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Martin Haberman

Martin Haberman is an educator who has developed interviewing techniques for identifying teachers and principals who will be successful in working with poor children. The most widely known of his programs was The National Teacher Corps, which was based on his intern program in Milwaukee. He is an advisor to alternative certification programs around the United States and has developed ways of bringing more minorities into teaching. Currently, his developmental efforts are focused on helping to resolve the crises in urban schools serving fifteen million at-risk students by helping these school districts "grow their own" teachers and principals. Haberman is a Distinguished Professor at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. He served six years as editor of the Journal of Teacher Education, and eleven years as a dean in the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. The Haberman Educational Foundation promotes his methods.
Part I
Major Findings from Literature Review
Summary of Literature Review (I)

- The Haberman “Star” Teacher Selection Interview (www.altcert.org/teacher/dimensions.asp) measures and is able to predict candidates level of persistence, organization and planning, value of student learning, theory of practice, ability to connect with and teach at-risk students, approach to students, survival in bureaucracy, teacher success, and fallibility. Of these qualities, one that has been found to be the most powerful indicator of success in an urban setting is “approach to working with high-risk children”.

- Studies have found a 95-98% retention rate for teachers hired using the Haberman interview in such places as Milwaukee and Houston. Also in Houston, students taught by teachers hired using the Haberman interview process achieved the highest achievement scores in their district (www.ed.gov/news/newsletters/innovator/2004/0223.html).

- The biggest, and of course the most important, benefit that may stem from using Haberman’s screening and training methods is for a district to be able to hire and provide qualified and motivated teachers to high-risk students (http://www.habermanfoundation.org).
Summary of Literature Review (II)

• Haberman does not share how his data was collected and analyzed, how his conclusions were drawn from the data or even provide an operational definition of “urban school” (http://edrev.asu.edu/reviews/rev64.htm).

• According to Stephanie Sachs (2004)*, Haberman’s studies “reported findings as correlates to effective teaching without gathering data from a control group of ineffective teachers leading to the unintentional generalization that these studies had identified attributes associated with teacher effectiveness”. In fact, Sach discovered that effective and ineffective teachers responded similarly on her questionnaire.

• In terms of the practices and beliefs of “star teachers”, a concern mentioned by Eric Brown (http://edrev.asu.edu/review/rev64.htm) is how this would play out in the real world setting. Brown claims that this approach is “narrow-minded and selfish” and it does not seem to mesh with the various responsibilities of teachers in the real world who must be able to work collaboratively with different facets of the school system and outside professionals.

Summary of Literature Review (III)

- districts may benefit from conducting their own research on the effectiveness of such screening processes as Haberman’s by looking at such things as pretest and posttest scores of employees who have been hired and later trained using Haberman’s interview/training workshops; retention rates of teachers and administrators, and student achievement. Finally, with so many obstacles that urban systems face, one must be careful of confounding variables when examining and evaluating the effectiveness of teachers and administrators.
Part II
About This Study
Research Questions

1. Is it true: stayed teacher group has a higher mean Haberman score in comparing to left teacher group?

2. Is there a causal relationship between teachers’ Haberman score and student achievement outcomes? high Haberman score group vs. low Haberman score group and Haberman method recruited group vs. previously non Haberman method recruited group.

3. Is there a causal relationship between teachers’ Haberman score and achievement outcomes for student with FRL/Color/Color & FRL? high Haberman score group vs. low Haberman score group and Haberman method recruited group vs. previously non Haberman method recruited group.
Groups of Comparison

- Teachers groups by Haberman score:
  Low score group (15-33) vs. High score group (34-48)

- Teacher groups by recruiting methods:
  Haberman method vs. non Haberman method
Student Achievement Growths of Comparison

• Teachers’ EVAAS Value Added Score
• Students’ Growth Score of state ABCs model

Research Design

• Regression-discontinuity – with Statistical Control
• Multiple Discriminant Analysis
Data Used in This Study

- All Haberman method recruited teachers’ Data
- 2006-07 teacher EVAAS data
- 2006-07 teacher data
- 2006-07 State student ABCs data
- 2006-07 teacher-student id linkage data
What is an effect and why is it so difficult to determine?

![Graph showing the comparison of outcomes between groups with High Haberman Score, Low Haberman Score, and no use of Haberman method before and after a certain period.]

- Group of High Haberman Score
- Group of Low Haberman Score
- Group did not use Haberman method
Part III
Basic Description
Distribution of Recruited 1946 Teachers by School Type

- Elementary: 749
- Middle: 503
- High: 581
- Mid College Hi: 67
- Special: 46

Legend:
- Green: Elementary
- Yellow: Middle
- Blue: High
- Pink: Mid College Hi
- Brown: Special
Distribution of Recruited Teachers by Retention Status

- **Stayed**: 1431
- **Left**: 515

Legend:
- Red: Left
- Green: Stayed
Distribution of Recruited 1946 Teachers by Years of Experience

- 0: 543
- 1-3: 554
- 4-10: 489
- 11-20: 216
- over 21: 144
Distribution of Recruited 1946 Teachers by Course Taught

- Low grade without EOG data: 366
- With EOG/EOC data: 930
- Subject without test data: 578
- Special school teacher: 72

Legend:
- Green: Low grade without EOG data
- Yellow: With EOG/EOC data
- Light blue: Subject without test data
- Pink: Special school teacher
(1) Haberman Score and Retention Status
Haberman Score by Retention Status

- Left: 33
- Stayed: 34.4
Histograms

Canonical Discriminant Function 1

retention_status = Left

 Mean = -0.21
 Std. Dev. = 1.078
 N = 515

Canonical Discriminant Function 1

retention_status = Stayed

 Mean = 0.07
 Std. Dev. = 0.97
 N = 1,431
No Difference
## Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>retention_status</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Stayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 55.7% of original grouped cases correctly classified.
(2)
Student Achievement
Higher Haberman Score Group
vs. Lower Haberman Score Group
Teacher Value Added Score and Teacher Haberman Score

![Bar chart showing the comparison between Low Haberman Score Group and High Haberman Score Group with scores 94.5 and 93.5 respectively.]

- Low Haberman Score Group: 94.5
- High Haberman Score Group: 93.5

Legend:
- Low Haberman Score Group
- High Haberman Score Group
Student with FRL Growth C Score and Teacher Haberman Score
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Student with Color Growth C Score and Teacher Haberman Score

Math Growth Score
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Low Haberman Score Group

High Haberman Score Group
(3)
Student Achievement
Teachers’ Years of Experience
Student with Color Growth C Score and Teacher Years of Experience
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(4) Student Achievement
Teachers Recruited by Haberman Method vs. Teachers Recruited Not by Haberman Method
Student Growth C Score by Teacher Group
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Student with Color Growth C Score by Teacher Group
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Student with Color & FRL Growth C Score by Teacher Group

Math Growth Score

Reading Growth Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math Growth Score</th>
<th>Reading Growth Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non Haberman Group

Haberman Group
(3) Summary and Suggestion
What is an effect and why is it so difficult to determine?
Summary

1. Although simple means comparison showed group of stayed teachers has higher Haberman score than group of left teachers, further study using multiple discriminant classification method did not show high Haberman score significantly contribute to teacher retention.

2. There is no significant difference on student academic achievement growth between group of teachers with high Haberman score and group of teachers with low Haberman score as well as between Haberman recruited group and non Haberman recruited group:
   i. No matter measured by value added score or by NC growth c score;
   ii. No matter compared among all students, FRL students, students with color, or FRL students with color.

3. Overall, teacher’s years of experience showed some significant differences on student achievement growth. The group of teachers with 4-10 years of experience has out performed the group of teachers with less years of experience in Math. The group of teachers with 11-20 years of experience has out performed the group of teachers with less than 10 years of experience in Reading.
Suggestions

1. By the end of 2006-07, there were only one and half years that the Haberman interview process had been used to recruit teachers in GCS. The real impact on student achievement may most likely take longer time period. Further follow up study should be conducted.

2. Among 1946 recruited teachers only 261 teachers who have 2007 data for this study. The comparison only includes a small portion, 13.4%, of all recruited teachers. Further study should include more teachers when those 0 years of experience teachers (n=500) and others have the EVAAS and the ABCs growth data.

3. We should continue to use Haberman recruiting method. At the same time, if it’s necessary, we should retrain the interviewers for obtaining objective and reliable Haberman scores. After the recruitment the further Haberman training, as some studies suggested, for those teachers should be carried on.

4. If we continue to use Haberman method, to pilot carefully selected other appropriate method, at a small scale, may be worthwhile. When we have data of two different methods a comparative study can be conducted.
What Have We Already Done?

- HR Principal Advisory Group Meeting
- Research Study- Dr. Zhang
- Teacher Screening Project Team Meeting
- Principal Survey on Teacher Screening
  - 85% of principals feel it is important to use a screener
  - 61% of principals feel that Haberman is a useful tool for teacher screening
  - 54% of principals use the Haberman screening scores as a factor in deciding whether or not to conduct a building level interview
Next Steps

• Implement Haberman Screeners during the next hiring cycle
  – Provide additional training on the Haberman instrument to insure fidelity
  – Work with Haberman Education Foundation to examine alternate forms and refine current questions
  – Add additional questions to the screening process to capture the behaviors related to teaching knowledge and skill vs. dispositions

• Office of Accountability and Research will conduct further research studies using additional Haberman data gathered during this next school year to increase sample size

• Develop an on-site interview protocol to insure a strong interview at the school sites

• Add components to the hiring process at the school level (Letters of Recommendation, Writing Sample, Observation Lesson, Case Scenarios)

• For comparative purposes, we have the option of conducting a pilot to test another screening instrument:
  – Gallup ($64,000 per year to implement)
  – GCS District Developed Screener (no validity data for 3 years)