/performance factor. Two of these measures are past performance in teaching and references, clearly very specific measures of a teacher's ability/performance as a teacher. At the same time, another measure, whether or not the individual is a resident of the school district loads on this factor. This measure, and only this measure, has a negative factor score on its dominant factor.¹⁴ It may be that some schools/districts believe that being a resident of the district is an important indicator of success as a teacher within the school/district and that they are willing to accept candidates with lower qualifications on other measures to obtain candidates who are district residents. Once again, more research is needed to better address these issues.

The fourth factor appears to represent qualifications more so than ability and/or performance. The measures loading on this factor include experience, level of certification, advanced degrees, and bachelor degree in teaching.

5. Conclusions and Implications

Although principals may not directly affect the student outcomes, they have the potential to importantly shape the environment in which students learn. An important aspect of the learning environment is the quality of the teaching workforce. Increasingly, research is documenting that teachers have an important impact on student learning. Good teachers can improve student outcomes much more than weaker teachers. Ultimately, we are interested to know whether some principals are better at hiring teachers than others. We approach addressing this question by examining how principals structure the hiring process:

- How is the teacher hiring process structured?
 - What control do principals have with respect to teacher hiring?
 - How do recruitment, selection and hiring vary across schools?
 - What attributes do principals seek in prospective teachers?
- Are some principals able to hire more qualified teachers than other principals? If so, is there a relationship to the nature of the hiring process or the attributes of the principal?

¹⁴ Most of the attributes/performance indicators are positively correlated with one another with respect to their level of importance (Table 13). One measure, whether or not the individual is a resident of the school district, is negatively correlated with many of the other measures. This negative correlation is statistically significant in the cases of the following measures: past performance in teaching, references, essays, and test scores.

We find that:

- Principals of urban and low-performing schools have less autonomy than do their suburban and rural counterparts;
- The socio-economic status of students in urban and low-performing schools presents is reported to provide a greater obstacle to hiring teachers than compensation;
- There is great variation in the level of importance of various attributes/qualifications of prospective teachers within urbanicity categories;

These results add to the mounting evidence that suggests urban and low-performing schools are disadvantaged with respect to their ability to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. However, important questions still remain. For example, are urban and low-performing schools advantaged by the lack of autonomy in hiring of teachers? Should they have more control over this process? It should be noted that these findings reflect the views of principals themselves. If we were to survey other professional staff, e.g., teacher or superintendents the responses may well differ.

Additional research, perhaps in the form of case studies, could provide valuable information with regard to these questions and others. In addition, case studies could help provide an understanding of why hiring practices are related to school characteristics/attributes far more than principal characteristics/attributes. It may be that changing hiring practices upon the arrival of a different principal is not warranted given the rather short average length of a principal's tenure and the time it would take to adjust to the new practices. However, without further research, answers to these questions will remain unknown.

References

- Adams, Jeanne P. (1999). "Good Principals, Good Schools." *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, Vol. 29 (1), pp. 8-11.
- Andrews, Richard L. & Soder, Roger (1987). "Principal Leadership and Student Achievement," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 4, pp. 9-11.
- Avolio, B. & Bass, B., (1988). "Transformational Leadership: Charisma and Beyond." In J. Hunt, B. Baliga, H. Dachler, and C. Shrieseim (eds.), *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (pp. 29-49). Toronto: Lexington Books,
- Block, A. W. (1983). "Effective Schools: A Summary of Research." Educational Research Service, Arlington, VA.
- Bolman, Lee G. and Deal, Terrence E. (1997). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bossert, Steven T., Dwyer, David C., Rowan, Brian, and Lee, Ginny V. (1982). "The instructional management role of the principal." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 18(3), pp. 34-64.
- Brewer, Dominic J. (1996). "Career Paths and Quit Decisions: Evidence from teaching." *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 14.
- Card, D. and Krueger, A. B. (1992). "Does School Quality Matter? Returns to Education and Characteristics of Public Schools in the United States." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 100, pp. 1-40.
- Coleman, J.S. and Others (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunities*. U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Collins, James C. and Porras, Jerry I. (1994). *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. New York: Harper Business.
- Coyle, L. and Witcher, A. (1992). "Transforming the Idea Into Action: Policies and Practices to Enhance School Effectiveness." *Urban Education*, 26(4) pp. 390-400.
- Downer, D.F. (1991). "Review of Research on Effective Schools." *McGill Journal of Education*, 26(3) pp. 323-331.
- Eberts, Randall W. and Stone, Joe A. (1988). "Student Achievement in Public Schools: Do Principals Make a Difference?" *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 7(3), pp. 291-299.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1982). "Programs for School Improvement: An Overview." *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 40, pp. 4-11.
- Ehrenberg, Ronald G. and Brewer, Dominic J. (1995). "Did Teachers' Verbal Ability and Race Matter in the 1960s? Coleman Revisited." *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 14(1), pp. 1-21.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G., Chaykowski, Richard P., and Ehrenberg, Randy A. (1988). "Determinants of the Compensation and Mobility of School Superintendents." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 41(3).

Education Research Service (2000). "The Principal, Keystone of a High-Achieving School: Attracting and Keeping the Leaders We Need." Arlington, VA

Fowler, William (1991). "What are the characteristics of principals identified as effective by teachers?" National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

Gantner, Myrna W., Daresh, John C., Dunlap, Karen, & Newsom, Janet (1999). "Effective School Leadership Attributes: Voices from the Field." Paper presented at American Education Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Gates, S., J. Ringel, L. Santibanez, C. Chung and K. Ross, *Who is Leading Our Schools? An Overview of School Administrators and their Careers*, RAND Corporation, 2002

Hallinger, Philip & Murphy, Joseph (1986). "Instructional leadership in effective schools."

Hanushek, Eric A. (1986). "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature* 24, pp. 1141-1177.

Hanushek, Eric A. (1997) "Assessing the Effects of School Resources on Student Performance: An Update." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 19, pp. 141-164.

Hanushek, Eric A. and Kain, John F. (1972). "On the Value of 'Equality of Educational Opportunity' as a Guide to Public Policy," in *On equality of educational opportunity*. Eds. Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan. NY: Random House, pp. 116-145.

Hanushek, Eric A., Kain, J.F., & Rivkin, Steven G. (1999). "Do higher salaries buy better teachers?" Working Paper.

Hanushek, Eric, Rivkin, Steven G., and Taylor, Lori L. (1996). "Aggregation and the Estimated Effects of School Resources." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pp. 611-627.

Hill, P., M. Roza, M. Celio, J. Harvey, and S. Wishon, *A Problem of Definition: Is There Truly a Shortage of School Principals?* Draft, Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington, 2002.

Kyle, Regina M. (1985). Eds. *Reaching for Excellence: An Effective Schools Sourcebook*, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., p. 6.

Larsen, Terry J. (1987). "Identification of instructional leadership behaviors and the impact of their implementation on academic achievements." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Larsen, Terry J. and Hartry, Arlene (1987). "Principal/teacher perceptual discrepancy: instructional leadership in high and low-achieving California schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Moore, Duane (1999). "Where Have all the Principals Gone?" Unpublished.

Mont, D., & Rees, D.I. (1996). "The influence of classroom characteristics on high school teacher turnover." *Economic Inquiry*, 34, pp. 152-167.

Murnane, R.J. (1981). "Teacher mobility revisited." *Journal of Human Resources*, 16(1) (Winter), pp. 3-19.

Murnane, R. J. and Olsen, R. (1991). *Who Will Teach? Policies That Matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murnane, R.J., Singer, J.D., & Willett, J.B. (1989). "The influences of salaries and 'opportunity costs' on teachers' career choices: Evidence from North Carolina." *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), pp. 325-346.

National Commission for Excellence in Education (1983). "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." Washington, D.C.

O'Connell, Ray (2001). "The New York State Principalship: Profile of an Evolving Profession." Paper for The School Administrators Association of New York State.

Pantili, Linda and Others (1991). "Principal Assessment: Effective or Not? A Meta-Analytical Model." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Purkey, S. C., and Smith, M. S. (1983). "Effective Schools: A Review." *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), pp. 427-452.

Research for Better Schools (1987). "Effective Principal Behaviors."

Rowan, Brian and Others (1982). "Methodological considerations in studies of effective principals." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Scannell, William (1988). "The Leadership of Effective Principals." *Insights on Educational Policy and Practice*, No. 5.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, Donald (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. U.S.A.: Basic Books, Inc.

Scott, Christy and Others (1990). "An Experimental Sampling Approach to the Study of Principal Instructional Leadership: A Comparison of Activities and Beliefs as Bases for

Understanding Effective School Leadership.” Project Report for National Center for School Leadership, Urbana, IL.

Smith, Stuart C. and Piele, Philip K. (1996). *School leadership: Handbook for Excellence*. ERIC.

Terry, Paul (1999). “Essential skills for principals.” *Thrust for Educational Leadership*.

Teske, Paul and Schneider, Mark (1999). “The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals.” PricewaterhouseCoopers

Theobald, N.D. (1990). “An examination of the influences of personal, professional, and school district characteristics on public school teacher retention.” *Economics of Education Review*, 9(3), pp. 241-250.

Theobald, N.D., & Gritz, R.M. (1996). “The effects of school district spending priorities on the exit paths of beginning teachers leaving the district.” *Economics of Education Review*, 15(1), pp. 11-22.

Willis, David B. and Bartell, Carol A. (1990). “Japanese and American Principals: A Comparison of Excellence in Educational Leadership.” *Comparative Education*, Vol. 26(1), pp 107-123.

Zigarelli, Michael A. (1996). “An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research.” *The Journal of Educational Research*. Vol. 90(2), pp. 103-110.

Appendix A – Results

Table 1a

*Principal Autonomy by Urbanicity and School Performance for Non-NYC Area Schools (Means)
(proportion of schools unless otherwise indicated)*

	Urbanicity				Percent of Students scoring level 1 on 4th or 8th grade ELA exam ²			
	urban	suburb	rural	Overall	0-5	>5 and ≤20	>20	Overall
Principal has primary overall responsibility for hiring	0.30	0.52**	0.55**	0.49	0.49**	0.60**	0.19	0.49
Principal has primary responsibility in choosing who moves on to latter stages ¹	0.38	0.74**	0.78**	0.70	0.71~	0.76~	0.50	0.71
Principal must accept teachers from other schools within district	0.73	0.41**	0.21**	0.40	0.39**	0.48*	0.75	0.47
Number of names on list of candidates for a position (mean)	3.69	2.54**	2.51**	2.74	2.53	2.79	3.08	2.69
School board can reject candidates	0.06	0.01~	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.03
Minimum sample size (unless otherwise noted)	30	68	65	163	54	42	10	106

1. There were only 26 observations in the urban category.

2. Level 1 is the lowest of four levels of student achievement and is considered failing.

Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01.

Approximately 75% of the urban and 90% of the >20 categories are schools in either Buffalo, Rochester or Syracuse (Big 3).

The non-Big 3 schools within each category had very similar results.

Table 1b
Principal Autonomy by Grade Level and Enrollments for Non-NYC Area Schools (Means)
(proportion of schools unless otherwise indicated)

	Grade Level				Enrollment			
	Elem.	Middle	High	Overall	25 - 400	401 - 850	> 850	Overall
Principal has primary overall responsibility for hiring	0.55	0.39	0.45	0.49	0.58	0.46	0.43	0.49
Principal has primary responsibility in choosing who moves on to latter stages	0.72	0.67	0.75	0.72	0.74**	0.78**	0.39	0.72
Principal must accept teachers from other schools within district	0.50**	0.60**	0.20	0.45	0.54	0.43	0.38	0.45
Number of names on list of candidates for a position (mean)	2.92*	2.85	2.32	2.75	3.14	2.60	2.78	2.76
Minimum sample size	74	24	35	133	35	85	18	138

Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01.

Table 2a
Common Hiring Practices by Urbanicity and School Performance for Non-NYC Area Schools³
(proportion of schools unless otherwise indicated)

	Urbanicity				Pct. of students scoring level 1 on 4th or 8th grade ELA exam			
	urban	suburb	rural	Overall	0-5	>5 and ≤20	>20	Overall
Recruitment								
advertise outside state	0.73	0.23**	0.39**	0.39	0.21**	0.54	0.57	0.38
advertise outside district	0.81	1.00**	0.99**	0.96	0.98**	0.93~	0.80	0.94
work with teacher prep colleges	0.65	0.76	0.8~	0.75	0.8*	0.78*	0.50	0.75
Selection								
writing an essay during first interview	0.34	0.56*	0.45	0.47	0.50	0.49	0.38	0.48
mock teaching during first interview	0.74	0.80	0.81	0.79	0.77	0.84	0.85	0.81
average length of first interview (minutes - mean)	29.56	38.73**	42.24**	38.47	38.21	37.33	35.77	37.57
there are second interviews	0.70	0.92**	0.89**	0.86	0.88*	0.84	0.69	0.84
Hiring								
some hires are always made after July 31st each year	0.49	0.09**	0.05**	0.15	0.15*	0.16*	0.38	0.18
some individuals do not accept job offers ¹	0.50	0.16**	0.31	0.27	0.16*	0.39	0.50	0.27
salary is a limitation	0.49	0.34~	0.49	0.44	0.39	0.43	0.40	0.40
socioeconomic status of students is a limitation	0.64	0.11**	0.28**	0.29	0.14**	0.36~	0.56	0.28
credit for previous teaching experience ² (as a proportion each year of previous experience - mean)	0.75	0.54**	0.65**	0.62	0.60	0.63	0.75	0.62
minimum sample size (unless otherwise noted)	29	62	62	153	52	39	13	104

1. There were only 14 observations in the urban category and 49, 36 and 6 for performance respectively.

2. There were only 4, 12 and 16 observations for urbanicity respectively and 10, 8 and 1 for performance respectively.

Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01.

Approximately 75% of the urban and 90% of the >20 categories are schools in Buffalo, Rochester or Syracuse (Big 3).

The non-Big 3 schools within each category had very similar results.

3. The original responses to the survey questions were in the form of a 5-point Lykert scale. Unless otherwise noted, the measures shown in this table are dummy variables:

0 if the respondent answered (1) not important or (2) not very important and

1 if the respondent answered (3) somewhat important, (4) important, or (5) extremely important.

Table 2b
Common Hiring Practices by Grade Level and Enrollments for Non-NYC Area Schools
(proportion of schools unless otherwise indicated)

	Grade Level				Enrollments			
	Elem.	Middle	High	Overall	25 - 400	401 - 850	> 850	Overall
average length of first interview (minutes - mean)	36.49**	34.82**	42.38	37.82	37.08	38.45	36.32	37.82
there are second interviews	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.85	0.82	0.88	0.78	0.85
some hires are always made after July 31st each year	0.24**	0.19*	0.03	0.17	0.26	0.14	0.16	0.17
some individuals do not accept job offers¹	0.28	0.33	0.26	0.28	0.42*	0.27	0.08	0.28
minimum sample size (unless otherwise noted)	73	24	35	132	33	81	17	131

1. There were only 60, 18 and 35 observations for grade level respectively and 24, 77 and 12 for enrollments respectively. Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01.

Table 3a

**Common Topics of Discussion during First Interview by Urbanicity and School Performance for Non-NYC Area Schools
(proportion of schools)**

	Urbanicity				Pct. of students scoring level 1 on 4th or 8th grade ELA exam			
	urban	suburb	rural	Overall	0-5	>5 and ≤20	>20	Overall
classroom problems¹	0.97	1.00~	1.00~	0.99	1.00*	1.00*	0.92	0.99
past experience	0.94	1.00*	0.97	0.98	0.96	1.00*	0.92	0.97
subject matter	0.94	0.99	1.00*	0.98	0.96	1.00*	0.92	0.97
curriculum	0.97	0.99	1.00~	0.99	0.98	1.00*	0.92	0.98
discipline	0.97	1.00~	1.00~	0.99	1.00*	1.00*	0.92	0.99
diversity	0.94	0.83~	0.83~	0.85	0.82*	0.87~	1.00	0.86
teaching/learning styles	0.92	1.00**	0.99*	0.98	1.00*	0.96	0.92	0.97
group interactions	0.83	0.96*	0.95*	0.93	0.93	0.89	0.92	0.91
professional/career goals	0.75	0.91**	0.94**	0.89	0.93	0.84	0.85	0.89
minimum sample size	35	70	70	175	55	45	13	113

Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01.

Approximately 75% of the urban and 90% of the >20 categories are schools in Buffalo, Rochester or Syracuse (Big 3).

The non-Big 3 schools within each category had very similar results.

1. The original responses to the survey questions were in the form of a 5-point Lykert scale. Unless otherwise noted, the measures shown in this table are dummy variables:

- 0 if the respondent answered (1) not important or (2) not very important and
- 1 if the respondent answered (3) somewhat important, (4) important, or (5) extremely important.

Table 3b
Common Topics of Discussion during First Interview by Grade Level and Enrollments for Non-NYC Area Schools
(proportion of schools)¹

	Grade Level				Enrollments			
	Elem.	Middle	High	Overall	25 - 400	401 - 850	> 850	Overall
classroom problems	1.00	0.96	1.00	0.99	1.00~	1.00*	0.95	0.99
past experience	0.98	0.93	1.00*	0.97	0.95	0.99	0.95	0.97
subject matter	0.98	0.96	1.00	0.98	0.97	0.99	0.95	0.98
curriculum	0.99	0.96	1.00	0.99	1.00~	0.99	0.95	0.99
discipline	1.00	0.96	1.00	0.99	1.00~	1.00*	0.95	0.99
diversity	0.85	0.93~	0.82	0.86	0.92	0.84	0.85	0.86
teaching/learning styles	0.98	0.96	1.00	0.98	1.00~	0.98	0.95	0.98
group interactions	0.91	0.86	0.95	0.91	0.89	0.93	0.85	0.91
professional/career goals	0.90	0.79	0.87	0.87	0.89~	0.89~	0.75	0.87
minimum sample size	80	25	38	143	37	91	20	148

Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

1. The original responses to the survey questions were in the form of a 5-point Lykert scale. Unless otherwise noted, the measures shown in this table are dummy variables:

- 0 if the respondent answered (1) not important or (2) not very important and
- 1 if the respondent answered (3) somewhat important, (4) important, or (5) extremely important.

Table 4a

*Attributes Sought for in Teachers by Urbanicity and School Performance for Non-NYC Area Schools (proportion of schools)
(these attributes are used to generate an initial or final interview list or both)²*

	Urbanicity				Pct. of students scoring level 1 on 4th or 8th grade ELA exam			
	urban	suburb	rural	Overall	0-5	>5 and ≤20	>20	Overall
previous experience	0.87	0.99*	0.96	0.95	0.98*	0.93	0.88	0.95
high gpa	0.54	0.75*	0.78**	0.72	0.70~	0.76*	0.50	0.70
high gpa in major	0.64	0.82*	0.87**	0.80	0.79*	0.85**	0.56	0.78
higher level of certification (permanent, provisional and so on)	0.77	0.76	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.78	0.88	0.78
good performance in past teaching	0.92	1.00**	0.99*	0.98	0.98*	1.00**	0.88	0.97
good references	0.92	1.00**	1.00**	0.98	1.00*	1.00*	0.94	0.99
major in teaching	0.90	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.88	0.95
highly ranked bachelor degree college	0.59	0.83**	0.83**	0.78	0.88**	0.72**	0.38	0.75
advanced degree	0.67	0.83*	0.71	0.74	0.75~	0.70	0.56	0.71
well written application essay	0.63	0.72	0.64	0.67	0.63	0.68	0.69	0.66
scores on teacher exams	0.58	0.69	0.60	0.63	0.65	0.53*	0.81	0.63
portfolio	0.76	0.83	0.69	0.76	0.81	0.76	0.67	0.77
resident of district	0.70	0.39**	0.31**	0.42	0.39*	0.32*	0.63	0.39
performance in mock teaching ¹	0.70	0.88*	0.92**	0.87	0.94*	0.91~	0.77	0.91
performance during interview ¹	0.90	1.00**	0.99*	0.98	0.98*	1.00**	0.85	0.97
minimum sample size (unless otherwise noted)	38	71	71	180	57	46	15	118

1. There were only 30, 68 and 68 observations for urbanicity respectively and 51, 43 and 13 for performance respectively. Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Approximately 75% of the urban and 90% of the >20 categories are schools in Buffalo, Rochester or Syracuse (Big 3).

The non-Big 3 schools within each category had very similar results.

2. The original responses to the survey questions were in the form of a 5-point Lykert scale. Unless otherwise noted, the measures shown in this table are dummy variables:

0 if the respondent answered (1) not important or (2) not very important and

1 if the respondent answered (3) somewhat important, (4) important, or (5) extremely important.

Table 4b

**Attributes Sought for in Teachers by Grade Level for Non-NYC Area Schools (proportion of schools)
(these attributes are used to generate an initial or final interview list or both)²**

	Grade Level			
	Elem.	Middle	High	Overall
previous experience	0.96	0.87*	0.98	0.95
high gpa	0.72	0.68	0.78	0.72
high gpa in major	0.77*	0.81	0.88	0.80
higher level of certification (permanent, provisional and so on)	0.80	0.68	0.78	0.77
good performance in past teaching	0.98	0.94~	1.00	0.97
good references	0.99	0.97	1.00	0.99
major in teaching	0.94	0.94	0.97	0.95
highly ranked bachelor degree college	0.79	0.65*	0.83	0.77
advanced degree	0.70	0.68	0.78	0.72
well written application essay	0.68	0.68	0.70	0.69
scores on teacher exams	0.65	0.61	0.53	0.61
portfolio	0.83**	0.77	0.63	0.76
resident of district	0.45	0.45	0.33	0.42
performance in mock teaching ¹	0.93	0.78	0.86	0.88
performance during interview ¹	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.97
minimum sample size (unless otherwise noted)	81	31	39	151

1. There were only 73, 27 and 37 observations for grade level respectively.

Statistical significance compares base category to the other two categories. ~ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01.

2. The original responses to the survey questions were in the form of a 5-point Lykert scale. Unless otherwise noted, the measures shown in this table are dummy variables:

0 if the respondent answered (1) not important or (2) not very important and

1 if the respondent answered (3) somewhat important, (4) important, or (5) extremely important.

Table 5a

*Categorical Percentages of Responses to Teacher Attribute Questions for Non-NYC Schools
(these attributes are used to generate an initial interview list)*

	Not Important	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Extremely Important	Totals
experience	5%	6%	29%	46%	13%	100%
overall g.p.a. (for bachelor degree)	7%	28%	42%	22%	1%	100%
g.p.a. in major	6%	20%	37%	32%	5%	100%
level of certification	11%	16%	29%	24%	20%	100%
past performance in teaching	1%	2%	7%	33%	57%	100%
references	2%	0%	13%	42%	43%	100%
bachelor degree major in area of teaching	2%	6%	23%	46%	22%	100%
caliber of institution granting bachelor degree	4%	18%	47%	28%	3%	100%
advanced degrees	7%	26%	41%	25%	2%	100%
test scores	12%	24%	31%	27%	6%	100%
portfolios	12%	32%	41%	14%	2%	100%
school district resident	37%	30%	19%	10%	4%	100%

Table 5b

*Categorical Percentages of Responses to Teacher Attribute Questions for Urban Schools (Non-NYC) (n=38)
(these attributes are used to generate an initial interview list)*

	Not Important	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Extremely Important	Totals
experience	13%	13%	26%	34%	13%	100%
overall g.p.a. (for bachelor degree)	26%	29%	29%	16%	0%	100%
g.p.a. in major	18%	26%	29%	26%	0%	100%
level of certification	16%	21%	26%	16%	21%	100%
past performance in teaching	5%	8%	11%	34%	42%	100%
references	8%	3%	24%	45%	21%	100%
bachelor degree major in area of teaching	11%	5%	16%	45%	24%	100%
caliber of institution granting bachelor degree	16%	29%	34%	21%	0%	100%
advanced degrees	18%	18%	42%	21%	0%	100%
essays	18%	23%	31%	18%	10%	100%
test scores	21%	26%	26%	18%	10%	100%
portfolios	14%	14%	38%	35%	0%	100%
school district resident	28%	10%	18%	18%	26%	100%

Table 5c

***Categorical Percentages of Responses to Teacher Attribute Questions for Suburban Schools (Non-NYC) (n=71)
(these attributes are used to generate an initial interview list)***

	Not Important	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Extremely Important	Totals
experience	4%	4%	28%	48%	15%	100%
overall g.p.a. (for bachelor degree)	4%	31%	38%	24%	3%	100%
g.p.a. in major	3%	18%	38%	35%	6%	100%
level of certification	17%	18%	23%	21%	21%	100%
past performance in teaching	1%	1%	3%	27%	68%	100%
references	1%	0%	7%	42%	49%	100%
bachelor degree major in area of teaching	3%	8%	25%	46%	17%	100%
caliber of institution granting bachelor degree	3%	20%	48%	25%	4%	100%
advanced degrees	7%	20%	45%	28%	0%	100%
essays	8%	25%	30%	28%	8%	100%
test scores	7%	34%	44%	14%	1%	100%
portfolios	6%	18%	46%	23%	7%	100%
school district resident	34%	37%	18%	10%	1%	100%

Table 5d

Categorical Percentages of Responses to Teacher Attribute Questions for Rural Schools (Non-NYC) (n=72)
(these attributes are used to generate an initial interview list)

	Not Important	Not Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Extremely Important	Totals
experience	1%	6%	29%	56%	8%	100%
overall g.p.a. (for bachelor degree)	3%	24%	44%	29%	0%	100%
g.p.a. in major	4%	14%	35%	40%	7%	100%
level of certification	8%	18%	40%	21%	13%	100%
past performance in teaching	0%	1%	4%	35%	60%	100%
references	0%	0%	13%	37%	51%	100%
bachelor degree major in area of teaching	0%	7%	26%	40%	27%	100%
caliber of institution granting bachelor degree	3%	15%	54%	24%	4%	100%
advanced degrees	4%	33%	39%	22%	1%	100%
essays	15%	28%	33%	18%	6%	100%
test scores	10%	35%	42%	13%	1%	100%
portfolios	4%	24%	46%	21%	6%	100%
school district resident	36%	36%	19%	8%	0%	100%

Table 6
Teacher Attributes Factors for Non-NYC Schools
(these attributes are used to generate an initial interview list)
(Rotated Component Matrix)

	Component			
	Ability/ Performance Least Specific	Ability/ Performance More Specific	Ability/ Performance Most Specific	Gained Qualifications
experience	0.250	-0.121	0.209	0.560
overall g.p.a. (for bachelor degree)	0.905	0.155	0.089	0.153
g.p.a. in major	0.887	0.206	0.077	0.098
level of certification	-0.015	0.041	0.025	0.699
past performance in teaching	0.063	0.068	0.746	0.353
references	0.018	0.181	0.781	0.212
bachelor degree major in area of teaching	-0.008	0.070	0.089	0.605
caliber of institution granting bachelor degree	0.357	0.267	0.295	0.376
advanced degrees	0.341	0.134	0.042	0.640
essays	0.183	0.822	-0.010	0.004
test scores	0.354	0.755	-0.157	0.097
portfolios	-0.017	0.615	0.354	0.057
school district resident	-0.208	0.315	-0.626	0.277
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a Rotation converged in 7 iterations.				

Table 7
**Correlations Between Candidates' Attributes Principals Reported as Being Important Schools
in Generating Initial Interview Lists (Non-NYC)**

	overall GPA	GPA in major	level of certif.- ication	past teaching performance	refer- ences	BA major in teaching	caliber of BA granting institution	holds advanced degree	essay	test score	port- folios	resident of sch. district
Experience	.264**	.203**	.270**	.322**	.222**	.148*	.250**	.336**	- 0.026	0.06	.146*	-0.011
overall GPA		.816**	.153*	.191**	.205**	.143*	.345**	.364**	.247**	.410**	.174**	-0.082
GPA in major			0.086	.189**	.184**	0.115	.351**	.328**	.273**	.410**	.195**	-0.035
level of certification				.193**	.170**	.234**	.216**	.310**	0.039	0.09	.130*	0.048
past teaching performance					.607**	.211**	.300**	.316**	0.044	0.028	.206**	-.210**
references						.240**	.251**	.151*	.127*	0.051	.240**	-.201**
BA major in teaching							.262**	.217**	0.087	0.087	0.033	0.1
caliber of BA granting inst.								.343**	.319**	.226**	.202**	-0.099
holds advan- ced degree									.171**	.294**	.145*	0.019
essays										.592**	.278**	.157*
certification test scores											.315**	.221**
portfolios												-0.023
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).												
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).												

Appendix B- New York Leadership Database

	<i>Personnel data</i>	<i>Certification and exam data</i>	<i>Retirement data</i>	<i>SUNY student data</i>	<i>School and district data</i>
<i>UNIVERSE:</i>	All public school superintendents, principals, and other staff	All individuals taking certification exams	All public school teachers, principals, and other staff	All SUNY graduates (including non-teachers)	All public schools and districts
<i>ELEMENTS:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - salary - administrative assignment - experience (district and other) - years of education and degree attainment - age - gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - scores on NTE and NYSTCE (general knowledge, pedagogy, and content specialty) exams - college of undergraduate and graduate degrees - degrees earned - zipcode of residence when certified - race 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - salary - pension benefits - race - age - retirement status - residence during retirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high school attended - high school courses - high school GPA - SAT exam scores - college attended and dates - intended college major - actual college major - college GPA - degrees earned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enrollment - student poverty (free and reduced lunch counts) - enrollment by race - limited English proficiency - student test results - dropout rates - district wealth - district salary schedule - support staff and aides
<i>TIME PERIOD:</i>	1969-70 to 1998-99	1984-85 to 1998-99	1979-80 to 1998-99	1989-90 to 1998-99	1969-70 to 1998-99
<i>SOURCE:</i>	New York State Education Department	New York State Education Department	The New York State Teacher Retirement System	The State University of New York	New York State Education Department

Appendix C – Survey Data

Table C-1

***Schools Sampled for and Responding to Hiring Practices Survey vs. Total Population
by MSA, Urban, Suburban, and Rural (Means)***

	New York City/Yonkers		Buffalo/Rochester/Syracuse		Rest of State			Statewide	Statewide w/o NYC
	urban	suburban	urban	suburban	urban	suburban	rural		
Total Number of Schools in Population	1281	944	185	625	65	268	913	4281	2056
Total Number of Schools in Sample	301	223	185	156	65	65	213	1208	684
Percentage of Schools in Sample	23.5	23.6	100.0	25.0	100.0	24.3	23.3	28.2	33.3
Total Number of Schools Responding	24	46	30	51	9	22	72	254	184
Percentage of Schools Responding	8.0	20.6	16.2	32.7	13.8	33.8	33.8	21.0	26.9

Table C-2

***Schools Sampled for and Responding to Hiring Practices Survey
by grade level***

	elementary schools	middle schools	high schools	total
Number of Schools Sampled	673	238	248	1159
Total Number of Schools Responding	137	54	59	250
Percentage of Schools Responding	20.4	22.7	23.8	21.6

Table C-3

Differences Between Respondents and All Other Principals (Non-NYC)

	Non-Respondent	Respondent	Overall
minimum sample size (unless otherwise noted)	1630	143	1773
Proportion of Principals that are Female	41.18	38.71	40.98
Proportion of Principals from Lowest Ranked College	11.96	8.39	11.68
Proportion of Principals from Highest Ranked College	6.44	6.99	6.49
Age of Principal	49.66	50.3	49.72
Years as a Principal	7.34	7.81	7.38
Number of Enrollments in School	592.88	590.25	592.64
Proportion of Students with Lowest Score on 4th Grade ELA¹	5.62	7.49	5.8
Proportion of Students with Lowest Score on 8th Grade ELA²	9.26	14	9.74

1. There were only 799 and 82 observations respectively.

2. There were only 472 and 53 observations respectively.

Note : All differences listed above are not significant at p = .1 level

Appendix D - Survey of Classroom Teacher Hiring Processes used for 2001-2002

Instructions: For all numbered questions, please provide your answers on the included scan sheet. In other cases, please provide your answers in the space provided on this questionnaire. Please return both the scan sheet and the questionnaire in the self-addressed return envelope included in this packet.

Answers should reference the hiring practices used for new teacher hires for the 2001-2002 school year (or the most recent school in which new hires were made if there were no new hires in the 2001-2002 school year).

General Information

- 1) Who has primary (not necessarily all) responsibility with respect to hiring new teachers in this school?
 - a) Principal
 - b) Superintendent
 - c) School Board
 - d) Some combination of the above

- 2) Are you required to accept teachers from other schools within your district to fill teacher openings?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't know

- 3) Is it common practice to accept teachers from other schools within your district to fill teacher openings?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't know

- 4) How long have you been the Principal at your present school?
 - a) Less than 1 year
 - b) Between 1 and 2 years
 - c) More than 2 years

Notification and Recruitment

- 5) Do you advertise for classroom teachers outside New York State?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't Know

- 6) Do you advertise for classroom teachers outside your district?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't Know

- 7) Do you work closely with teacher preparation programs that are trying to market their graduates?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No (if no, then skip to question 9)
 - c) Don't Know

- 8) If yes, what is the approximate distance of the primary teacher preparation program from your school?
 - a) Within 20 miles
 - b) 20-50 miles
 - c) 50-100 miles
 - d) Don't Know

- 9) To what degree has salary been a limitation in attracting applicants?
 - a) Not at all
 - b) Very little
 - c) Somewhat
 - d) High
 - e) Very high

If yes, what, if anything, have you done to attenuate this problem?

- 10) To what degree has the socio-economic status of your students and their families been a limitation in attracting applicants?
 - a) Not at all
 - b) Very little
 - c) Somewhat
 - d) High
 - e) Very high

If yes, what, if anything, have you done to attenuate this problem?

Generating an Interview List

Which of the following qualities were considered important in narrowing the applicant pool? Please rate the qualities in the following manner and mark your scan sheet accordingly:

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
not important	not very important	somewhat important	important	extremely important

- 11) Experience
- 12) GPA overall (for BA)
- 13) GPA in major
- 14) Level of certification (e.g. permanent, provisional, and so on)
- 15) Past performance in teaching
- 16) References/Recommendation
- 17) Major in area of teaching
- 18) Caliber of institution granting bachelors degree
- 19) Advanced degrees
- 20) Essay(s)
- 21) Test scores
- 22) Portfolios
- 23) School district resident (present or past)

Other, please list.

First Interview

- 24) Were you part of the interview team for the first interview?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't remember

- 25) Did you chair the first interview?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't remember

- 26) If no, who chaired the first interview?
 - a) Superintendent
 - b) Assistant Superintendent
 - c) Assistant Principal
 - d) Other

- 27) Which length of time most closely estimates the average length of time that an applicant spent with the interview team?
- a) 15 minutes
 - b) 30 minutes
 - c) 45 minutes
 - d) 1 hour or more

To what degree did the following occur during the first interview? Please mark the scan sheet in the following manner:

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
not important	not very important	somewhat important	important	extremely important

- 28) Essay
- 29) Practice teaching
- 30) Discussion of reaction to possible classroom problems
- 31) Discussion of experience
- 32) Questions about subject matter
- 33) Questions about curriculum
- 34) Questions about discipline
- 35) Questions about diversity
- 36) Questions about learning styles
- 37) Discussions about group interactions
- 38) Discussions about Professional/Career goals
- 39) To what degree were there differences in the interview for a first-time teacher as opposed to one with experience?
- a) Not at all
 - b) Very little
 - c) Somewhat
 - d) High
 - e) Very High
- 40) Were you primarily responsible in determining who moved on to the next stage?
- a) Yes (if yes, please skip to question 42)
 - b) No
 - c) Don't remember
- 41) If no, who was primarily responsible in determining who moved on to the next stage?
- a) Superintendent
 - b) Assistant Superintendent
 - c) Assistant Principal
 - d) Other

Which of the following qualities were considered important in determining who moved on to the next stage? Please rate the qualities in the following manner:

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
not important	not very important	somewhat important	important	extremely important

- 42) Experience
- 43) GPA overall (for BA)
- 44) GPA in major
- 45) Level of certification (e.g. permanent, provisional, and so on)
- 46) Past performance in teaching
- 47) References/Recommendation
- 48) Major in area of teaching
- 49) Caliber of institution granting bachelors degree
- 50) Advanced degrees
- 51) Essay(s)
- 52) Test scores
- 53) Portfolios
- 54) School district resident (present or past)
- 55) Practice teaching
- 56) Performance in the interview

Other, please list.

Second Interview

- 57) Are there second interviews?
 - a) Never
 - b) Sometimes
 - c) Almost always
 - d) Always

If there are never second interviews, please skip ahead to question 91.

- 58) Were you part of the interview team for the second interview?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't remember
- 59) Did you chair the second interview?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't remember

60) If no, who chaired the first interview?

- a) Superintendent
- b) Assistant Superintendent
- c) Assistant Principal
- d) Other

61) Which length of time most closely estimates the average length of time that an applicant spent with the interview team?

- a) 15 minutes
- b) 30 minutes
- c) 45 minutes
- d) 1 hour or more

Did the following occur at any time during the second interview? Please rate the qualities in the following manner:

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
not important	not very important	somewhat important	important	extremely important

62) Essay

63) Practice teaching

64) Discussion of reaction to possible classroom problems

65) Discussion of experience

66) Questions about subject matter

67) Questions about curriculum

68) Questions about discipline

69) Questions about diversity

70) Questions about learning styles

71) Discussions about group interactions

72) Discussions about Professional/Career goals

73) To what degree were there differences in the interview for a first-time teacher as opposed to one with experience?

- a) Not at all
- b) Very little
- c) Somewhat
- d) High
- e) Very High

74) Were you primarily responsible in determining who moved on to the next stage?

- a) Yes (if yes, please skip to question 76)
- b) No
- c) Don't remember

- 75) If no, who was primarily responsible in determining who moved on to the next stage?
- a) Superintendent
 - b) Assistant Superintendent
 - c) Assistant Principal
 - d) Other

Which of the following qualities were considered important in determining who moved on to the next stage? Please rate the qualities in the following manner and mark your scan sheet accordingly:

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
not important	not very important	somewhat important	important	extremely important

- 76) Experience
- 77) GPA overall (for BA)
- 78) GPA in major
- 79) Level of certification (e.g. permanent, provisional, and so on)
- 80) Past performance in teaching
- 81) References/Recommendation
- 82) Major in area of teaching
- 83) Caliber of institution granting bachelors degree
- 84) Advanced degrees
- 85) Essay(s)
- 86) Test scores
- 87) Portfolios
- 88) School district resident (present or past)
- 89) Practice teaching
- 90) Performance in the interview

Other, please list.

Selection

- 91) How often are there more than two interviews?
- a) Never
 - b) Rarely
 - c) Sometimes
 - d) Usually
 - e) Always

- 92) For each position, how many names are typically offered on a list of approved teacher candidates?
- a) 1
 - b) 2
 - c) 3
 - d) 4
 - e) 5 or more
- 93) Does the list of approved teacher candidates go to a person(s) other than the school board for approval?
- a) Yes
 - b) No (if so, please skip to question 96)
 - c) Don't Know (if so, please skip to question 96)
- 94) If yes, who else must approve the list?
- a) Superintendent
 - b) Assistant Superintendent
 - c) Other
- 95) Also if yes, can the person(s) add names to the list?
- a) Yes
 - b) No
 - c) Don't Know
- 96) How often does the school board reject the candidates offered for approval?
- a) Never
 - b) Rarely
 - c) Sometimes
 - d) Usually
 - e) Always
- 97) How often does the school board add a candidate to the list?
- a) Never
 - b) Rarely
 - c) Sometimes
 - d) Usually
 - e) Always
- 98) How often does the district make late hires (after July 31st)?
- a) Never
 - b) Rarely
 - c) Sometimes
 - d) Usually
 - e) Always

- 99) If candidates are hired after July 31st, from what pool are the candidates chosen?
- a) Candidate from the final stages of the selection process?
 - b) Substitutes
 - c) Other

Offers and Salaries

- 100) What is the approximate number of offers to acceptances?
- a) 1:1
 - b) 2:1
 - c) 3:1
 - d) 4:1 or more
 - e) Don't know
- 101) In the case of experienced hires, is there typically a set formula for the value of X years of service in another district?
- a) Yes
 - b) No (if so, please skip question 102)
 - c) Don't Know (if so, please skip question 102)
- 102) If yes, what is the approximate value for each year of service in another district?
- a) 1/4 of a year (4 years in another district earns salary for 1 year in your district)
 - b) 1/2 of a year
 - c) 3/4 of a year or more
 - d) negotiable
 - e) other

What, if any, special circumstances and/or problems do you face with respect to hiring new teachers?

What could the state do to assist you in hiring new teachers?

Are there any additional comments you would like to make?
