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Abstract

This research is a heuristic project developed to ascertain strategies most frequently used to recruit and retain teachers in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area school districts, including districts with urban and non-urban populations. The study’s purpose entailed: (a) determining the different teacher recruitment strategies used to attract highly qualified teachers to metropolitan area school districts; (b) determining those recruitment strategies generating the highest number of highly qualified teachers for metropolitan area school districts; (c) determining those recruitment strategies resulting in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired by metropolitan area school districts; and (d) identifying those recruitment strategies that Greater Kansas City metropolitan area administrators perceived as influencing teacher retention in urban and non-urban districts.

Data tabulations indicated the following: (1) internet marketing, recruitment fairs, local/national media publications and alternative certification programs were frequently implemented by sample participants representing
metropolitan area school districts; (2) internet marketing, local/national media publications and alternative certification programs generated the highest number of qualified teachers in metropolitan area school districts; (3) recruitment fairs, internet marketing and local/national media publications generated the highest number of first year, highly qualified teachers for metropolitan area school districts; and (4) recruitment fairs and alternative certification programs were perceived by Greater Kansas City Metropolitan area administrators to have influence on teacher retention.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

American public education was and continues to be a topic of high interest reported on by local and national media during the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Legislative and educational pundits, especially during the last two decades, have alerted our nation to an imminent teacher shortage, namely in urban settings, with the potential to negatively impact student achievement for several years. According to Ingersoll and Smith (2003), American public schools will need to hire 2 million teachers within the next decade to fill teaching positions created by attrition or increased student enrollment. Furthermore, an estimated 50% of our nation’s public school teachers will leave public districts because of “burn-out” and desire to change careers (3).

Traditional teacher education programs have failed to meet the supply and demand for qualified teachers in critical needs areas as well as underrepresented ethnic groups. According to Haberman (1995), up to 30% of teacher education graduates do not enter the teaching profession. Of those entering the profession, 50% resign prior to obtaining tenure. Compounding the problem, retirement rates have risen sharply as veteran teachers are now
completing their teaching careers and leaving the classroom (Harris 1985; Hammen 2005).

Aggressive recruiting has become even more important to meet the demands for metropolitan area urban and non-urban settings, critical needs areas, special education and districts experiencing rising student enrollment (Jensen 1987; Peterson 2002). Being faced with these facts, school districts have placed more importance on the recruitment and selection of quality teacher candidates in order to address demands introduced by the No Child Left Behind Legislation.

Recruitment is the first and most crucial phase of selecting teachers. Heneman and Milanowski (2004) and Gonzalez (2005), conducted research indicating unprecedented numbers of probationary and tenured teachers are leaving the profession due to non-competitive salaries, inadequate working conditions, lack of support from administration, lack of professional development opportunities, difficult students, or the difficulties inherent with being assigned to an out-of-field assignment. Therefore, human resources personnel responsible for recruitment in public school districts must have a clear vision, mission, well-defined action plan, adequate funding
and evaluative processes for recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers (Behrens 2001). With the level of attrition increasing due to the aforementioned factors, all districts, large, small, urban, suburban or rural, experiencing teacher shortages or not, will have positions to fill and new teachers to hire in the future (Jensen 1987).

In 2006, the National Education Association reported there were approximately 15,000 school districts in the United States. Of the 15,000, 575 United States public school districts were classified as urban. The total number of teachers under contract during this study was approximately 3 million. One-third were tenured and had surpassed the age of 50, one-third were probationary 23 to 50 years of age and one-third were tenured and under the age of 50. Most significantly, only 15% of the nation’s teachers during the study (450,000) desired employment in high-poverty, significantly diverse school districts.

From a local perspective, The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education or DESE (2001) provided the following data during its annual Recruitment and Retention of Teachers report to Missouri’s General Assembly (23):
• Missouri’s ratio of non-minority to minority teachers in 2001 was 90%/10%.

• Classroom teachers were predominantly female, and the percentage of male teachers decreased steadily from 24% in 1991 to 21.7% in 2001.

• African American teachers comprised 7% of the work force in 2001, down from 8.3% in 1991. The decrease was especially significant when compared to the increased number of African American students. The African American population increased from 15.6% of the total student population in 1991 to 17.4% in 2001. The discrepancy between other student ethnicities and the teaching population follows the same trend. In 2001, other ethnicities accounted for 3.3% of the student population, but only .7% of Missouri’s teacher work force.

• While there was no significant change in the average age of teachers (41.5 years in 1991 and 42 years in 2001), the sizes of various age groups within the teacher work force did change. Both the percentage of older teachers and the percentage of younger teachers increased. The percentage of teachers in the middle groups (30-
Missouri teachers were more equally distributed in the various age groups in 2001 than they were in 1991. In 1991, there were far more teachers in the 40-49 age group reflecting the large “baby boomer” generation. By 2001, many of those teachers had moved into the growing 50-59 age group.

- The percentage of teachers with five or fewer years of experience increased from 21.6% to 30.5%. The percentage of inexperienced teachers in the work force nearly doubled the percentage of young teachers entering the work force, which suggested the inexperienced teachers are not necessarily “young” teachers.

DESE’s report concluded by urging Missouri school districts to consider the following Recruitment and Retention strategies (44):

- Salary increases
- Tuition reimbursement programs
- Signing bonuses
- Closing costs for housing
- Interest-free home loans
- Student loan forgiveness
• Income tax credits
• Bonuses for teachers employed in low-achieving schools
• Job sharing
• District-sponsored daycare
• “Meaningful” mentoring
• Comprehensive professional development
• Release time
• District-sponsored graduate courses
• Cadet teacher academies
• Tuition reimbursement for paraprofessionals and substitutes

**Background to the Study**

As often noted, teaching is the profession from which all other professions and careers develop. Despite the public’s lack of knowledge regarding teacher recruitment and retention data, the media continues its claim that many teaching prospects enter private industry because most public school districts do not have sufficient monetary, human or material resources. Some sources estimate the decline of prospective teaching candidates could be as high as 40% over the next five years (Hough 1994).
From an urban perspective, Haberman (1987) reported there has been a continued shortage of teachers qualified to teach in urban schools since *Brown vs. Board of Education*. Haberman also predicted urban and poor communities would have the greatest need for a readily available pool of teachers due to rising student enrollments and attrition. “Urban districts are going to be faced with the challenge of retaining teachers who may be attracted to higher salaries and newer physical plants offered by wealthier suburban school districts” (19).

The National Center for Alternate Teaching Certification (2004) reported an increasing number of alternatively certified individuals are being hired to teach at-risk children in high poverty areas. According to its estimation, approximately 15% of teacher education graduates apply for teaching positions in urban public school systems (37).

In general, supply and demand fluctuations affect the employment of teachers in the same way other occupations are affected. In periods of high demand, college students may view teaching as a worthwhile and desirable occupation due to the possibility of immediate employment upon graduation. Conversely, teaching may not be an occupation of choice during periods of over-supply due to the number
of available candidates. Currently, school districts, especially metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts, are experiencing high demands for special services, mathematics, bi-lingual and science teachers. But the quandary is exacerbated for districts with diverse populations, as a majority of pre-service teaching candidates prefer to embark upon their careers in more affluent school systems.

If this trend continues, personnel directors will need to search for more efficient means of recruiting and employing teachers. Furthermore, a district’s most prolific asset is its human resources, and the approach to obtaining these resources, as well as their management, must be of high priority (Harris 1985).

The literature suggests there are several elements of effective teacher recruitment strategies. Slosson (1999) provided five essential characteristics personnel administrators should attempt to identify during recruitment activities. According to Slosson, recruiters should identify candidates with:

- High levels of integrity who enjoy helping others grow and learn.
• An affinity for students with diverse backgrounds, especially students’ experiencing difficulty with learning.

• A desire to be a part of the team.

• A longing for intellectual stimulation through professional development activities.

• Strong content area knowledge (62).

The National Teacher Recruitment Clearinghouse (2000) has also identified several recruiting strategies for personnel administrators: (1) screening with teacher perceivers, (2) enhancing teacher salaries, (3) providing professional development stipends, (4) providing housing stipends, (5) attending college recruitment fairs, (6) implementing internet employment processing, and (7) providing budgets for classroom resources and technology (10). The Clearinghouse’s publication further substantiated how urban districts must prioritize their limited resources when attempting to recruit highly qualified teachers. Additional national statistics spanning 1996 through 2005 indicate a pervasive number of urban districts are utilizing pay incentives for pre-service teachers as well as offering tuition reimbursement for existing staff with certification in critical needs areas (see Table 1).
An examination of Table 1 reveals that urban school districts in the South and West with more than 10,000 students enrolled, a greater than 50% minority student population and greater than 20% minority teachers are innovatively recruiting highly qualified faculty by offering pay incentives and tuition reimbursement for
critical needs areas, e.g., special services, math and bilingual certification.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine teacher recruitment and retention strategies in metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts. Young and Castetter (2004) purported: “the impact of poor teaching on children is so serious that the selection process in education has been and continues to be a critical issue. By increasing the quality of employees in our nation’s schools, it is hoped that tomorrow’s youth will be better prepared to function productively in society” (104). Therefore, the federal government, state government and local school districts have a duty to devise creative methods for attracting individuals into teaching.

Three days after taking office in January 2001 as the 43rd President of the United States, George W. Bush announced *No Child Left Behind*, his framework for bipartisan education reform that he described as “the cornerstone of my Administration.” President Bush emphasized his deep belief in our public schools, but expressed a greater concern that “too many of our neediest children are being left behind,” despite nearly $200
billion in Federal spending since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA 140).

Less than a year later, President Bush secured passage of the landmark No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The NCLB Act, which reauthorized the ESEA, incorporates the principles and strategies proposed by President Bush. The legislation’s intent was to increase accountability for student performance in reading and math, increase choices available to the parents of students attending Title I schools failing to meet state standards, provide flexibility in the use of federal education funds in exchange for strong accountability results, institute unequivocal commitment toward ensuring that every child is performing at grade level in reading and mathematics by 2014, and require local school districts to ensure that all teachers hired to teach core academic subjects (English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics/government, economics, arts, history and geography) in Title I programs after the first day of 2002/03 are highly qualified, i.e., with full certification, a bachelor’s degree and demonstrated competence in subject knowledge and teaching on or before July 1, 2005 (United States Department of Education 2002).
Due to budgetary constraints and the limited pool of prospective teachers meeting the “highly qualified” certification standard per the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, urban school districts in the South and West with more than 10,000 students enrolled, greater than 50% minority student population and greater than 20% minority teachers are grappling with meeting the strict NCLB highly qualified teacher standards (see Figure 1). Therefore, a study such as this one could provide helpful information to metropolitan area school districts on recruitment and retention strategies.

In order to successfully recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, Lankard (1994) implores personnel administrators to overcome factors limiting the availability of preferred candidates. Lankard advocates personnel leaders accomplish such by accumulating the perceptions of teachers recruited and continuing to teach in the same district over the last ten years. This could lead to resource reallocation as well as improving strategies devised for attracting teaching prospects.
Certification Status of Newly Hired Teachers Lacking Standard State Certification in Assignment Held.

**Significance of the Research**

This study is an attempt to provide valuable information regarding recruitment strategies so that more highly qualified teachers could be available for critical teacher shortages existing in metropolitan area school districts. According to Harris and Monk (2002), many districts have ineffective recruitment results due to insufficient professional development for personnel administrators responsible for hiring highly qualified...
teachers. Consequently, personnel administrators must vigilantly pursue available resources and gain additional knowledge from research in order to make informed decisions regarding the probable effectiveness of their teacher recruitment programs (Ericson 1997).

**Research Questions**

This research study is designed to identify teacher recruitment and retention strategies that will attract highly qualified teachers to urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts. To guide the collection of data for this study, the following questions are used:

1. What are the different recruitment strategies used in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts to attract highly qualified teachers?
2. Which recruitment strategies generate the highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban and non-urban metropolitan area districts?
3. Which recruitment strategies resulted in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers being hired in urban and non-urban metropolitan area districts?
4. Which recruitment strategies do metropolitan area administrators perceive to have influence on teacher retention?

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The following are limitations associated with the study:

1. Teacher recruitment data in this study will be presented based on administrative perceptions – not anecdotal or empirical evidence.

2. The study will focus only on public school districts.

The study is delimited to survey responses associated with teacher recruitment and retention data in 14 (9 non-urban and 5 urban) Greater Kansas City metropolitan area school districts including: Blue Springs R-IV School District, Center School District #58, Grandview CSD#4, Hickman Mills C-1 School District, Independence School District, Kansas City Kansas School District, Kansas City Missouri School District, Lawrence USD #497, Leavenworth USD #453, Lee’s Summit School District, North Kansas City School District, Raytown C-2 School District, Shawnee Mission School District and Turner School District (see Table 2).
### Table 2
Demographic Information For Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area School Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Minority Percentage</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Non-Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Springs R-IV</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center #58</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview CSD #4</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman Mills C-1</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Kansas</td>
<td>19,722</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Missouri</td>
<td>24,449</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence USD #497</td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth USD #453</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee’s Summit</td>
<td>16,742</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kansas City</td>
<td>17,553</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytown C-2</td>
<td>8,742</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission</td>
<td>28,158</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE), School Data, 2007/08.

### Definition of Key Terms

1. Pre-service Teacher – An individual who has recently completed state/federal teacher certification requirements, but has yet to sign a contract with a school district (U.S. Department of Education).
2. Teacher Perceiver – Individually administered structured interviews that consist of a set of open-ended items divided into specific themes used in the selection of teachers (The Gallup Organization).

3. The National Center for Educational Statistics defines an urban school district as one with 70% of its students being classified as minority. For the purposes of this study, an urban district will be defined as one with a greater than 50% minority student enrollment.

4. Recruitment Strategies – Activities created specifically for attracting teaching candidates to a school district (US Department of Education).

5. Retention – Maintaining the employment of teachers from probationary through tenured stages (U.S. Department of Education).

6. Probationary Teacher – Per Missouri statutes, an individual with less than 5 consecutive years of contracted, teaching service (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education).

7. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 – The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110) is a United States federal law that reauthorizes a
number of federal programs that aim to improve the performance of America's primary and secondary schools by increasing the standards of accountability for states, school districts, and schools (The U.S. Department of Education).

8. Highly Qualified Teacher – Individual who has been fully licensed or certified by the state and who has not had any certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis (U.S. Department of Education).

9. Alternative Licensure or Certification – Temporary teaching authorization for individuals with a bachelor’s degree, but lacking an actual teaching certificate (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education).

10. Housing Stipend – Supplemental compensation awarded to candidates not living within state or district boundaries (The National Center for Educational Statistics).

11. Signing Stipend – Supplemental compensation for candidates consenting to contractual responsibilities within a specific school district before the academic year commences (The National Center for Educational Statistics).
Summary

Teacher recruitment has become a significant endeavor for most urban and non-urban public school district personnel administrators. In addition, the No Child Left Behind legislation has precipitated the need for prudent decision making with regard to acquiring viable candidates. This study will examine recruitment strategies utilized to acquire “highly qualified” teachers for metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts, and identify metropolitan area administrators’ perceptions of how recruitment strategies influence teacher retention.

The results of this study can provide valuable information pertinent to how appropriate recruitment strategies are used to employ highly qualified teachers. Furthermore, the research could yield a strategic planning direction for personnel administrators with responsibilities relative to recruitment, selection, hiring and retention of teachers.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 delineates the study’s background, purpose, significance, research questions, limitations, delimitations and key definitions; Chapter 2 will introduce historical and current scholarly literature correlated with teacher recruitment strategies; Chapter 3 will describe
methodology, instrumentation ("Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey"), how the survey was dispersed to designated public school administrators and the subsequent tabulations; Chapter 4 will present results reported from the Teacher Recruitment Survey and Chapter 5 will close the study with interpretations, evaluation of data and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature

This chapter presents an amalgam of scholarly literature pertinent to how local, state and federal legislators as well as educational consultants have: (a) used the educational reform platform to impact teacher recruitment and retention in public schools; (b) required public school systems to staff all classrooms with highly qualified teachers; and (c) legislatively guided public school systems toward implementing strategies to recruit/retain highly qualified teachers. There are four significant components of this chapter: (1) a synopsis of reform legislation spanning from *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1957 to the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001; (2) United States statistics regarding recruitment, retention, supply and demand for teachers and their impact on student achievement; (3) national as well as local efforts planned and implemented to recruit/retain teachers for urban school districts; and (4) the significance of proactively planning, budgeting and evaluating teacher recruitment and retention strategies.

The literature for this study was attained from educational journals, texts authored by educational consultants with expertise in teacher recruitment
strategies, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), dissertations with a similar focus, local as well as national electronic libraries, the U.S. Department of Education and several state departments of education. Searches were conducted electronically utilizing a myriad of data bases created and publicized by educational practitioners, professors, legislators and lay-persons throughout the teaching profession.

**Educational Reform’s Impact on Recruitment and Retention**

One of our nation’s most significant desegregation acts evolved from the 1957 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*. The Supreme Court’s unanimous decision prohibited separate yet equal segregation policies and supplanted them with a judicial mandate for the integration of all U.S. public schools. In addition, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 began an era of close scrutiny for student achievement in public schools, especially through devising accountability clauses for federally funded programs (Title I). Prior to ESEA, school effectiveness with regard to student achievement was based solely on invalid, subjective assessment results (Darling-Hammond 1997).

President Jimmy Carter’s administration was the first to implement cabinet-level status for public education.
Carter selected Shirley Hufstedler, United States Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit judge, to be his first Secretary of Education, and she vigorously sought making education one of our nation’s highest priorities through extensive traveling, public forums and personal appearances. Additionally, Judge Hufstedler led the U.S. Department of Education toward becoming a federal government entity determined to reform schools domestically as well as internationally (Stallings 2002).

During President Reagan’s administration, Terrel Bell, Secretary of State, amassed support from Congress for educational programs such as Title I and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But Bell’s most prolific accomplishment, however, was his staunch support of the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, an educational report actually prepared by the 18-member National Commission on Excellence in Education panel. The report raised the level of concern for student achievement across our nation by publicizing the pervasive inadequacies of public schools, and spurred fierce debate regarding the quality and productiveness of American education (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983).
The Commission’s report revealed the pressing need to focus on teacher preparation, recruitment and retention, as nearly 50% of newly acquired mathematics, science and English teachers had failed to meet standards for teaching those subjects. In addition, less than one third of the nation’s high schools offered physics taught by a qualified teacher, yet most teachers were being given the opportunity to teach rigorous math and science courses despite being in the lower 10% of their high school and college graduating classes. Due to this overwhelming information regarding under-qualified teachers, all but four states (Alaska, Nebraska, Utah, and Vermont) convened similar commissions or committees charged with making recommendations for reform in public education (Kramer 2000).

A Nation at Risk raised the public’s awareness of three new phases regarding educational reform. The initial phase sought to improve student achievement through course and testing mandates; the second phase argued for improvements in teaching and the pre-service teacher’s preparation; and, the third phase concentrated on instituting more rigorous academic standards, which would lead to improved student achievement nationally (Darling-Hammond 1997).
Both the House of Representatives and Senate also played significant roles in educational reform during the Reagan Administration. Legislators completed landmark reauthorizations of ESEA, which significantly increased federal support for public schools. With the bi-partisan reauthorizations, federal emphasis transitioned from merely ensuring superficial compliance to intense concentration on achievement for disadvantaged students, with funding being earmarked specifically for state and local programs (Stallings 2002).

After being elected in 1988 President George H. Bush continued, and to some extent heightened, the influence of politics on public education. Most significantly, President Bush participated in the National Governors Association’s Education Summit in Charlottesville, Virginia. By 1991, the Bush Administration released “America 2000: An Education Strategy,” which reemphasized sentiments from *A Nation at Risk* including an initiative to increase salaries for those teachers teaching rigorous subject matters such as math, science, English, geography and history. Additionally, alternative certification systems were instituted as a means of encouraging new college graduates with degrees outside the realm of education to pursue teaching as their profession.
An example of such, *Teach for America*, founded by Wendy Kopp in 1990, was comprised of recent college graduates in all academic majors who committed two years to teach in regional urban and rural public schools (*Teach For America* 1996). *The Kauffman Fellows Program*, a nationally recognized urban initiative of the same era, was founded by the Ewing Kauffman Foundation and The Venture Capital Industry in 1994. The program featured a structured educational curriculum, an individual learning plan, facilitated mentoring, peer learning and networking, and industry-specific leadership development (*The Kauffman Fellowship Program 2000*). Local, regional and national America 2000 initiatives stressed the importance of teachers and potential leaders having content-area specialty, along with pedagogical expertise, to facilitate increased student achievement in our nation’s schools (*Swanson 1991*).

In 1993, the Clinton Administration attempted to finalize the efforts begun by the Bush Administration and the Charlottesville Summit by unveiling “Goals 2000.” *Goals 2000* was a plan for education that sought to encourage a nationwide, standards-based focus in public schools. Clinton’s Administration developed a list of eight national education goals that were voted into law as
the “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” on April 22, 1993. The primary purpose of Goals 2000 was to improve student achievement through high standards for parents, teachers and students, to give state and local reform efforts greater flexibility and to implement merit pay and alternative paths of certification for pre-service teachers (Stallings 2002).

President Clinton’s 1997 State of the Union Address made several poignant references regarding the need to improve student achievement in our public schools. During the address, he articulated a 10-point plan to improve education in America, which included moving away from federally regulated funding toward more state and local flexibility. President Clinton completed his 10-point plan for improving education in America by reiterating the Goals 2000 Act’s mission of equipping all public school classrooms with a talented, dedicated teacher (Meyer 1998).

President Clinton’s Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, vehemently supported several initiatives aimed at improving teaching. One of tremendous significance, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), resulted in all states intensifying their standards for teacher certification. During this period, the U.S. Department of Education placed new emphasis on reforming
the teacher certification process. State education departments were urged to adopt performance-based certification, whereby a pre-service teacher was to demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective in the classroom (Riley 2002).

According to Riley,

We need a dramatic overhaul of how we recruit, prepare, license, induct and retain good teachers. We will get the high-quality teachers that our children deserve only when we prepare them well, pay them well and create conditions in which teachers are treated as professionals whose learning and growth are valued and supported (13).

*What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future,* prepared by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996), reported on the reform of teacher education and development. The report summarized two years of research and debate undertaken by a 26-member panel of educators, public officials and business and community leaders. The panel was formed to examine the education system in the United States and to determine how to ensure that all children have access to highly qualified, competent teachers (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future). The report also indicated how student
learning was distinctly influenced by what teachers know and are able to do. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future offered five recommendations to better prepare, recruit and retain quality teachers:

1. Get serious about standards for both students and teachers;
2. Reinvent teacher preparation and professional development;
3. Fix teacher recruitment and put qualified teachers in every classroom;
4. Encourage and reward teacher knowledge and skills; and
5. Create schools that are organized for student and teacher success (66).

An ongoing development in educational reform involves a move to redefine quality teaching through the use of descriptive standards. Efforts currently being adopted to develop and institute standards for improving teacher quality include a transition toward performance-based criteria, more sophisticated, authentic assessments for licensing and state integration of national standards for teacher education, licensing and certification. This intensified focus on certification standards is being promoted by the National Board for Professional Teaching
Standards and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, which have dedicated themselves to creating quality standards for our nation’s teacher education programs (Farrell 2004; Darling-Hammond 1996).

President George W. Bush enacted unprecedented educational reform in 2002 when he signed into law the “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001,” which required the most comprehensive modifications to ESEA since its inception in 1965. The new law changed the federal government’s role in education by requiring America’s schools to describe their success in terms of student achievement exclusively. NCLB was the culmination of a year-long, bi-partisan effort to bring accountability to federally funded education programs. The primary proponents were Representative John Boehner, Representative George Miller, Senator Judd Gregg and Senator Edward Kennedy. This landmark legislation fosters educational excellence for public school children and represents an educational reform plan with a specific timeline for changing America’s public education systems (NCLB 2002).

NCLB envelops several provisions pertinent to teacher qualifications. These requirements challenge state departments of education to reexamine their teacher certification processes and to: (1) ensure teachers have
mastery of their content areas, (2) create higher standards for paraprofessionals, (3) develop strategies for tracking and disclosing information on teacher qualification, and (4) promote ongoing professional development for all existing teachers (102). In addition, clauses within the legislation encouraged states and school districts to reform teacher certification processes by earmarking funds specifically for teacher recruitment and retention (Berry 2002). Hanushek and Raymond (2001) submitted a report indicating how placing quality teachers in every classroom is the single most important factor necessary for improving student achievement. They went on to emphasize that success or failure of American public school systems hinged upon highly qualified teachers having the knowledge and skills necessary to facilitate students meeting higher federal and state academic standards.

NCLB required all teachers to be state certified as “highly qualified” by July 1, 2005. The legislation also defines a highly qualified teacher as one who has been fully licensed or certified by the state and has not had any certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary or provisional basis. Elementary school teachers must pass a state test demonstrating subject knowledge and teaching skills in reading, writing,
mathematics and other areas of the elementary school curriculum. Secondary teachers must demonstrate competency in all subject areas taught by: (1) passing a state assessment, (2) meeting the requirement of a state evaluation standard used to judge competency, and (3) successfully completing an academic major or coursework equivalent to a major, graduate degree or advanced certification (Berry 2002 56). NCLB also requires states to prepare an annual report card delineating the professional qualification of teachers, the percentage of teachers with emergency or provisional credentials and the percentage of classes void of a highly qualified instructor. Hence, NCLB serves as a major impetus for schools to recruit, retain and support highly qualified staff.

The intent of the legislation was to ensure teachers were demonstrating expertise in the disciplines they were assigned to teach. NCLB further defined an out-of-field teacher as a teacher who was teaching an academic subject or a grade level for which he is not highly qualified. NCLB’s highly qualified teacher mandate was designed to eliminate out-of-field teaching by July 1, 2005. States continuing to rely heavily on emergency certification, waivers or provisional licenses are authorized to use Title
II funding as a means of assisting all teachers – new, provisional or existing – to become highly qualified.

The Bush Administration’s vision for preparing, training, recruiting, and retaining teachers was based upon the principle of teacher excellence spawning improvement in student achievement. Because of this vision, microscopic focus is required by school administrators, especially personnel administrators, in their task to recruit and retain quality teachers (Farrell 2004; Berry 2002).

According to Levine (2006) the availability of highly qualified teachers for public school districts hinges upon complete restructuring of current teacher education programs. Today’s teachers need to know and be able to do things their predecessors did not. They have to be prepared to educate all of their students to achieve the highest learning outcomes in history. Hence, the true task is to redesign teacher education for a new era – to produce a greater number of high-quality teachers with the skills and knowledge necessary to educate every child in the class to achieve the same learning outcomes at a time in which the student body has changed economically, racially, geographically, linguistically and academically. With teacher education programs restructured, the availability of quality candidates will be improved.
United States Recruitment and Retention Statistics

The National Center for Education Statistics (2005) released its “Special Analysis: Mobility in the Teacher Workforce” report on August 18, 2005. The report gave highlights of our nation’s teacher workforce during the 1999/2000 school term. During 1999/2000, a total of 3,450,000 teachers worked in public and private elementary and secondary schools across the country – representing about 2.7% of the overall U.S. workforce that year. Elementary and secondary school teachers constituted a greater percentage of the workforce than physicians (0.5%), legal professionals (0.8%), postsecondary faculty (0.9%), engineers (1.0%), registered nurses (1.5%), or any other professional group that year. Elementary and secondary school teachers constituted about the same percentage of the workforce as all secretaries and administrative assistants (2.7%) and slightly less than retail workers (2.8%).

The majority of teachers (90%) worked full time, 4% worked part time, 3% were itinerant teachers, and less than 0.5% worked as long-term substitutes. Eighty-seven percent (3,000,000 teachers) worked in public schools, and 13% (450,000 teachers) worked in private schools. As has historically been true in the United States, females made
up the majority of the teacher workforce in 1999/2000: a total of 2,590,000 teachers were female, while 860,000 teachers were male (75% vs. 25 percent). The percentages of female and male teachers were similar in both public and private schools: female teachers made up 75% of public school teachers and 76% of private school teachers.

However, the distribution of teachers by sex differed widely by grade level. Among those teaching in the elementary grades, 1,340,000 teachers were female, while 140,000 teachers were male (91% vs. 9%). In contrast, at the high school level, 570,000 teachers were female, while 470,000 teachers were male (55% vs. 45%). In the middle grades, there were 660,000 female and 250,000 male teachers (73% vs. 27%).

This report also indicated the average age of brand-new teachers in 1999/2000 was 29, suggesting that many teachers do not enter the teacher workforce in their early twenties – an age that is traditionally associated with being “right out of college.” The average age of all elementary, middle and high school teachers was 42. About 29% of teachers were under age 35, 42% were ages 35-49 and 29% were age 50 or older.

The average number of years in teaching for all teachers was 14 in 1999/2000. More than one-third of
teachers (36%) had 19 or more years of teaching experience, 245 had 10-18 years, 24% had 4-9 years and 17% had 3 or fewer years. This analysis indicates many teachers leave the teaching profession for a period of time for various reasons, and some enter it later in life. As a result, age does not always equate to teaching experience. For example, 19% of teachers between the age of 45 and 49 in 1999/2000 had less than 10 years of teaching experience, and 9% of teachers between the age of 50 and 59 had less than 10 years of teaching experience (National Center for Educational Statistics 2005).

In 1999/2000, the highest degree attained for the majority of teachers (53%) was a bachelor’s degree. Forty-two percent of teachers had attained a master’s degree as their highest degree, and 4% had attained a doctorate, professional, or education specialist degree. Less than 2% of all teachers had completed no more than an associate’s degree.

Although teachers’ academic degrees and their average years of experience have been traditional indicators of the qualifications of the teacher workforce, research has not found the highest degree attained by teachers to be a good predictor of gains in student achievement. Number of years of teaching experience has also proven to be problematic in
predicting such gains. Generally, beginning teachers (those with 3 or fewer years of teaching experience) are not as effective as teachers with more years of teaching experience, with brand-new teachers typically being the least effective teachers. Research has consistently found that brand-new teachers make important gains in teaching quality in the first year and smaller gains over the next few career years. However, there is not a consistent linear relationship between years of teaching experience and student achievement after the initial three years of teaching, making it difficult to say whether there are any discernible differences among more veteran teachers – for example between teachers with 7-10 years of experience and teachers with 20 or more years of experience (National Center for Education Statistics 2005).

A more efficient predictor of student achievement – and hence a better indicator of the qualifications of the teacher workforce – is whether teachers have training and certification in the field they teach. Those who have neither and undergraduate or graduate major nor certification in the field they teach are known as “out-of-field” teachers. Ingersoll (1999) purported information relative to how high school students in mathematics and science learn less from out-of-field teachers than they do
from teachers with a major or certification in the field they teach.

In 1999/2000, among all teachers at all grade levels, an average of 12% were teaching out-of-field in their main assignment area; however, this percentage varied greatly by school district priority, subject area and level. For example, among public school teachers who taught in the middle school grades, 8% of social science teachers, 11% of English teachers, 13% of science teachers and 18% of mathematics teachers were teaching out-of-field. However, among public high school teachers, 2% of social science teachers, 2% of English teachers, 3% of science teachers and 5% of mathematics teachers were teaching out-of-field (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005).

The 1999/2000 data are compelling and should serve as poignant impetus for public school administrators with recruitment and retention responsibilities to: (1) focus not only on the currently earmarked population of prospective teachers, but also include recruitment of the mid-aged realm, (2) cultivate and proliferate the methods of exuberant first year teachers through appropriate mentor assignments and coaching, (3) establish partnerships with institutions of higher learning to ensure adequate preparation and certification for critical needs areas, and
(4) foster teacher retention and student achievement by eliminating out-of-field assignment authorizations (109).

From an urban perspective, The National Center for Alternative Teaching Certification (2004) reported an increasing number of alternatively certified individuals being hired to teach at-risk children in high poverty areas. It estimated that only about 15% of teacher education graduates apply for teaching positions in urban public school systems. Haberman (1989) noted other factors that are specific to urban schools. He asserted that the expansion of out-of-teaching career opportunities for women and minorities has negatively impacted the supply of teachers for urban schools. Haberman (1995) also identified the conditions of teaching, that is, fear, racism, the general perception that teaching does not occur in urban schools, and the plain hard work that it takes to teach effectively in urban schools as factors that limit the pool of quality teachers for urban schools. Ingersoll (2003) concluded that it is the organizational characteristics of urban schools, particularly those related to the control of teacher’s work that provide the basis for a teacher’s employment satisfaction - collaboration, collegiality and shared decision making being key components of a preferred organizational climate.
Haberman (1988) also posited a theory regarding how the organizational characteristics of urban schools and of the universities and their teacher education programs also negatively affect the recruitment and retention of teachers in urban schools. While the university may place great value on the individual, urban schools are generally large bureaucracies whose routines and practices are depersonalized in favor of efficiency. Haberman substantiated his efficiency theory through the example of many new teachers being hired based on their GPA in college, non-professional references, hearsay, ethnicity or gender. “The efficiency of urban public school systems often pressures administrators to fill vacancies with provisionally or alternatively certified teachers in lieu of selecting a candidate who has proven his/her expertise through an appropriate, face-to-face interview” (14).

Similarly, Levine (2006) wrote of the disconnectedness between school systems and teacher education programs. Specifically, most teacher education professors have limited real-world experience, are out-of date, are more theoretical than practical and thin in content. Information accrued from current and alumni teacher education students during Dr. Levine’s research survey indicated professors were not teaching the current
technology, classroom management or pedagogical practices used by major school systems located near the university where they studied. Levine’s research gives credence to the significance of public school systems enhancing their recruitment endeavors by establishing partnerships focused on frequent pre-service experiences for education students. Collaborative, practical experiences initiated as early as the sophomore year of teacher preparation will eliminate the tendency of new teachers being hired without privy to the school’s methodology for computer assisted instruction, classroom management or pedagogical protocol.

**Recruiting and Retaining Teachers in Urban and Non-Urban School Districts**

The traditional paradigm of recruiting and retaining teachers for urban and non-urban school districts must be shattered in order to establish a high quality, diverse teaching force prepared to positively impact at-risk students’ achievement. Furthermore, recruiting teachers to public school environments is a laborious, and to some extent, a frustrating challenge. Nonetheless, we must remain resolute in devising and implementing recruitment strategies proven to attract teachers with capacity for successfully educating students of color (Hodges 1997; Fraser 1992).
The American Association of College Teacher Educators (1987) conducted a Prospective Urban Education Enrollment survey in Washington D.C. The purpose of the survey was to gather information about current programs and activities related to recruitment of prospective teachers and administrators for urban school districts.

The survey included questions and statements about the activities and perceptions related to encouraging high school African American and Latino students to consider teaching as a career. Five hundred two high school students were selected to participate. Forty percent, or 205 returned responses, with the results indicating less than one-fifth were recruited for the teaching profession. Seventy-five percent, or 153 students indicated they were exposed to various types of teacher awareness events such as: (1) career days, and/or (2) personally meeting alumni currently under contract as teachers or administrators. However, the students felt the most compelling activities were: (1) conversing with recruiters regarding scholarships, grants and loans specifically earmarked for prospective urban teachers, (2) the availability of counseling, tutoring and other academic services for prospective urban teachers, (3) work-study programs related to the urban teaching experience, (4) opportunities to
network with upper classmen committed to teaching in urban districts, and (5) receiving information relative to certification requirements as early as possible (70). Walker (1988) also conducted an urban teacher recruitment effort involving several elementary schools in Hearne, Texas. Approximately 1,800 students were enrolled in the participating elementary schools during the activity; 45% African American, 40% Caucasian, 15% Latino, with about 60% of the total population meeting criteria for being at or below the poverty level. Hearne embarked upon an endeavor to attract minority teachers, especially minority males, by employing male African American high school students as paraprofessionals. The students were predominantly seniors in the Coordinated Vocational Academic Education (CVAE) program. Selected students were currently adhering to a schedule consisting of two hours per day working in the general employment arena, one hour per day in CVAE classes and the remainder of the day in prerequisites for graduation. Prospective participants were screened by administrators and faculty from CVAE and subsequently employed based on interest in teaching, gender, GPA and character. Walker went on to indicate how CVAE participants would be the sole positive, literate minority role model for minority elementary students.
The program’s success was measured by analysis deciphered from surveys given to administrators and faculty employed at participating elementary schools. Student achievement, especially for minority students, improved significantly in reading, mathematics and science. During the initial four years, 18 high school students were hired as part time elementary paraprofessionals, with only 3 failing to complete the year and 15 enrolling in area undergraduate teaching programs. Walker’s study is touted for making a significant difference in recruiting prospective teachers for urban elementary schools (Walker, 1988).

The Houston Independent School District designated one of its high schools, Stephen F. Austin High School, as a magnet specifically for students interested in the teaching profession. Students complete traditional high school graduation prerequisites, but the curriculum is supplemented with two pedagogically related courses at each grade level. Freshmen must enroll in an information technology course and an orientation to teaching course. Sophomores must enroll in a current educational issues course and a cultural sensitivity course. Juniors must enroll in a college preparatory course geared toward teacher certification and an ACT prep course. Seniors must
enroll in an internship in which they dedicate two hours per day at one of five district elementary schools. The students are compensated for the internship and at least 90% of the school’s graduates enrolled in national or local teacher education programs (Hodges 1997).

According to Haberman (1996):

For the traditional student, prior school experiences are the most powerful influences on the way in which individuals perceive teachers and the teaching profession. Students educated in urban environments choose teaching as a career on the basis of their own school experiences and perceptions of what teachers are and what they do. Most students in teacher education classes attribute their interest in teaching to former teachers who positively influenced their lives. Teachers, counselors and administrators can personally recruit minority students in high schools, community colleges, career/technical schools and universities for the teaching profession (17).

Martinez (1991) advocated creating a candidate pool through making personal contact with minority students in their middle or junior high school years as an excellent recruitment strategy for urban districts. Their interest
in teaching can be spurred through career exploration courses or special field trips geared toward the teaching profession. He also emphasized the significance of involving parents in the process of encouraging their children to pursue teaching as a career.

Haberman (1989) articulated how much of the research on the best practices for recruiting teachers to urban districts included: (a) the use of peer contact, (b) parental involvement, (c) using positive minority role models in mass media, (d) accessing computer data bases for student records, (e) generous financial assistance, (f) experiential programs in middle and high schools, (g) academic and psychological support, (h) discussing obstacles and eliminating them, (i) flexible scheduling, involvement of faculty members totally committed to urban teaching in the process of admissions, (j) recruitment, surveying students as early as the 7th grade, and (k) early experience with successful urban school teaching strategies and enthusiastic counselors (22).

Haberman (1996) also advocated the use of caution when predicting the shortage of teachers who actually prefer teaching in urban educational environments, as he believes it is a matter of inappropriate strategies used to recruit potential candidates. From his perspective, urban school
districts are failing to recruit and retain prospective teachers because of traditional dependency on colleges and universities to pursue the typical National Junior Honor Society, 4.0 GPA students. Haberman advises urban districts to shift their focus toward recruiting the following type of pre-education major, high school students: (a) those who did not decide to teach until they had the opportunity to work with at-risk students, (b) those who attended urban middle and high schools, (c) those who currently live in the urban core and aspire to continue residence there, (d) those who may or may not have an above average GPA, (e) those who do not believe that all kids are the same, (f) those who have knowledge or actual experiences with the community’s social programs, and (g) those who are sensitive to their own racism, sexism or other prejudices (51).

Haberman also advised urban school districts to recruit interested high school or college prospects based on deliberate screening devised for expedient determination of the predetermined characteristics. After actually employing the newly recruited and hired teacher, it is imperative to couple new recruits with a master teacher for at least the first and second contract year, which will ensure retention.
Additionally, Williams (2005) conducted research which apprised urban administrators and school districts of elements closely correlated with failing to retain teachers: (1) low salaries, (2) increased paperwork, (3) higher student achievement accountability, (4) low social status attributed to the profession, (5) unresponsive administration, (6) lack of teacher autonomy, (7) student attitudes toward learning, (8) lack of long-term influence on students, (9) lack of parental support, (10) limited opportunities for promotion, (11) family reasons (raising children), (12) personal reasons (marriage, spouse is transferred), (13) burn-out, (14) lack of recognition, (15) inadequate teacher resources, (16) lack of participation in decision making, and (17) large class sizes (44).

Conversely, urban and non-urban school districts could reap benefits from fashioning their strategies to incorporate statistically significant teacher recruitment results recently publicized by the University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Mary Ann Rankin, Dean of Natural Sciences Department, testified before a Senate Subcommittee on Education and Early Childhood Development regarding UTA’s highly successful teacher preparation program aimed specifically at recruiting math and science majors – UTeach. According to Rankin (2006), prior to 1997, UT-
Austin had very few majors pursuing math and science teaching certification: 4 science; 19 math from a total body of about 8300 majors. UT-Austin implemented its UTeach initiative in 1997, and by the fall of 2006 enrollment in math and science education programs had increased to 449. Rankin attributes the overwhelming success of the program to: (1) paying full tuition for the first two courses which focus on field teaching experiences, (2) offering scholarships (up to $1,500.00 annually) for students who certify to teach in math, science, or computer science (3) employment of outstanding, experienced high school and middle school teachers as instructors, advisors, and field supervisors to work in tandem with current Math and Science Education faculty, (4) inclusion of field experiences in the pedagogy courses at every level, (5) facilitating internships which enable students to acquire employment in arenas relevant to the teaching profession — working in museums, working in Austin Independent School District (AISD) classrooms, informal science clubs, etc., and (6) developing a post-graduation support system which includes assistance in the areas of lesson plans, curriculum and advice on classroom management.

Rankin concluded her testimony by indicating:
The quality of UTeach students is very high. As a group they have higher SAT scores, and higher grades in comparison to their College of Natural Sciences (CNS) undergraduate peer group. Approximately one-quarter of UTeach students are traditionally underrepresented minorities who we believe will be strong, inspiring role models for the minority students in their own classrooms – this is substantially more than in the overall UT undergraduate population (113).

Planning, Budgeting for and Evaluating Recruitment and Retention Strategies

Strategic planning is of monumental importance for effective teacher recruitment (Young and Castetter 2004; Harris and Monk 1992). A comprehensive plan should include but is not limited to district administrative policies, a detailed plan of action including fiscal support, designation of the recruitment team, professional development for the recruitment team, long-term commitment and an evaluation plan. Successful recruitment should be on a year-round continuum supported by the entire district. In order to provide high quality teachers for every student, systemic planning must be implemented as a means
of locating and attracting the most competent candidates. According to Young and Castetter (2004):

Throughout history, the concept of systematic planning has been an intellectual luxury rather than an organizational necessity for many public school districts. Since the last half of the 20th century, the complexities of organizational demands and environmental changes have changed planning from a luxury to a necessity for an efficient and effective school district (31).

In order to have an effective, meaningful recruitment plan, policies should be clearly written, with all corresponding guidelines being correlated to the district’s strategic plan for recruitment (Jorgensen and Espey, 1986). Darling-Hammond (1988) found local school board policies to have a strong impact on recruitment efforts. Castetter (1991) states, “the effective solution of the modern recruitment problem depends to a large extent on the policy posture of the Board Directors.” Jenson (1986) indicated approximately one-third of the nation’s public school districts did not have established policies related to teacher recruitment and retention.
According to Jenson, policies must pay careful attention to the organizational context in which they are implemented. Policies can either enhance or hinder recruitment efforts. Jenson further indicated how policies should “declare the district’s commitment to hiring the most qualified teachers, establish guidelines of fairness, require intensive job analyses and encourage validation of locally developed procedures” (16). They can address teacher salaries and fringe benefits, offer relocation incentives, enhance working conditions and provide support for new teachers. Policies hindering recruitment can be delaying hiring pending internal transfers, limiting initial salary credit for incoming, experienced teachers and limiting the transfer of benefits. Jorgensen and Espey (1986) also emphasize the importance of district policies defining the recruiting roles and responsibilities of all existing certificated and non-certificated staff.

The plan should include specific descriptions of activities, targeted universities and preferred candidates, procedures for screening, interviewing techniques, processing documentation, protocol for Board approval and most significantly, broadly distributed and well known goals/objectives throughout the district (Harris and Monk 1992).
The plan’s success hinges upon sufficient allocations approved by Board Directors. DeWeese (1987) challenged public school Board Directors to make a commitment to acquiring highly qualified teachers through approving adequate funding for the teacher recruitment and retention process.

According to Erickson (1977):

No single or multiple expenditure of public money in the school business is nearly so significant as that related to recruitment...No other expenditure of public money carries with it such a heavy burden of responsibility for justification (11).

Young and Castetter (2004) described the budget as a powerful planning device. Berry and Hare (1986) indicated school districts do not expend many resources for the recruitment process. Approximately one-third of public school districts do not have a line-item budget for recruitment and lack sufficient data regarding recruitment expenditures. All districts should keep records of expenditures for recruitment such as travel expenses, advertisements, presentations, publications, document processing and the specific dollar amount linked to recruitment incentives. Frase (1991) advocates districts allocating a generous amount for teacher recruitment, and
evaluating dividends based on results in lieu of actual expenditures.

According to Erickson and Shinn (1977), a district must be concerned not only with the development of a recruitment process, but with the evaluation of such also. A formal, written evaluation plan should be implemented on an annual basis. Darling-Hammond (1988) emphasized the significance of evaluation in relation to the district’s vision, mission and goals for recruitment:

"The effectiveness of teacher selection processes closely relate to the district’s vision, mission and goals for actual teacher assignment. A judgment of whether qualified applicants have been selected must seek answers to the question, ‘qualified for what?’" (9).

Sandberg (1987) encouraged districts to study recruiting in the same way they study the instructional programs...constantly, critically and constructively. Young and Castetter (2004) advocated recruitment programs being evaluated both for efficiency and effectiveness. They suggested the following guidelines: (a) evaluate whether the recruitment process is generating an adequate number of applicants, (b) evaluate whether the recruitment process is generating high quality teachers, (c) evaluate whether the recruitment process is generating dividends worth the
investment, (d) evaluate whether the recruitment process is generating teacher retention, and (f) evaluate the ratio of interviews to actual employment (71). Most significantly, school districts must evaluate their recruitment plans with two questions: Did we employ the high quality teachers we needed? Did we employ all candidates as efficiently as possible?

According to The National School Board Foundation (1999), urban school district leaders truly committed to positively effecting student achievement through budgeting, planning and evaluation, consistently practice the following:

- Identification and allocation of sufficient resources so all students have real opportunities to succeed.
- In concert with all school stakeholders, developing and communicating clear expectations for progress toward high academic achievement by all students.
- Delegating authority to school-level leaders for hiring, budget, curriculum, and other decisions that will allow them to share responsibility for school improvement.
• Developing systems that hold teachers, principals, administrators, and other key players accountable for student progress.

• Regularly monitoring and basing school board decisions on student performance data that are analyzed and disaggregated by school, class, gender, race, income, and teacher (40).

Summary

Our nation’s public school districts must place a highly qualified teacher in every classroom to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. In the wake of this paradigm shifting legislation, increasing significance has been made manifest in educational standards, accountability and student achievement results. Because of the diminished pool of highly qualified teachers in critical needs areas, urban and non-urban districts have been forced into becoming fierce competitors. Therefore, teacher recruitment and retention initiatives must include strict adherence to legal mandates, strategies proven successful through extensive research, a long-term action plan, sufficient allocations and an evaluation process.

Researchers delineated in the reviewed literature have indicated there is a positive correlation between effective
recruitment strategies, teacher retention and student achievement. Most significantly, the literature has revealed a continuum of innovative recruitment strategies school districts have used to attract highly qualified teachers. Invaluable information deciphered from this review can be considered by policy makers, superintendents, personnel directors, and building administrators during their quest to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers.

Information in this study can be useful to Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban personnel administrators charged with deciding upon prudent recruitment strategies conducive to meeting the benchmarks of their respective district’s vision, mission and goals.

Chapter 3 will provide an explanation of the methodology utilized to determine whether recruitment strategies have any influence on teacher recruitment in metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

Chapter 3 encompasses an explanation of the methodological processes used to investigate recruitment strategies implemented by 14 Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts. The sample from the 14 participating urban and non-urban school districts included 67 public school district central office administrators - 14 superintendents, 33 associate superintendents and 20 division directors - responding to a previously designed questionnaire (Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey). Surveys were disseminated in December of 2006 and all tabulations were completed by February 1, 2007. The final review of data and recommendations was presented during the spring semester of 2008. Chapter 3 includes: (a) the purpose, (b) the study design, (c) the study questions, (d) the population and sample, (e) the instrumentation, (f) the data collection procedure, and (g) the summary.

Purpose

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine teacher recruitment and retention strategies in metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts.
In addition, three questions associated with teacher recruitment and retention were also analyzed: (a) which teaching areas were in the greatest demand, (b) how many “out-of-field” teachers were currently employed, and (c) what are metropolitan area administrators’ perceptions regarding how recruitment activities influence teacher retention, especially with highly qualified, first year teachers.

**Research Design**

The design of this qualitative study will be predominantly descriptive. Quantitative or descriptive research, according to Gall, Gall and Borg (2005), “aims to provide a clear, accurate description of individuals, events or processes, i.e., identifying how teachers plan their lessons and how much time they spend in planning” (179). In addition, quantitative research involves the collection and analysis of numerical data in order to develop a precise description of a sample’s behavior or personal characteristics. Researchers have used the following types of Quantitative Research:

1. Survey Research – collecting information about research participants’ beliefs, attitudes, interests,
or behavior through questionnaires, interviews, or paper-and-pencil tests.

2. Direct Observation - gathering “live” data about an individuals’ behavior as the behavior occurs.

3. Longitudinal Research - examining patterns of stability or change in individuals from one point in time to another (180-182).

Qualitative research is often referred to as case study research primarily because it focuses on cases through in-depth, field-based studies of particular instances of the phenomenon. More specifically, qualitative researchers study single individuals or situations and generalize case findings mainly by comparing the case with other cases that also have been studied in-depth. Some researchers believe that the methods of qualitative and quantitative research are complementary, and that researchers who use a combination of both types of methods can give the fullest picture of the nature of educational phenomena. Conversely, some researchers would argue that quantitative and qualitative research are incompatible because they are based on different assumptions. Most educational researchers are advocates of both approaches in order to assist the academic realm with making important discoveries (Gall, Gall and Borg 2005).
In addition to descriptive statistics, the study will incorporate variability. According to Salkind (2005), variability (also called spread or dispersion) can be thought of as a measure of how different scores are from one another.

**Research Questions**

This research study is designed to identify teacher recruitment and retention strategies that will attract highly qualified teachers to urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts. To guide the collection of data for this study, the following questions are used:

1. What are the different recruitment strategies used in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts to attract highly qualified teachers?

2. Which recruitment strategies generate the highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?

3. Which recruitment strategies resulted in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?
4. Which recruitment strategies do metropolitan area administrators perceive to have influence on teacher retention?

The descriptive data calculated and reported during this study are a heuristic attempt to benefit the entire population of administrators employed by urban and non-urban public school districts with greater than 50% minority student enrollment in the Midwestern states. The sample would be selected to serve as a purposive convenience or non-random sample. The literature review revealed information relative to how researchers and evaluators often erroneously justify the use of sample sizes by failing to reflect precisely upon population estimates. Under those circumstances, they have the responsibility to make the imprecision of their results clear in the reports of the evaluation (Jackson 2002). Even though random samples are most commonly used in survey research, occasionally, a purposive (nonrandom) sample may be more appropriate. Such samples may include people who are selected because of their unique perspectives, people or other units meeting specific criterion, or people on the extremes of some variable of interest (Alreck and Settle 2003).
Although convenience samples are frequently used, Abrami, Cholmsky and Gordon (2000) cautioned researchers to carefully define how the population to which one hopes to generalize the results. With their premise being noted, this study can not be conceptualized as one which scientifically defines the population. The data will reflect perspectives elicited from Central Office public school administrators with recruitment and retention responsibilities in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area public school districts. Demographic data from respondents will be requested in order to ensure adequate representation of urban and non-urban school districts in the Missouri and Kansas bi-state area.

Surveys were disseminated to administrators representing 14 Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts (5 urban and 9 non-urban) including: Blue Springs R-IV, Center #58, Grandview CSD#4, Hickman Mills C-1, Independence, Kansas City Kansas, Kansas City Missouri, Lawrence USD #497, Leavenworth USD #453, Lee’s Summit, North Kansas City, Raytown C-2, Shawnee Mission and Turner. Of the 67 administrators designated for participation, 57 or 85% returned their surveys - 9 superintendents, 28 associate superintendents and 20 division directors (see Table 3).
Table 3
Demographic Information For Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area School Districts, And The Number of Respondents Per District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Minority Percentage</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Non-Urban</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Springs R-IV</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 supt., 2 assoc. supt. and 1 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center #58</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 supt. and 3 assoc. supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview CSD #4</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 supt. and 2 assoc. supt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman Mills C-1</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 supt., 1 assoc. supt. and 2 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 supt., 2 assoc. supt. and 2 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Kansas</td>
<td>19,722</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 supt., 3 assoc. supt. and 3 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Missouri</td>
<td>24,449</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 assoc. supt. and 1 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence USD #497</td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth USD #453</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 supt., 1 assoc. supt. and 1 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee’s Summit</td>
<td>16,742</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 supt., 3 assoc. supt. and 2 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kansas City</td>
<td>17,553</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 assoc. supt. and 2 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td>Minority Percentage</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Non-Urban</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytown C-2</td>
<td>8,742</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 assoc. supt. and 1 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission</td>
<td>28,158</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 supt., 2 assoc. supt. and 2 direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 assoc. supt. and 2 direct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumentation**

Data were collected by using the *Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey*, a survey developed by Dr. Betsy Blades-Butler in 2002, which was deemed to have Criterion Validity during a survey course taught by research professors at the University of Central Florida (validity coefficient was high positive). Permission to utilize and moderately modify the *Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey* was granted by e-mail correspondence with Dr. Butler on Friday, September 15, 2006 (Appendix A and B). The current researcher modified two questions from the survey, #8 and #10, to generate additional data regarding teacher retention and demographic information more specific to urban and non-urban districts in the Greater Kansas City metropolitan area. Dr. Butler devised the survey to describe the
different teacher recruitment strategies used by 67 public school districts in Florida, and to identify the most productive teacher recruitment strategies defined as those resulting in the highest percentage of new teachers acquired.

The 12-question survey was disseminated by mail to 67 public school administrators in 14 Greater Kansas City metropolitan area public school districts, with 9 superintendents, 28 associate superintendents and 20 division directors actually returning the instrument. Respondents were appropriately advised of participation being strictly voluntary, and were asked to return the surveys within 10 school calendar days (Appendix C). A professional reminder was e-mailed to respondents when only approximately 30% of the surveys were received within the original 10 school calendar day timeline (Appendix D). All respondents were given the option of receiving the survey’s final tabulations by e-mail upon forwarding a written request.

Greater metropolitan area urban and non-urban administrators were asked for responses to the following questions:

- In Question #1, respondents were asked to rate their perceptions of the supply and demand of teacher
applicants in specific disciplines. The disciplines included elementary Grades pre-K through 5, middle school Grades 6 through 8, and secondary Grades 9 through 12. The secondary grades were categorized by specific subject matter or departments.

- In Question #2, respondents were to submit information regarding how many certified teacher positions were open when the school term commenced.

- In Question #3, respondents were to submit data indicating what percentage of new teachers were acquired for the current school term, but placed in “out-of-field” assignments due to an insufficient pool of qualified applicants.

- In Question #4, respondents were to indicate which recruitment strategies their respective districts implemented for attracting highly qualified teachers.

- Question #5 had two stems: (1) respondents were to rank the top five recruitment strategies yielding the most highly qualified applicants, and (2) respondents were to rank the strategies yielding the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers.
- In Question #6, respondents were to indicate the specific recruitment initiative(s) practiced by their respective districts.

- In Question #7, respondents were to convey information regarding out-of district and national recruiting activities.

- In Question #8, respondents were to rank recruitment strategies, based their own perception, directly resulting in teacher retention.

- In Question #9, respondents were to indicate the percentage of teachers within their respective districts retained or remaining under contract for three consecutive school years - 2003/04, 2004/05 and 2005/06.

- Question #10 requested demographic information.

- Question #11 permitted respondents to submit additional comments.

- Question #12 gave respondents the option of receiving a final tabulated copy of the survey’s results via e-mail. Essentially, the survey’s queries included open-ended, free response and forced choice responses (see Appendix E).
Evidence of validity was determined by: (a) the original instrument by Dr. Betsy Blades-Butler (2002) was validated during a survey course at Central Florida University in 2001, (b) Nancy Farrell (2004) requested permission to utilize the instrument for a similar study in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Permission was granted and a panel of professors from George Washington University reviewed the instrument for clarity and content, with a suggestion to add one question relative to demographic data, and (c) the revised instrument was reviewed and approved by Dr. Betsy Blades-Butler and Nancy Farrell’s doctoral committee in 2003.

In order to maximize the response rate, an explanation of how the study would be of assistance to public school administrators was included. In addition, anonymity was assured and respondents were apprised of any/all liabilities, risks and/or employment ramifications being totally eliminated.

Approval for this particular study and the current researcher’s modifications to Dr. Blades-Butler’s Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey was obtained after review of the proposal by the doctoral faculty prior to submission to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Baker University in
Overland Park, Kansas during the fall semester of 2006 (Appendix F).

**Data Collection Procedures**

Qualitative data were compiled through survey tabulations. All statistical computations were generated by SPSS, Version 13.0 for Windows software. Descriptive statistics and variability were calculated for all responses from the *Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey*. According to Gall, Gall and Borg (2005), descriptive statistics serve a useful purpose by summarizing all data in the form of a few simple numerical expressions. Salkind (2005) defined descriptive statistics as the vehicle used to do a fine job of representing large data-set characteristics.

When at least 50% of respondents from within their own district selected the same item, the response(s) was deemed as reflective of the entire district’s current practice or protocol.

**Data Calculation for Research Question #1**

Adequately responding to Research Study Question #1 - “What are the different recruitment strategies used in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts to attract highly qualified teachers?” - required tabulating data from Survey Question #4. Answering Research Question
#1 consisted of requesting information pertinent to the
different teacher recruitment strategies used by sample
districts. The survey delineated 15 different recruitment
strategies. Respondents appropriately selected each
teacher recruitment strategy applicable to their respective
districts. Respondents were also given the opportunity to
report “other” strategies as a means of identifying those
unlisted. The results were tabulated using descriptive
statistics and variability. Cross-references between urban
and non-urban administrators’ responses were used to report
comparison data from all participating districts. The
results are provided in Chapter 4.

Data Calculation for Research Question #2

Adequately responding to Research Study Question #2 -
“Which recruitment strategies generate the highest number
of highly qualified teachers for urban and non-urban
metropolitan area school districts?” - required tabulating
data from Survey Question #5, stem 1. Respondents were to
list the top three to five strategies, in rank order,
resulting in the highest number of applicants from the list
of strategies provided in Survey Question #4. Requesting
the top three to five strategies would result in
determining those administrators perceived as most
effective. The results were tabulated using descriptive
statistics and variability. Cross-references between urban and non-urban administrators' responses were used to report comparison data from all participating school districts. The results can be found in Chapter 4.

Data Calculation for Research Question #3

Adequately responding to Research Study Question #3 - “Which recruitment strategies resulted in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?” - required tabulating data from Survey Question #5, stem 2. Respondents were to list the top three to five strategies, in rank order, resulting in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired from the list of strategies provided in Survey Question #4. Requesting the top three to five strategies resulted in those strategies administrative respondents perceived as most effective. The results were tabulated using descriptive statistics and variability. Cross-references between urban and non-urban administrators' responses were used to report comparison data from all participating school districts. The results are provided in Chapter 4.

Data Calculation for Research Question #4

Adequately responding to Research Study Question #4 - “Which recruitment strategies do metropolitan area
administrators perceive to have influence on teacher retention?" required tabulating data from Survey Question #7 and #8. Respondents were directed to provide information on how their district’s recruitment strategies resulted in a tendency of teacher retention for 3 or more years, and were directed to give a percentage of their retention rates for three consecutive school years - 2003/04, 2004/05 and 2005/06. The results were tabulated using descriptive statistics and variability. Cross-references between urban and non-urban administrators’ responses were used to report comparison data from all participating school districts. The results can be found in Chapter 4.

Summary

Chapter 3 is a comprehensive description of the methodological processes used to identify teacher recruitment strategies implemented in 14 (9 non-urban and 5 urban) Greater Kansas City metropolitan area school districts - Blue Springs R-IV, Center #58, Grandview CSD#4, Hickman Mills C-1, Independence, Kansas City Kansas, Kansas City Missouri, Lawrence USD #497, Leavenworth USD #453, Lee’s Summit, North Kansas City, Raytown C-2, Shawnee Mission and Turner. The data obtained will provide direction for metropolitan area urban and non-urban
districts to: (1) attract highly qualified teachers to their districts, (2) generate high percentages of highly qualified applicants, (3) determine recruitment strategies that result in the employment of highly qualified, first year teachers hired, and (4) support recruitment strategies that increase the probability of retaining teachers for more than 3 years. Tabulations will be facilitated by the SPSS, Version 13.0 for Windows software. When at least 50% of respondents from within their own district selected the same item, the response(s) was deemed as reflective of the entire district’s current practice or protocol.

The population of the study included administrators employed by Midwestern urban public school districts with greater than 50% minority student enrollment. The sample of the study was comprised of administrators representing 14 Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts (5 urban and 9 non-urban) including: Blue Springs R-IV, Center #58, Grandview CSD#4, Hickman Mills C-1, Independence, Kansas City Kansas, Kansas City Missouri, Lawrence USD #497, Leavenworth USD #453, Lee’s Summit, North Kansas City, Raytown C-2, Shawnee Mission and Turner. Of the 67 administrators designated for participation, 57 or 85% returned their surveys - 9 superintendents, 28 associate superintendents and 20
division directors. Narrative, figures and tables are used to display data reporting in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

Chapter 4 will display data accrued from surveys disseminated to and returned by research study participants. This chapter evolves as six specific components: the introduction, research question #1, research question #2, research question #3, research question #4, supplemental findings, and the summary.

Data within this chapter are depicted in narrative as well as figures and tables for the purpose of: (1) identifying different recruitment strategies used in metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts to attract highly qualified teachers, (2) determining which recruitment strategies generate the highest number of highly qualified teachers for metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts, (3) identifying which recruitment strategies resulted in the employment of highly qualified, first year teachers hired in metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts, and (4) determining which recruitment strategies are perceived by administrative respondents to influence teacher retention in metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts.
The Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey (Butler 2002) was mailed to 67 public school administrators – 14 superintendents, 33 associate superintendents and 20 division directors – in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts on December 15, 2006. Of the 67 surveys mailed, 9 superintendents, 28 associate superintendents and 20 division directors responded (85%).

Participants were asked to dedicate at least 15 to 20 minutes of their time, respond to the queries based on their professional perspectives and return the surveys within 10 school calendar days. As of January 10, 2007, 20 or 29.8% of the participants had completed and returned their surveys within the suggested timeline.

In order to augment the percentage of surveys returned, a professional reminder, via e-mail, was sent to each participant on January 10, 2007. The professional reminder resulted in a total of 57 (85%) of surveys being returned. Hence, Chapter 4 will reflect data from 85% or 57 of 67 administrators targeted for the study’s purposive sample. Urban administrators represented 40% or 23 of 57 sample participants. Non-urban administrators represented 59% or 34 of 57 sample participants. For the purposes of
this study, urban will be categorized as a district with 50% or greater minority student population.

**Research Question #1**

*What are the different recruitment strategies used in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts to attract highly qualified teachers?*

In order to ascertain the frequency of recruitment strategies used by metropolitan area urban and non-urban administrators during 2006/07, the researcher used a list of recruitment methods prescribed by historical and current educational literature. Participants were directed to select their district’s recruitment strategies from an assortment of 15, with the opportunity to include supplemental strategies not listed (survey instrument question #4).

Data tabulations, from a percentage perspective, indicated the four most frequently used recruitment strategies in urban districts were: (1) internet advertising (n=19 respondents or 82% representing all 5 urban school districts); (2) local and national media programs (n=19 respondents or 82% representing all 5 urban school districts); (3) recruitment fairs (n=19 respondents or 82% representing all 5 urban school districts); and (4) staff’s children being permitted to attend district schools.
without tuition requirement (n=18 respondents or 78% representing all 5 urban school districts).

Data tabulations revealed the four least frequently used recruitment strategies by urban districts were: (1) discount housing programs (n=0 respondents or 0% representing urban school districts); (2) stipend for classroom resources (n=0 respondents or 0% representing urban school districts); (3) setting salaries based on years of experience (n=0 respondents or 0% representing urban school districts); and (4) stipend for staff development (n=0 respondents or 0% representing urban school districts).

Data tabulations, from a percentage perspective, indicated the four most frequently used recruitment strategies in non-urban districts were: (1) internet advertising (n=31 respondents or 91% representing all 9 school districts); (2) alternative certification programs (n=18 respondents or 52% representing 6 non-urban school districts); (3) national and local media programs (n=15 respondents or 44% representing 6 non-urban school districts); and (4) recruitment fairs (n=15 respondents or 44% representing 6 non-urban school districts).

Data tabulations revealed the four least frequently used recruitment strategies in non-urban districts were:
(1) loan forgiveness programs (n=0 respondents or 0% representing non-urban school districts); (2) setting salary based on all years experience (n=1 respondent or .2% representing 1 non-urban school districts); (3) staff development stipend (n=1 respondent or .2% representing 1 non-urban school district); and (4) critical needs areas bonuses (n=3 respondents or .8% representing 1 non-urban school district). The data are delineated in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECRUITMENT STRATEGY</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Certification Programs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/National Media Advertising</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Fairs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff’s Children are permitted to attend district schools without tuition being assessed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Incentives for Staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Bonuses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Needs Areas Bonuses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Forgiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITMENT STRATEGY</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Expenses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for Classroom Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Housing Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for Graduating Seniors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Salary Based on All Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Stipend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summation, Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban administrators used the following recruitment strategies most frequently (in rank order): internet advertising, alternative certification programs, local/national media publications, recruitment fairs and tuition waivers for staff with children attending district schools. Greater Kansas City metropolitan area non-urban public school administrators used the following recruitment strategies most frequently (in rank order): internet advertising, alternative certification programs, local/national media publications and recruitment fairs. Additionally, while both urban and non-urban school districts are relying upon virtually the same recruitment strategies, urban school districts are using these
strategies much more aggressively. This suggests urban school districts are faced with an even greater challenge of influencing retention through recruitment strategies.

Research Question #2

Which recruitment strategies generate the highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?

Survey participants were asked to rank their district’s top four recruitment strategies, those which resulted in the highest number of highly qualified applicants (survey instrument question #5, stem 1).

Data tabulations from Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban participants resulted in the following 4 strategies being selected for generating the highest number of highly qualified teachers: (1) internet advertising and recruitment fairs generated the highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban districts (n=18 respondents or 78% representing all 5 urban school districts); (3) local/national media publications generated the third highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban districts (n=14 respondents or 61% representing 3 of 5 school districts); and (4) alternative certification programs generated the fourth highest number of highly
qualified teachers for urban districts (n=11 respondents or 48% representing 3 of 5 school districts).

Data tabulations from Greater Kansas City metropolitan area non-urban survey participants resulted in the following 4 strategies being selected for generating the highest number of highly qualified teachers: (1) internet advertising (n=29 respondents or 87% representing 9 school districts); (2) recruitment fairs (n=27 respondents or 79% representing 9 school districts); (3) local/national media publications (n=30 respondents or 53% representing 7 school districts); and (4) alternative certification programs (n=26 respondents or 46% representing 5 school districts). The data are displayed in Figure 2.
Figure 2

Top 4 Strategies Generating the Highest Number of Highly Qualified Teachers for Greater Kansas City Metropolitan Area Public School Districts.
Survey participants, both urban and non-urban, provided strategies under the “other” category also, i.e., word of mouth, summer staff development stipends and stipends for first year teachers without previous experience. These strategies did not attain a frequency greater than 1 in any particular district, were not found to be common within the sample and appeared to be individualized preferences exclusively. The data were included if there was a frequency greater than 1.

In summation, Greater Kansas City metropolitan area public school administrators, both urban and non-urban, had similar survey responses relative to the top four strategies used for recruiting highly qualified teachers – internet advertising, recruitment fairs, local/national media publications and alternative certification programs.

**Research Question #3**

*Which recruitment strategies resulted in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?*

Survey participants were asked to rank their district’s top four recruitment strategies that resulted in the highest number of first year, highly qualified applicants (survey instrument question #5, stem 2). Data tabulations from Greater Kansas City metropolitan area
urban survey participants resulted in the following 4 strategies being selected for generating the highest number of first year, highly qualified teachers: (1) recruitment fairs (n=19 respondents or 83% representing all 5 urban school districts); (2) internet advertising (n=17 or 74% representing all 5 urban school districts); (3) local/national media publications (n=13 respondents or 57% representing 3 of 5 urban school districts); and (4) alternative certification programs (n=11 respondents or 48% representing 3 of 5 urban school districts).

Data tabulations from Greater Kansas City metropolitan area non-urban survey participants resulted in the following 4 strategies being selected for generating the highest number of first year, highly qualified teachers: (1) internet advertising (n=50 respondents or 88% representing all 14 school districts); (2) recruitment fairs (n=49 respondents or 86% representing all 14 school districts); (3) local/national media publications (n=26 respondents or 46% representing 8 of 14 school districts); and (4) alternative certification programs (n=26 respondents or 46% representing 8 of 14 school districts). The data are displayed in Figure 3.
In summation, Greater Kansas City metropolitan area public school administrators, both urban and non-urban, had similar survey responses relative to the top four strategies for recruiting first year, highly qualified teachers (in rank order) - internet advertisements,
recruitment fairs, local/national media publications, and alternative certification programs.

**Research Question #4**

Which recruitment strategies do metropolitan area administrators perceive to have influence on teacher retention?

Survey participants were asked to rank their perceptions with this particular prompt, 1 being the most effective and 5 being the least effective, regarding district recruitment strategies resulting in teachers being retained for 3 or more years. This research question was modified specifically to discern how the 15 recruitment strategies resulted in percentile and mean score rankings for teacher retention (survey instrument questions #7 and #8). Descriptive Statistics and variability were used to tabulate the results. The data are disaggregated in two categories: (a) survey participants representing districts with less than 50% of their student population being minority, and (b) survey participants representing districts with 50% or more of their student population being minority.

Data tabulations from survey participants with less than 50% minority student enrollment resulted in recruitment fairs obtaining a mean score of 1.508 and a
standard deviation of .98 ($\bar{X} = 1.508; SD = .98$). The data are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Recruitment Strategies Influence on Teacher Retention In Districts With Less Than 50% Minority Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Strategy</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Fairs</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/National Media</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Forgiveness</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Needs Area Bonuses</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Bonuses</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Expenses</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Incentives for Staff</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of new recruits are permitted to attend district schools without tuition being assessed</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Housing Programs</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for Graduating Seniors</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Discounts</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data tabulations from survey participants representing districts with 50% or more minority student enrollment resulted in recruitment fairs and alternative certification programs obtaining mean scores of 1.86 and 2.00, and their respective standard deviations were 1.39 and 1.08 - ($\bar{X} = 1.86; SD = 1.39$); ($\bar{X} = 2.00; SD = 1.08$). The data are illustrated in Table 6.

**Table 6**

Means and Standard Deviations for Recruitment Strategies Influence on Teacher Retention in Districts with 50% or More Minority Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Strategy</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Fairs</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/National Media</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Forgiveness</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Bonuses</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of new recruits are permitted to attend district schools without tuition being assessed</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Needs Area Bonuses</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Expenses</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recruitment Strategy Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Incentives for Staff</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for Graduating Seniors</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Housing Programs</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Discounts</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher retention mean scores gleaned from survey participants representing both urban and non-urban school districts during the interim of 2003 and 2006 were: (1) 2003/04 = 64.1%; (2) 2004/05 = 60.8%; and (3) 2005/06 = 60.8%. The 2006/07 teaching vacancy mean scores was 1.52%, and the 2006/07 mean score for teachers teaching outside of their licensure/certification area was 2.11%.

In summation, recruitment fairs and alternative certification recruiting strategies, irrespective of a minority student enrollment greater or less than 50% in Greater Kansas City area metropolitan school districts, revealed similar percentile and mean score rankings for teacher retention. More specifically, non-urban administrators perceive recruitment fairs and internet advertising as having greater influence on retention –
urban administrators perceiving national/local media publications and alternative certification programs as having greater influence on retention. Furthermore, the 2006/07 mean score for current vacancies was 1.52% and the 2006/07 mean score for teachers teaching outside of their licensure/certification area was 2.11%. These data are most likely attributed to success with filling vacancies in the short-term, but failing to experience the same level of success with long-term teacher retention.

**Supplemental Findings**

Data tabulations of items not directly associated with the research questions proved to be substantive also (survey instrument questions #1, #2, #6 and #9). The following are additional specifics pertinent to school year 2006/07 gleaned from the remaining survey prompts: (a) sample participants from Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts conveyed an immediate need for reading, math, science, special education, library sciences and career and technical teachers (see table 7); and (b) sample participants from Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban public school districts conveyed a dearth of qualified applicants for communication arts, reading, math, science, foreign language, ESOL, fine arts, practical arts, computer
science, career and technical, special education and library sciences vacancies (see table 8).

With regard to recruitment program data tabulated from the 57 survey participants respective districts, 26 or 45.6% (9 school districts) indicated their district had a recruitment specialist; 50 or 87.7% (all 14 school districts) indicated their district had a team of individuals designated for recruitment; 19 or 33.3% (7 school districts) indicated their district utilized an out-of state/country travel recruitment team; 51 or 89.4% (all 14 school districts) indicated their district had new teacher orientation programs; 57 or 100% (all 14 school districts) indicated their district had a new teacher mentoring/coaching program (Figure 4); 34 or 59.65% (12 school districts) indicated that their recruitment strategies focus on in-state candidates exclusively; 1 or 2% (1 school district) indicated its recruitment strategies focused on out-of state candidates exclusively; and 23 or 40% (9 school districts) indicated their recruitment strategies focused on in-state and out-of state candidates equitably (see figure 5).
Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for the Demand of Applicants in Specific Licensure/Certification Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensure Areas</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Arts</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/Health</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for the Supply of Qualified Applicants in Specific Licensure/Certification Areas.

**Qualified Applicants**

1. Shortage of Applicants
2. Adequate Supply of Applicants
3. Surplus of Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensure Areas</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Science</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Arts</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/Health</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4

District Recruitment Program Data For All 14 Districts.

Figure 5

District Recruitment Program Data.
Summary

Chapter 4 chronicled data tabulations from 57 survey participants serving as central office administrators in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban public school districts - 9 superintendents, 28 assistant superintendents and 20 division directors. Descriptive statistics and variability were used to elucidate responses for the study’s four research questions, as well as supplemental findings relevant to teacher recruitment and retention. Chapter 5 will include interpretation of the data, synthesis of literature review and data tabulations and recommendations for future study.
Chapter 5
Interpretations, Synthesis and Recommendations

Introduction

The thrust of this research was to examine teacher recruitment and retention strategies in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts. Chapter 5 is organized to include: (1) the introduction, (2) an interpretation of data from each research question, (3) synthesis emanating from the results, (4) recommendations, (5) recommendations for future research, and (6) a summary.

For the purpose of reiteration, the study embedded four research questions:

1. What are the different recruitment strategies used in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts to attract highly qualified teachers?

2. Which recruitment strategies generate the highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?

3. Which recruitment strategies resulted in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?
4. Which recruitment strategies do metropolitan area administrators perceive to have influence on teacher retention?

This research study included a sample population of 57 central office administrators in 14 urban and non-urban public school districts throughout the Greater Kansas City metropolitan area – 9 superintendents, 28 assistant superintendents and 20 division directors. Of the 57 administrators submitting survey responses, 23 or 40% represented school districts with a minority student population greater than 49% and 34 or 59% represented school districts with a minority student population less than 50%. The survey instrument, Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey (Butler 2002), was created by Dr. Betsy Blades-Butler, and was deemed to have Criterion Validity by Central Florida’s Internal Review Board (IRB). It was subsequently used during a study focused on how recruitment strategies affected acquiring first year, highly qualified teachers in 67 of Florida’s public school districts.

**Interpretations**

Research Question #1

*What are the different recruitment strategies used in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts to attract highly qualified teachers?*
Data tabulations indicated administrators from urban and non-urban school districts most frequently used the following recruitment strategies: internet advertising, local/national media publications, recruitment fairs, and alternative certification programs. Recruitment strategies incorporated sparingly in urban and non-urban districts were: discount housing incentives, stipend for educational resources, relocation expenses, critical needs areas bonuses and signing bonuses. Additionally, while both urban and non-urban school districts are relying upon virtually the same recruitment strategies, urban school districts are using these strategies much more aggressively. This suggests urban school districts are faced with an even greater challenge of influencing retention through recruitment strategies.

Participants were given the opportunity to introduce “other” strategies implemented by their respective districts – word of mouth, professional training stipends, and stipend for first year teachers without previous experience – were all selected, but did not attain a frequency greater than 1.
Research Question #2
Which recruitment strategies generate the highest number of highly qualified teachers for urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?

Data tabulations indicated administrators from urban and non-urban school districts participating in this study experienced success with recruiting highly qualified teachers by relying upon internet advertising, recruitment fairs, local/national media publications and alternative certification programs.

Research Question #3
Which recruitment strategies resulted in the highest number of highly qualified, first year teachers hired in urban and non-urban metropolitan area school districts?

Data tabulations indicated administrators from urban and non-urban school districts experienced success with recruiting highly qualified, first year teachers by relying upon recruitment fairs, internet advertising, local/national media publications and alternative certification programs.

Research Question #4
Which recruitment strategies do metropolitan area administrators perceive to have influence on teacher retention?
Data tabulations from sample urban and non-urban administrators, which included percentiles, mean scores, and standard deviations, indicated recruitment fairs and alternative certification recruiting strategies have a tendency to influence teacher.

**Synthesis of Literature Review**

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine teacher recruitment and retention strategies in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts. Descriptive statistics indicated recruitment fairs and alternative certification programs had a tendency to influence teacher retention.

The review of literature offered the following conclusions: (1) urban and non-urban school districts aspiring to foster teacher retention must establish partnerships focused on frequent pre-service experiences for education students. Collaborative, practical experiences initiated as early as the sophomore year of teacher preparation will eliminate the tendency of new teachers being hired without privy to the school’s methodology for computer assisted instruction, classroom management or pedagogical protocol (Levine 2006); (2) urban and non-urban school districts must shift their focus toward recruiting the following type of pre-education
major, high school students; those who did not decide to teach until they had the opportunity to work with at risk students; those who attended urban middle and high schools; those who currently live in the urban core and aspire to continue residence there; those who may or may not have an above average GPA; those who do not believe that all kids are the same; those who have knowledge or actual experiences with the community’s social programs; and those who are sensitive to their own racism, sexism or other prejudices (Haberman 1996); (3) urban and non-urban school districts can significantly enhance retention of science and math teachers by: paying full tuition for the first two courses which focus on math and science field teaching experiences; offering scholarships (up to $1,500.00 annually) for students who certify to teach in math, science, or computer science; employing outstanding, experienced high school and middle school teachers as instructors, advisors, and field supervisors to work in tandem with current Math and Science Education faculty; inclusion of field experiences in the pedagogy courses at every level; facilitating internships which enable students to acquire employment in arenas relevant to the teaching profession — working in museums, working in actual urban settings, sponsoring informal science clubs, etc.; and
developing a post-graduation support system which includes assistance with lesson plans, curriculum and advice on classroom management (Rankin 2006); (4) urban and non-urban school districts must embark upon recruiting prospective teachers from within their ranks - compensating seniors for tutoring, offering loan forgiveness, and offering scholarships (Hodges 1997; Walker 1998); (5) Extended mentoring must be available for new teachers (Haberman 1989); and (6) recruiting should commence as early as middle school (Martinez 1991).

**Recommendations**

Based upon the results of surveys from sample participants and the synthesis of literature review and data tabulations, the following recommendations are made:

- Urban and non-urban school districts should proactively plan, evaluate and modify their teacher recruitment strategies.

- Urban and non-urban school districts should continue to pursue teacher retention through alternative teacher certification programs, yet conducting themselves within the parameters mandated by Title IX, Sec. 9101 (Definitions) of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB 2002).
• Urban and non-urban school districts should institute Haberman’s strategies as well as other researched-based strategies for selecting prospective candidates most likely to sustain their careers in diverse educational environments.

• Urban and non-urban school districts should develop partnerships (professional development schools) with local universities, as advocated by Levine and Rankin. University and district partnerships will ensure a sufficient pool of highly qualified candidates prepared to sustain a career in a diverse educational environment.

• Urban and non-urban school districts should tap the most prevalent resource of prospective teachers available – their students. Students should be introduced and recruited to the career of teaching as early as middle school.

• Urban and non-urban school districts should elongate the span of time approved for new teacher mentoring.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

1. Research of effective recruitment strategies should be conducted annually in order to ensure highly qualified teachers are available for urban and non-urban school districts.
2. Conduct additional research regarding full scholarship opportunities for teachers committed to employment in urban school districts, e.g. the Institute for Urban Education (IUE).

3. Continuously research modifications to NCLB legislation as a means of meeting the highly qualified teacher mandate.

4. Conduct research similar to this study, but involve a larger sample size.

5. Compare the findings of this study to those which incorporated $t$-Tests, ANOVA or The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient statistical analysis.

6. Conduct research investigating reasons why metropolitan area urban and non-urban teachers resign before becoming tenured.

**Summary**

This study was conducted to examine teacher recruitment and retention strategies in Greater Kansas City metropolitan area urban and non-urban school districts. Interpretations, synthesis and recommendations were rendered specifically for the purpose of reporting strategies utilized for successfully recruiting highly
qualified teachers to urban and non-urban districts, and most importantly, retaining them.

A review and comparison of studies similar to this one consistently substantiated how researched based, statistically significant recruitment strategies make a difference on teacher retention in urban as well as non-urban districts. Statistical significance in comparative studies was arrived at by incorporating Descriptive Statistics, Variability, the Correlation Coefficient, $t$-Tests, ANOVA and Chi-Square analysis (Blades-Butler 2002; Ericson 1997; Farrell 2004; Fowlkes 2002; Williams 2005; Zezech 2002). When comparing the results of this study with the Blades-Butler study (2002), a study which utilized a version of the Quality Teacher Survey also, administrators with the delegated responsibility of influencing teacher retention indicated, through survey analysis, internet advertising and teacher recruitment fairs facilitate teachers continuing their tenure for more than three years.

Finally, results from this study in conjunction with similar research also substantiated the significance of planning, budgeting and evaluating teacher recruitment strategies (Castetetter and Young 2004). The future of today’s youth and what they successfully learn depends upon
the ability of school systems to place competent and qualified teachers in all subject areas in every classroom. Good teaching lasts a lifetime - bad teaching limits dreams and opportunities (Farrell 2004).
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Permission Letter for Survey
September 15, 2006

Dr. Betsy B. Butler
1780 Mill Avenue
Merritt Island, Florida 32952

Dear Dr. Butler,

Please allow me to commence this message by congratulating you on your absolutely riveting teacher recruitment strategies dissertation research. It was meticulously drafted, succinct, and most significantly, statistically poignant. As indicated via voice-mail message earlier this afternoon, my name is Darryl O. Cobb, an educational doctoral candidate at Baker University in Kansas City, Ks. The study I have embarked upon is similar to yours, and it is my intent to utilize your statistically validated "Teacher Recruitment Survey" contingent on being given professional authorization.

When you render consent, which informally occurred in your return voice-mail message this evening, my action plan entails; (1) obtaining approval for the instrument from my major professor and assigned review board, (2) making minor modifications conducive to the studies’ direction, (3) forwarding a finalized copy of the modified instrument for your approval, which will hopefully ensure continued validity, and (4) disseminating the instrument to local public school administrators no later than January 1, 2007.

I apologize for any inconvenience, but would you please correspond via e-mail (cobb4@swbell.net) with regard to your initial and final approval. As you are aware, your written authorization is a required formality. In addition, you will be appropriately referenced in chapters 3, 4, and 5 as well as within the "Works Cited" section of my study.

Your assistance is immensely appreciated.

Godspeed!

Darryl O. Cobb
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education Graduate Department
Baker University
APPENDIX B

Authorization
Hello Darryl! :)  

You are most welcome to use my dissertation. Please feel free to make any modifications to it that will better suit your own study and research. Again, I am honored you will be using my instrument. In the end, it is all about the kids. If we keep teachers in the classrooms and recruit the brightest out of college, the kids are our big winners!

I do have one question...how on earth did you find my dissertation? Just curious. Good luck--keep me posted if I can do anything to assist--and have a great weekend! :)  

Yours in Education,
Betsy B. Butler, Ed.D.
APPENDIX C

SURVEY COVER LETTER
December 8, 2006

Dear Public School Administrator:

As you are aware, public school districts, locally and nationally, are held accountable for acquiring highly qualified teachers pursuant to mandates within the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Hence, you have been selected to participate in a study being conducted for dissertation research. As a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership Cohort at Baker University, I am accumulating quantitative and qualitative teacher recruitment data from your district. Participation is voluntary, but your perspective is pivotal with regard to the study’s hypothesis, data analysis and recommendations.

Furthermore, all responses (kept with strict confidence) will facilitate comprehension of successful teacher recruitment strategies being utilized in the bi-state area. Specifically, I am attempting to obtain your perception(s) of current teacher recruitment strategies practiced by you and/or the district. The data will be analyzed, tabulated and disseminated to Missouri and Kansas public school administrators as a reference guide for unique, innovative teacher recruitment methods. Participants and their respective school districts will not be specified during the study. Demographic data will be requested only as a means of ensuring the sample’s diversity.

Please dedicate approximately 10-15 minutes of your time to complete and return the survey within 10 business days (return envelope enclosed). In addition, you will be the recipient of electronic final tabulations upon requests made via voice or e-mail to: cobb4@swbell.net or (816) 220-1837.

You participation is immensely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Darryl O. Cobb
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education Graduate Department
Baker University

There are no anticipated risks, compensation or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this study.
APPENDIX D

PROFESSIONAL REMINDER LETTER
January 10, 2007

Dear Superintendent, C/I or HR Administrator:

On or before Monday, December 18, 2006, you should have been the recipient of a cover letter, a self-addressed envelope and a qualitative/quantitative survey pertinent to my doctoral research - "Quality Teacher Recruitment Survey." As indicated in the cover letter, the results of the survey will be utilized to complete my research regarding the effect of teacher recruitment strategies on teacher retention. In addition, I respectfully petitioned you to dedicate at least 15 minutes of your time to complete the survey and return it within 10 business days. As of Wednesday, January 10, 2007, I have received approximately 30% of the surveys - 90% being the statistically significant goal.

Please sir or madam, If you have not completed and returned your survey, commit to doing such no later than Friday, January 26, 2007, as the successful completion of my doctoral study is contingent upon your assistance. Several survey participants have logged queries regarding whether human resources administrators should respond on behalf of the entire district. Actually, the study was designed to garner qualitative as well as quantitative data from superintendents, curriculum and instruction and human resources administrators. Hence, if you received the survey please respond with your individualized perspective. I have attached an additional copy of the survey if the initial copy was not received. Please forward it to:

Darryl O. Cobb
1837 SW Twincreek Place
Blue Springs, Mo. 64015

Again, your assistance in this endeavor is immensely appreciated.

Darryl O. Cobb,
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education Department Baker University
APPENDIX E

QUALITY TEACHER RECRUITMENT SURVEY
QUALITY TEACHER RECRUITMENT SURVEY
All requested information is for the current school term, 2006/07

1. The following items represent perceptions of the demand for and supply of applicants in specific teacher licensure/certification areas. First, numerically rate your perceptions of the demand for applicants in each area. Second, numerically rate your perception regarding the supply of qualified applicants in each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand for Applicants</th>
<th>Teaching Levels and Specific Disciplines</th>
<th>Qualified Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PE/Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Practical Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career and Technical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. On the first day of school-year 2006/07 (estimate only):
   - Approximately what percentage of teacher positions remained vacant? ____%
   - Approximately what percentage of Pre-K – 5 positions remained vacant? ____%
   - Approximately what percentage of 6-8 positions remained vacant? ____%
   - Approximately what percentage of 9-12 positions remained vacant? ____%

3. Approximately what percentage of new teachers hired this year is teaching outside of their licensure/certification area? ____%
4. Using the following list, check the recruitment strategies currently utilized in your district.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Local/National Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recruitment Fairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Recruitment Incentives for Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Signing Bonuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Loan Forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Relocation Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Tuition Reimbursement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Critical Needs Area Bonuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Discount Housing Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Scholarships for Graduating Seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Stipend for Materials and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Staff’s children are permitted to attend district schools w/o tuition being assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Retail Discounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. From the list above, write in rank order, using the letter associated with each recruitment strategy, the top five recruitment strategies that:

   a. Yielded the most qualified applicants for 2006/07
      1.____  2.____  3.____  4.____  5.____

   b. Yielded the most first year, qualified applicants for 2006/07
      1.____  2.____  3.____  4.____  5.____

   c. Comments _______________________________________________________

6. Indicate which of the following recruitment programs your district has:

   (Please check all that apply)
   ____ Designated Recruitment Specialist
   ____ Recruitment Team (Who? ____________________________________)  
   ____ Out-of state/country travel Recruitment Team
   ____ New Teacher Orientation Program
   ____ New Teacher Mentoring/Coaching
   ____ Other _______________________________

7. In recruiting prospective candidates, your district focuses more on:

   (circle one)
   In-state Recruiting   Out-of state Recruiting   Both are equal
8. Please rank your perceptions, 1 being the most effective and 5 being the least effective, regarding district recruitment strategies resulting in teachers being retained for 3 or more years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Local/National Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recruitment Fairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Recruitment Incentives for Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Signing Bonuses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Loan Forgiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Relocation Expenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Tuition Reimbursement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Critical Needs Area Bonuses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Discount Housing Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Alternative Certification Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Scholarships for Graduating Seniors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Stipend for Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Children of new recruits are permitted to attend district schools w/o tuition being assessed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Retail Discounts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. With "new teacher" being defined as one receiving his/her initial contract and remaining in your district from 2000/01 through 2005/06, give your estimate of the retention percentage for new teachers during:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>25%-50%</th>
<th>50%-75%</th>
<th>75%-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. District demographic information:

- Non-minority/minority percentage of students in your district?
- Non-minority/minority percentage of teachers in your district?
- Total student enrollment in your district?
- Is your district classified as rural, suburban or urban?

11. Do you have additional comments regarding your district’s recruitment strategies?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. Please provide contact information if you desire a copy of the results:

Your e-mail address: ___________________________________________

Thank You!

I sincerely appreciate your time and effort, as the success of my research is contingent upon a 95% return rate. Please place the survey in the self-addressed envelope and return it within 10 business days.
APPENDIX F

BAKER UNIVERSITY’S IRB APPROVAL
18 November 2006

Darryl O. Cobb
1837 SW Twin creek Place
Blue Springs, MO 64015

Dear Mr. Cobb:

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application (M0022-1106-1108-G) and approved this project under Exempt Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

The Baker University IRB requires that your consent form must include the date of approval and expiration date (one year from today). Please be aware of the following:

1. At designated intervals (usually annually) until the project is completed, a Project Status Report must be returned to the IRB.
2. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
3. Notify the OIR about any new investigators not named in original application.
4. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported to the IRB Chair or representative immediately.
5. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity. If you use a signed consent form, provide a copy of the consent form to subjects at the time of consent.
6. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.

Please inform Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or myself when this project is terminated. As noted above, you must also provide OIR with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If your project receives funding which requests an annual update approval, you must request this from the IRB one month prior to the annual update. Thanks for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marc L Carter, PhD
Chair, Baker University IRB

CC: Harold Frye, PhD, Faculty Sponsor