WHAT MAKES A STAR TEACHER?

Examining the Dispositions of PK-12 Urban Teachers in Chicago
PK-12 schools need effective teachers, and schools within urban districts need to identify, recruit, and retain highly effective teachers in order to respond to the demographic imperative present in under-served communities. Current conditions result in a significant percentage of PK-12 teachers leaving the classroom within their first five years of teaching. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) (2010), “After five years over 30% of our beginning teachers have left the profession” (p. 4). This high rate of teacher turnover affects student achievement in mathematics and English negatively (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). All in all, not retaining PK-12 teachers is a problem worth solving.

This white paper, “What makes a Star Teacher? Examining the Dispositions of PK-12 Urban Teachers in Chicago” shares the preliminary findings of a large-scale study of urban PK-12 teachers. In this report we share findings of this mixed-methods research conducted with in-service teachers from Chicago Public Schools. The results draw from data collected through multiple instruments across a study period of four months starting in January 2014. This data and its subsequent analysis represent what we have come to understand to be some of the most salient factors—both pre- and in-service—in the identification and cultivation of teachers with potential for excellence with urban students. Dispositional research like ours has been conducted before, and we owe a debt to those whose work informs and inspires our own. Some of the more recent work is presented in Table 1, and further discussion of key theoretical and methodological underpinnings follow.
There has been much scholarly writing about teacher dispositions—Table 1 below shares a sampling of such work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asa, 1998</td>
<td>Discusses the importance of maturity for understanding the challenges of teaching in urban settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberman, 2004b</td>
<td>Shares a personal qualitative inventory (PQI) of dispositions that can be used with teacher candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasicsko, 2004</td>
<td>Offers dispositional questions that can be asked when hiring teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayda &amp; Lund, 2005</td>
<td>Indicates how dispositions can be included in assessment strategies for teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schussler, 2006</td>
<td>Highlights the development of teacher candidates’ dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borko, Liston, &amp; Whitcomb, 2007</td>
<td>Discusses why supporting the role of dispositions in teacher education programs is noteworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burant, Chubbuck, &amp; Whipp, 2007</td>
<td>Shares why and how teacher dispositions are linked to humanistic and existential beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon, 2007</td>
<td>Shares reasons why a definition of dispositions in assessment procedures must be fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koeppen &amp; Davison-Jenkins, 2007</td>
<td>Indicates that expanding knowledge and skill can influence teacher dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villegas, 2007</td>
<td>Shares a dispositional framework that attends to social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger &amp; Wu, 2008</td>
<td>Shares the importance of translating affective beliefs, attitudes, and values into practicable teacher selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osguthorpe, 2008</td>
<td>Describes how teacher dispositions are interrelated with moral character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill-Jackson &amp; Lewis, 2010</td>
<td>States that dispositions matter, yet they have received less attention than knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazar, 2013</td>
<td>Examines teacher dispositions through degrees toward social justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature Review

In order to analyze the data collected in this study, a literature review was done on teacher effectiveness and the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener.

TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Many factors contribute to teacher effectiveness, including age/experience, national board certification, advanced degree completion, and certification. Notwithstanding, teacher effectiveness is almost exclusively measured by student performance on high stakes standardized achievement tests, although the push for additional measurement methods such as performance-based evaluations, observations, and merit-pay are increasingly gaining attention. In the literature, teacher effectiveness—or what makes an effective teacher—is defined in numerous but consistently similar ways. Morrison (2006) described effective teachers as those who "accept responsibility for teaching, allocate most of their time to instruction, organize their classroom for effective instruction... maintain a pleasant learning environment that is student centered, and provide opportunities for practice and feedback on performance" (p. 13). Another definition was provided by Wong and Wong (2005), who define an effective teacher as "one who has positive expectations for student success, is an extremely good classroom manager, and knows how to design lessons for student mastery" (as cited in Aleccia, 2011, p. 87).

Some researchers separate teacher effectiveness into distinct categories. According to Aleccia (2011), there are four criteria for being an effective teacher and/or teacher educator. These criteria are: (1) be clear about your professional mission; (2) have the appropriate background/training; (3) keep current in your classroom practice by bridging theory with practice; and (4) model what it means to be an "accomplished teacher" for pre-service teachers, including getting your National Board certification (p. 87). All four of these criteria require experience, suggesting that older and more experienced educators are more effective teachers than younger and inexperienced educators.

The literature says a lot about the role experience plays in teacher effectiveness. While many scholars have found it difficult to identify the factors that correlate well with teacher effectiveness, the one factor that has been regularly correlated with teacher effectiveness is experience from on-the-job training (Chingos & Peterson, 2011). This correlation, however, is weak over time. Some recent studies have suggested that the value of on-the-job experience eventually decays and becomes negative after five to ten years of teaching (Chingos & Peterson, 2011; Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006; Harris & Sass, 2008; Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2008; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Staiger & Rockoff, 2010). In a study by Rivkin et al. (2005), the researchers noticed some improvements in teaching initially, but concluded that "there is little evidence that improvements continue after the first three years" (p. 449). Although these studies have indicated a leveling out or even a decline in teacher effectiveness, no previous study has detected the point at which that decline occurs, which is particularly of interest in terms of policy given that teacher salary schedules tend to reward teachers for additional years of experience (Chingos & Peterson, 2011).

The other factor affecting the validity of the relationship between experience and teacher effectiveness is the potential bias that is inherent in the data. A study of Florida teachers by Chingos and Peterson (2011) analyzed student reading and mathematics scores on a state standardized achievement test. The scores were analyzed from 2002-2009 and adjusted for demographic characteristics in addition to matching the individual students' scores with each teacher. The results showed a positive relationship between student achievement and the number of years teaching, although the authors note that a potential bias exists given the higher attrition rate of less effective teachers (p. 458). Nonetheless, the literature points to a clear, albeit small, correlation between age/experience and teacher effectiveness, part of which might be related to the development over time of teaching self-efficacy. As teachers increase their own personal teaching efficacy—the belief in themselves that they are effective teachers and can produce desired student outcomes—they often become more effective teachers because they are less concerned about the demands of teacher tasks and more likely to adopt innovative approaches that support diverse learning needs (Ghaim & Yaghi, 1997; Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010). This efficacy is directly related to teaching experience and therefore affects teacher effectiveness.

Another factor that is often said to increase teacher effectiveness is the completion of an advanced or terminal degree. Yet, the research literature does not support this conclusion. Although most teacher pay scales reward the attainment of an advanced degree, literature on teacher effectiveness shows that holding a master’s degree does not increase teacher effectiveness (Aaronson, Barrow, & Sanders, 2007; Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006; Ehrenberg & Brewer, 1994; Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2008; Summers & Wolfe, 1977). Additionally, Chingos and Peter-

---

1 Some of this literature review appears in Hartlep, McCubbins, and Morgan (2014).
son (2011) found that “teachers with masters’ degrees are no more effective in the classroom than those without an advanced degree” (p. 464). This does not mean that teachers with advanced degrees are not effective; in fact, they are highly effective teachers because they also tend to be those teachers with more experience. The completion of that degree alone, however, does not increase the already high level of effectiveness that these teachers demonstrate. In other words, the lack of change in teacher effectiveness could be, in part, due to the fact that teachers who are already effective are more likely to seek advanced degrees and certificates.

According to the WestEd policy brief *A Continuum of Teacher Preparation and Development* (2000), “research show[s] it is less harmful to students, and also more cost effective, to recruit candidates who meet ability and disposition requirements than to counsel out ineffective pre-service or practicing teachers” (p. 2, italics added). One person who has championed teacher selection over teacher preparation has been Dr. Martin Haberman. Haberman developed his definition of a Star Teacher based upon decades of research in New York, Chicago, and Milwaukee Public Schools. Haberman (2004b) says that Star Teachers are those teachers who “are so effective that the adverse conditions of working in failing schools or school districts do not prevent them from being successful teachers” (p. 53). Haberman (2004b), notes that Star Teachers possess similar dispositions, which include some of the following: their persistence, their physical and emotional stamina, their caring relationships with students, their commitment to acknowledging and appreciating student effort, their willingness to admit mistakes, their focus on deep learning, their commitment to inclusion, and their organization skills. They also protect student learning, translate theory and research into practice, cope with the bureaucracy, create student ownership, engage parents and caregivers as partners in student learning, and support accountability for at-risk students (p. 53).

Thus, the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener was developed to identify those potential teachers who exhibit the Star attributes. As a distinguished professor emeritus at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, in 2009, Haberman received the Legacy Award from the American Educational Research Association (AERA) for this work on Star Teachers and for his expertise in urban education teacher preparation.

Many schools and districts (of all kinds) across the country have made use of Haberman’s methods for identifying Star Teachers and their dispositions, but the impact of Haberman’s work is not just limited to PK-12 schools. Universities have also used Haberman’s methods to supplement their teacher training programs. Though Haberman was a strong proponent of alternative certification methods, some institutions have also tried to bring his theories into their traditional undergraduate teacher education programs. For example, Hart and Rowley (1999) used Haberman’s idea of Star Teachers to develop a video series using case scenarios that each reflected one of the Star Teacher functions identified by Haberman. These case scenarios used urban students, Star Teachers, administrators, and urban school support personnel to provide a realistic virtual world of urban teaching for pre-service teachers based on the expertise and reflections of actual star urban teachers (Hart & Rowley, 1999, p. 207).

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Much of Haberman’s (2004b) work on Star Teachers relied on the field of psychology (Haberman Educational Foundation, 1994). For instance, the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener and the Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview were developed during the late-1950s and early-1960s. As detailed in the STAR Teacher Live Interview training manual, while developing the interview, Haberman “thoroughly reviewed the literature related to the MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) as well as other personality tests” (Haberman Educational Foundation, 1994). We draw on Haberman’s scholarship (e.g., see Haberman 1991, 2004a, 2004b, 2010, 2012) not simply because we use instruments he developed, but also because theoretically, it made sense to.

For instance, social desirability bias leads people who are being interviewed to reply in generic ways or ways that may not truly reflect their teaching dispositions. Therefore, to tap into teachers’ core beliefs and attitudes, dispositions are best measured using psychological instruments that measure in some respects a teacher’s personality (e.g., humor, personalness, gentleness, affect, etc.).

**METHOD**

**Participants**

The participants in this study were drawn from a database of in-service teachers who were currently teaching in the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and who had completed teacher preparation at Illinois State University. An e-mail message was sent to all 1,111 teachers in this database, asking them to complete (1) the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener, and (2) a supplemental survey developed by the researchers. A $10.00 Barnes and Noble gift card was offered as an incentive for those who completed both surveys. The researchers analyzed the responses to the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener and the supplemental survey from 191 participants who completed teacher preparation at Illinois State University and responded to the e-mail message. Those teachers who were
identified as Star Teachers by the Pre-Screener—Star Teachers were those individuals who scored in the first quartile (see Table 2 below)—were invited to participate in a follow-up interview, which consisted of the Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview protocol.  

A $50.00 Visa/Mastercard was offered as an incentive for those who participated in the follow up interviews. Of the 9 participants who were identified as Star Teachers on the Pre-Screener, 7 completed a 1:1 in-person interview (see Table 3).

**Table 2: Quartile Scores for Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUARTILE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40–50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0–26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Haberman Educational Foundation (2006)  
*Star Teacher

2 The two interviewers also asked each teacher one additional, supplemental question, “Beyond your teaching duties, how else are you involved or connected with your school’s community?”

**Table 3: Profiles of 7 Star Teachers (Names are pseudonyms)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>YRS. EXP</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>HABERMAN SCORE (QUARTILE)</th>
<th>STAR INTERVIEW SCORE</th>
<th>CURRENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michael</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Illinois State University (B.A.) Roosevelt University (M.A.T.)</td>
<td>42 (1)</td>
<td>39.25/45</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bachelors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collette</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Illinois State University (2012)</td>
<td>40 (1)</td>
<td>43.50/45</td>
<td>10-12 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bachelors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Working on Doctorate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Amanda</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Illinois State University (2007)</td>
<td>41 (1)</td>
<td>38/45</td>
<td>7-8 Special Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Masters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ryan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Illinois State University (2013)</td>
<td>42 (1)</td>
<td>40/45</td>
<td>9-10 Special Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bachelors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bachelors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Masters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL        | 5 F  | 2 M   | 4 W | 2 AA | 1 L | 6 ISU | 1 Other | 41 (7 fell in Quartile 1) | 39.18 |

**KEY**

AA = African American  |  W = White  |  L = Latino  |  M.S. = Middle School  |  E.S. = Elementary School  |  H.S. = High School

*According to the Haberman Educational Foundation (1994), 1 out of 10 respondents under the age of 25 pass the Live Interview, while 1 out of 3 respondents over the age of 30 pass the Live Interview. * ( ) denotes highest level of education or education in progress
The overall total and each one of the ten dimensional scores for the seven Star Teachers who were interviewed in this study are found in Table 4.

INSTRUMENTS

Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener

Two instruments were used for the study. The Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener is a quantitative questionaire made up of 50 questions. Respondents are given three possible answers for each question. The questions evaluate the respondents' knowledge and skills when it comes to teaching lower income students and specifically assesses the following ten dimensions:

1. **Persistence** predicts the propensity to work with children who present learning and behavioral problems on a daily basis without giving up on them for the full 180 day work year.
2. **Organization and Planning** refers to how and why star teachers plan as well as their ability to manage complex classroom organizations.
3. **Values Student Learning** predicts the degree to which the responses reflect a willingness to make student learning the teacher's highest priority.
4. **Theory to Practice** predicts the respondent's ability to see the practical implications of generalizations as well as the concepts reflected by specific practices.
5. **At-Risk Students** predicts the likelihood that the respondent will be able to connect with and teach students of all backgrounds and levels.

6. **Approach to Students** predicts the way the respondent will attempt to relate to students and the likelihood this approach will be effective.
7. **Survive in Bureaucracy** predicts the likelihood that the respondent will be able to function as a teacher in large, depersonalized organizations.
8. **Explains Teacher Success** deals with the criteria the respondent uses to determine teaching success and whether these are relevant to teachers in high poverty schools.
9. **Explains Student Success** deals with the criteria the respondent uses to determine students' success and whether these are relevant to students in high poverty schools.
10. **Fallibility** refers to how the teacher plans to deal with mistakes in the classroom.

Previous research has found the STAR Teacher Pre-Screener instrument to be statistically valid and reliable (see Haberman, 2004, pp. 90-95).

Table 4: Overall Total and 10 Dimensional Scores for the 7 Star Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERSISTENCE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING</th>
<th>VALUES STUDENTS LEARNING</th>
<th>THEORY TO PRACTICE</th>
<th>AT-RISK STUDENTS</th>
<th>APPROACH TO STUDENTS</th>
<th>SURVIVE IN BUREAUCRACY</th>
<th>EXPLAINS TEACHER SUCCESS</th>
<th>EXPLAINS STUDENT SUCCESS</th>
<th>FALLIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collette</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breanna</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total refers to the overall Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener score that a teacher received. The highest score is 50. The 10 dimensional scores (e.g., Persistence, Organization and Planning, Values Student Learning... etc. either are scored low, average, or high). High is color-coded green, average is color-coded yellow, and low is color-coded red.)
Supplemental Survey

The research team developed a supplemental survey instrument. This survey instrument consisted of 54 questions (see Appendix A). These questions were forced-entry, open-ended, and/or demographic in nature, and were crafted in order to obtain information that could be used when answering this study's research questions (see Table 5).

Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview

According to the Haberman Educational Foundation’s (The Haberman Educational Foundation, 1994) STAR Teacher Interview Training Manual, there are no significant differences in the pass/fail rate between male and female respondents. Moreover, there are no differences in the distribution of their scores. However, according to the Training Manual, “Age does discriminate” (p. 29). 1 out of 10 respondents under 25 pass the Live Interview, while 1 out of 3 respondents over 30 pass. These conditional pass rates based on age are statistically significantly different. In terms of race/ethnicity, 60% of African Americans pass the Live Interview, while 51% of European Americans pass the Live Interview.

The Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview has been found to be a statistically valid interview protocol (e.g., see Baskin, Ross, & Smith, 1996; Lesniak, 1969; Storey, 1995; Ross & Baskin, 1992). Interestingly, to our knowledge, the Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview is the only interview protocol that boasts having legal validation. In Rodriguez vs. The Chicago Board of Education (1996), a jury trial maintained that the interview was a valid instrument which the Chicago Public Schools had a right to use (Research Based Teacher Selection, 2002).

Table 5: Research Study Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Study Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do the profiles (teachers’ identity, pre-teaching experience and current teaching experience) of the sampled Illinois State University graduates teaching in Chicago Public Schools (CPS) relate to the Haberman Instruments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Who are/are not the STAR Teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do the results on the Haberman Instruments for Illinois State University graduate CPS teachers relate to the following factors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Past teacher preparation experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Years of classroom/teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Current and past teaching assignment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In-service factors (e.g. teacher mobility, student demographics, administration support, professional development, parent-teacher interaction, new teacher supports, mentoring, advanced degrees, National Board Certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways do the Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview results align/not align with the results of the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA ANALYSIS

The Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener data was exported from the website3 into an Excel spreadsheet file. The data was then anonymized and imported into SPSS v.21, where it was analyzed by the fifth author. The supplemental survey data was run against the total and dimensional Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener scores initially to detect meaningful findings. The research team looked at this first draft of findings and provided feedback to author five who then revised his statistical analysis to reflect the research team’s feedback. A second draft/round of findings were then once again presented to the other four research team members.

A research team consisting of the first four authors followed the consensual qualitative research (CQR) method when analyzing the structured interview data from the Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview. This interview protocol has high levels of interrater reliability, and using CQR increased reliability due to its consensual nature (Hill et al., 1997, 2005).

RESULTS

This section of the white paper shares results of this mixed-method study. First qualitative data is shared (Haberman Live Teacher Interview and the Supplemental Survey). Next quantitative data is shared (Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener and the Supplemental Survey).

Qualitative, Haberman Live Teacher Interview and Supplemental Survey

According to Wasicsko (2004), “Most teachers who do not succeed fail because they do not have the right dispositions” (p. 40). Indeed, humor has been identified as an important disposition for PK-12 teachers to possess (Thompson, Ransdell, & Rousseau, 2005; Wasicsko, 2004). According to our interviews with the seven Star Teachers, humor was one of the teacher characteristics or endorsements that Stars displayed. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of humor (all names are pseudonyms):

“I think maybe, I mean going back to even just the whole respect of students and teacher relationships, I think one mistake a teacher could make with a student is saying something negative to the student. So whether it’s and I..."
mean nowadays a lot of teachers joke with their students, especially with older kids, but you never want to say anything that could actually hurt a child’s feelings. So maybe I don’t know, you say something disrespectful. I can’t even think of anything.” (Michelle, page 11, lines 490–495).

“Oh, I always let the kids joke and say because I will say, ‘Oh my gosh’ you know I spilled something wrong, I did something wrong, I’ll say, ‘Oh my gosh it’s the first mistake I’ve ever made!’ You know, they’ll laugh about it and stuff. But now if I make a mistake they’ll say, ‘Oh my gosh it’s the first mistake you’ve ever made!’ And so I think letting them know everyone makes mistakes, you know, I want to do the best that I can do and I want you to do the best that you can do but I think that maybe I didn’t do my best job at showing you this so let’s try it one more time in a different way and see if that helps us all to understand it better.” (Amanda, page 10, lines 308–314).

“I try to joke with them to get them to do their work.” (Breanna, page 2, line 43).

“There are a bunch of different things that you could do. Sometimes if it’s during that first opening routine, I try to say something that I know will make that kid laugh, to wake them up. To see if their brain is even turned on.” (Collette, page 2, lines 47–49).

Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was empathy. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of empathy:

“Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was non-escalation. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of non-escalation:

“…teach others the way you would want someone teaching your child or your family member” (Amanda, page 6, lines 168–169).

“I apologized to him. I needed him to understand how really horrible I’m even feeling it now, how really horrible I was not trying to make him feel bad. And you know I’m very sorry that that happened to you. So yes that day that was a rough day. I just felt horrible. I tried to make it, I don’t know if I made him feel better I really don’t know, but I expressed it the best way I could.” (Janet, page 11, lines 469–473).

“Either apologize in front of the whole class and apologize to that kid and apologize again. And find ways to fix it, to build back up the most positive things you can say to the kid in the next week, you do.” (Collette, page 9, lines 281–283).

“Because nobody has any dignity in that situation. You’re setting a bad precedent because you are saying this is how adults solve things. You’re not getting to the deal with this!” (Breanna, page 12, lines 353–355).

“But if he’s still acting out or she then I try not to acknowledge that behavior and I try not to get into a struggle with them and I really and I talk to the kids I’m like okay clearly somebody is not having a good day we have to ignore it we got to work throughout and then the kids will rally around to try to help us all get forward to get done what we need to get done. So but if he’s that tough I’m out of here. (Laughs).” (Janet, page 3, lines 124–129).

“Sometimes after I go through that process I just leave them alone for a little while.” (Collette, page 3, line 65).

Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was taking responsibility for student learning. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of taking responsibility for student learning:

“Ob a teacher. Yeah as a teacher I make one of the biggest impacts too.” (Ryan, page 10, line 323).

“But your job as a teacher is to teach every single student in the classroom.” (Ryan, page 11, line 365).

“I think students should know that the teachers are there for them. You know, there are times a student might think, ‘I don’t want to go to school because my teachers don’t even care about me.’ And I’ve always gave myself to be the students’ favorite teacher not because I give them all A’s and it’s a free class but because I generally look out for their best interests but also use—challenge them in their learning. And I think that’s the biggest thing too that I didn’t want nobody to feel that I don’t care about them. My apologizing and me looking like a little girl but it’s something that I honestly like to see done to understand that I am sorry and say, ‘Hey, I made a mistake. Sorry if I made you feel that way. I want to let you know that I am here with you and that we are a team here. We will get through this stuff.’” (Ryan, page 14, lines 461–469).

“Okay because I mean sometimes it’s just you know the motivation that they lack. Sometimes they don’t see the point in it and they aren’t working and they think because they are behind they are not going to try the next point.” (Breanna, page 8, lines 222–224).

“I apologized to him. I needed him to understand how really horrible I’m even feeling it now…” (Janet, page 11, lines 469–470).
Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was being energetic. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of being energetically:

“Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was being energetic. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of being institutionally aware:

“You know, I enjoy…” (Ryan, page 1, lines 5–6).

“I love to teach everything. I love reading. I like reading.” (Michelle, page 2, line 48).

“If we’re going back to the curriculum and there has to be something else exciting to learn about so you know. I know that you guys are really excited about horseback riding but we have this really cool new problem that we have to solve and this is what we have to do next. And if you guys are really interested in horseback riding if you come after school, if you want to stay in after class I have all of these cool activities that you can do and you can keep doing but we have really important business to get done in this new unit that we’ll be doing.” (Breanna, page 4, lines 115–121).

Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was being institutionally aware. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of being institutionally aware:

“But your job as a teacher is to teach every single student in the classroom”... “You’re not there to be their best friend or hold hands like you’re the teacher, you’re here to help you learn history and that’s what you’re going to do. And you might hate me for giving you so much homework, and you might hate me for you know, history is boring but it’s a material you have to learn and it’s a material that I will teach all of you.” (Ryan, pages 11–12, lines 365–367–370).

“Ok, the way I think about this is, and I’ll come at it from two different angles. I think that building a relationship with your administrators is important because you open up a line of communication. So I think a scenario like that is never an awkward scenario. If they came to me with something like that I could explain to them how I am incorporating the curriculum into this. I also know that my administrators would love to see me incorporate biking into this. That conversation is like a theoretical conversation but it’s a matter of approaching them in a way that is respectful but also in a way that lets them know that I do know what I am doing and that I am incorporating the soup de jour, the whatever is in right now which is the common core. Anything Charlotte Danielson, or what’s the other big thing, the I do, you do, we do. So the GRRM, the gradual release model. So incorporate all of that stuff, and I show that in my lesson plans.” (Michael, page 7, lines 193–202).

“Right, I’m just trying to think of a real life scenario, I’ve done this with my students. ‘Hey listen, this is what I’m supposed to do’, I’m very upfront with them, I say ‘when an administrator walks in the room, here is what they want to know’. I put myself on ILT to learn these things too.” (Michael, page 8, lines 248–251).

“Well, if I’m bringing in God knows it would have to be attached to the standards because I wouldn’t bring it in if it didn’t.” (Breanna, page 4, lines 95–96).

“We’ve had the conversation with a lot of—[?] and things have improved for a little while. But just tell them and show them the growth that my students have had. Maybe you have data or something to show that it’s working. My very next closest stop would be to have the students go in and talk to him about it if I know that they are enjoying it and learning from it. They are going to be much better advocates than I am. Yeah, I think is he was reasonable he would listen to that.” (Collette, page 4, lines 99–104).

“Just for show and tell purposes I might teach the curriculum as written for a couple of days just to see the difference in data and or anecdotal things that the students said. If there are those differences I would go in and be like, ‘Look, there are two options here: which one do you like better?’” (Collette, page 4, lines 108–111).
Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was having high expectations. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of having high expectations:

“Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was honesty and transparency. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of being honest and transparent:

“Yeah me being honest will create a place where my students can be honest with me too. Because I’m letting them know, ‘Hey you know sorry I bombed yesterday, probably embarrassing but hey you know we’re not perfect human beings. You will probably make mistakes too where you probably write something totally different.’” (Ryan, page 13, lines 429-432).

“Me apologizing and me looking like a little girl but it’s something that I honestly like to see done to understand that I am sorry and say, ‘Hey, I made a mistake. Sorry if I made you feel that way. I want to let you know that I am here with you and that we are a team here. We will get through this stuff.’” (Ryan, page 14, lines 466-469).

“And so I think letting them know everyone makes mistakes, you know, I want to do the best I can and I want you to do the best you can…” (Amanda, page 10, lines 311-313).

“You know, you tell them the truth. I’m really sorry. This was not the right way to handle it. I would really really like to sort this out. I’m really sorry but I am human and your actions made me feel this way. What made you do whatever it is you were doing?” (Breanna, page 13, lines 369-371).

“I tell them we can’t do this because… I try to be as honest with the kids as I can without being mean, being nasty without making the principal look bad. So I tell them you know the principal said we can’t do this you know if they don’t ask why I don’t try to come up with a why if they ask why then you know I will hopefully I’ll know the why and I can share that with them.” (Janet, page 5, lines 206-210).

“I’m pretty honest with my students all the time so I would explain exactly what all concerns were, what conversations happened…” (Collette, page 5, lines 127-128).

“…there have been some disagreements among teachers about what we should be teaching in the classroom and it all comes back to the standards.” (Collette, page 5, lines 135-136).

“I’m pretty honest with my students all the time so I would explain exactly what all concerns were, what conversations happened, you know, without throwing anyone under the bus but being respectful to anyone in the building. But tell them what happened, the steps that I had taken to save what we’ve been doing. And just explain that for right now…” (Collette, page 5, lines 127-131).

Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was professionalism. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of being professional:

“So I will show my administrator every piece of artifact that I can find that I’ve saved that shows by using real life situations… the kids are actually getting the information.” (Michelle, page 4, lines 157-158).

“So I see like five classes a day and I see anywhere from first grade to eighth grade in a day so I see about 600 kids. One of these weaknesses is not being able to know 600 children’s names, which really makes the dynamics very hard as a teacher trying to maintain classroom discipline. So every day when I come to work I’m thinking about okay who am I getting, how do I make sure you know whose names do I need to know today because once you know the names it makes life a lot easier instead of going ‘excuse me sir, pardon me miss what’s your name, young woman so…”’ (Janet, page 4, lines 139-146).

“If that doesn’t work, I will wait to we get started and go over to their table for a second. Just stop and talk and ask them how they are doing that day. Talk to them about something else for a little while and then kind of re-introduce what we are doing.” (Collette, page 2, lines 53-55).
Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was opposition to deficit ideologies. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of being opposed to deficit ideologies:

“So you know you have different types of learners and especially at a young age you really see these learning styles shape and mold...I kind of attend to all different learning styles and every kid gets to experience it.” (Michelle, page 6, lines 261-265).

“Mostly, it's about the student. Assume the best. It's if you are going to, because so many times, you know and I do it too, that I freak out and think that I'm letting them all of the hook on something or whatever it is. And I found that you know you don't let them get away with things but you always assume—if you have to make a mistake, you have to assume something. If you don't have all the data, if you don't have all the information, it's better to err on the side of: This is a human being. There are many problems, I can believe the best in you at this point. ‘Does that make sense?” (Breanna, page 5, lines 131-137).

“Empowerment—the child takes it’s own responsibility of education to empower themselves through the learning…” (Ryan, page 8, lines 251-252).

“Oh because nobodies the same, we're all diverse, unique, and everyone is going to learn something a different way. So, if you can, if you have the time and you have the resources and mental ability to do that. To approach each individual student and teach them something different…” (Michael, page 11, lines 353-356).

“...so going back to the kids that nobody wanted to work with, an example I had a little boy who was on the autistic spectrum and one of the things I do not like is when someone walks in and says put that down don't touch that he's not listening I'm like yes he is. But he was playing with his imaginary toys. He’s not bothering anybody. He’s just playing with his imaginary toys but I learned he’s listening so to demonstrate that the kid is listening and I know what I'm doing with the kid we did a spelling test. So the kids who were doing the right thing, they had the words for a week. I didn't give the other kid the words I gave him the words that day just before we took the test but he had been listening all week. The principal came in; he's playing with his imaginary toys. I said okay, let's take this spelling test. They took the spelling test, he scored 100 points. The other kids didn't. They had a week to learn the words. I said, so when you make him stop playing with the imaginary toys, he's not listening because it's whatever I don't know what the it cuts off his ability to do what he needs to do to process stuff. He also needed to walk around the room so when he takes his test I give him a clipboard. I let him walk around the room. I had another kid, I knew I’m exaggerating, didn't recognize his name but he was a big kid, he was in a gang he didn't want his crew to know he couldn't read. I knew the secret. I said look, you can't read and you're in my homeroom and I need you to do I need you to succeed so what can we do? So how about this, if you come to school every day before everybody else gets here, I will work with you on the reading. That kid comes to school every day, every day before everybody else get there and we worked on his reading. It took him a year to read that book but he read it.” (Janet, pages 6 and 7, lines 267-287).

Another teacher characteristic or endorsement that Stars displayed was differentiating instruction. Below are some quotes that speak to the idea of differentiating instruction:

“And I would take students that I know are in higher level learning and a student that’s maybe struggling a bit, pair them together. But I would have students working almost in a different version of a test or class work where a student in the higher level can still be challenge while another can learn at a lower level.” (Ryan, pages 8-9, lines 266-269).

“You’ll definitely see many different groups doing similar tasks but in different ways. So you know you have the different types of learners and especially at a young age, you really can see these learning styles shape and mold. So when I’m teaching a concept, I kind of attend to all the different learning styles and every kid gets to experience it so definitely in small groups I break that up and you may have a table that focuses more on sensory where another one focuses more on visual learning, another one maybe focusing on kinesthetic learning and so they kind of are doing similar types of tasks going towards the same end goal but just in different ways. And then of course I have my own small group that I always pull to kind of help model and reinforce whatever that skill may be for the day or week.” (Michael, page 6, lines 260-269).
"One of the problems I have now is finding that balance between my mixed classroom, as in mixed abilities. I think that there’s a lot of talking heads, people that are telling me what to do from different directions. Administrators, people from the new teachers center, other teachers, and they’re all kind of pulling me in a different direction. Just trying to interpret what they’re saying and then applying it to my classroom, which is a mixed abilities classroom, I think that it’s kind of figuring out how to evaluate these students in a live scenario, so kind of a non on your toes, sort of how do I evaluate them, what are they learning, what aren’t they learning, what’s working, what’s not working, and then dancing around that, and trying to group them in an organic way so I can meet their, not individual needs, but their small group needs." (Michael, page 4, lines 93–101).

"So I would say one of my biggest problems would be differentiating students and making sure that I am trying to give them as much information related to common core standards, related to what the gen. eds. are doing, related to the performance task at hand while still accommodating it appropriately for them based on their needs and their IEP in order to gauge that they can do the task at hand." (Amanda, pages 2–3, lines 63–67).

"Oh goodness. I think differentiation is a huge thing, so trying to address a kid or expect something from a kid and completely missing the ball on what they are able to do." (Bridget, page 11, lines 332–333).

"Differentiation is a mistake but when you make a mistake assuming a kid can do something that they cannot. So when you’re saying you know, ‘Oh let’s do this!’ And some kids are like, ‘What?’ and just completely miss it and I mean…” (Broanna, page 12, lines 335–337).

Quantitative, Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener and Supplemental Survey

PERSISTENCE

Figure 1 below shows that there is a moderately strong relationship between Star Teachers and persistence ($p < 0.001$). In other words, Star Teachers are more persistent than non-Stars.

Figure 2: Fallibility

Figure 2 below shows a statistically significant relationship between Star Teachers and fallibility. The difference between Star Teachers and their non–Star peers, is that they recognize and own up to mistakes in the classroom that break teacher-student rapport. In other words, Star Teachers readily admit their mistakes, and “apologize and rectify the situation publicly” (Haberman, 2004b, p. 187).

AT-RISK STUDENTS

Figure 3 below shows a statistically significant relationship between Star Teachers and at-risk students. While both Star Teachers and non-Star Teachers understand the factors that affect at-risk students, the key difference between the two are that Star Teachers “seek more effective teaching strategies, regardless of youngsters’ backgrounds” (Haberman, 2004, p. 169) in order to make their teaching and their students’ learning more meaningful and relevant. In other words, non–Star Teachers use the label of “at-risk” to prove “the child cannot be taught or doesn’t belong in their classroom” (Haberman, 2004b, p. 169), while Star
Teachers take responsibility and “find ways of involving [their] students in learning no matter what their out-of-school lives are like” (Haberman, 2004b, p. 168). Star Teachers do not blame students, while non-Star Teachers do quite often.

**Figure 3: At-Risk Students**

**EXPLAINS TEACHER SUCCESS**

Figure 4 below shows a statistically significant relationship between Star Teachers and their explanation for teacher success. Star Teachers are not judgmental or moralistic and they believe in effort rather than ability. They also believe in the eleven indicators of successful teaching that Haberman (2004, pp. 54-57) identifies as the following:

1. Whenever students are involved with issues they regard as vital concerns, good teaching is going on;
2. Whenever students are involved with explanations of human differences good teaching is going on;
3. Whenever students are being helped to see major concepts, big ideas, and general principles and not merely engaged in the pursuit of isolated facts, good teaching is going on;
4. Whenever students are involved in planning what they will be doing, it is likely that good teaching is going on;
5. Whenever students are involved with applying ideals such as fairness, equity, or justice to their world, it is likely good teaching is going on;
6. Whenever students are directly involved in real-life experience, it is likely that good teaching is going on;
7. Whenever students are actively involved in heterogeneous groups, it is likely that good teaching is going on;
8. Whenever students are asked to think about an idea in a way that questions common sense or an assumption accepted as “good” by everyone, or relates new ideas to ones learned previously, or applies an idea to the problems of living, then good teaching is going on;
9. Whenever students are involved in redoing, re-polishing or perfecting their work, it is likely good teaching is going on;
10. Whenever teachers involve students with technology of information access, good teaching is going on; and
11. Whenever students are involved in reflecting upon their own lives and how they have come to believe and feel as they do, good teaching is going on.

What distinguishes Star Teachers from non-Stars is that while Stars believe in the above 11 items, non-Stars subscribe to what Haberman (1991) labels the “pedagogy of poverty.” According to Haberman (2010), the teacher acts that constitute the “pedagogy of poverty” are not based on theory or research, resulting in 11 undesirable consequences:

1. There will continue to be no difference between what teachers do when teaching diverse students in poverty and when teaching students from advantaged backgrounds.
2. There will continue to be no connection between what teachers do and any theory of learning.
3. The widespread use of these acts will not decrease in spite of growing research on effective instruction.
4. Veteran and novice teachers will continue to perform these same ritualized acts. (This explains why those with no teacher training teach the same way and get the same results as those with extensive coursework in education.)
5. Since these acts characterize the behavior of teachers in a class of 35 or more and in a class of 10 or less, lowering class size provides no benefit. Discipline may be easier, but learning will not improve.
6. Teachers will make no distinctions in how different subject matters are taught.
7. Teachers will continue to teach skills, concepts, and appreciations using the very same ineffective acts.
8. The age of the learners or their competencies or interests won’t influence or interfere with teachers performing these acts.
9. There can be no teacher growth, since these acts won’t be discontinued or replaced. This explains why professional development doesn’t change instruction.
10. Teachers have always reported that the greatest problems they face are classroom management and students’ lack of motivation for learning. Since these acts of teaching themselves generate and exacerbate students’ problems, teachers will continue to have discipline problems and unmotivated students for the foreseeable future.
11. These acts have become so firmly ritualized and pervasive that the public, parents, students, and educators will crush any attempt to redefine or transform teaching.

**Figure 4: Explains Teacher Success**
Figure 5 below shows a statistically significant relationship between Star Teachers and student teaching in Chicago ($p < .001$). In other words, Star Teachers complete their student teaching in Chicago at a higher percentage than non-Stars. The most appropriate teacher preparation faculty are the classroom teachers who have demonstrated their effectiveness with diverse children in poverty over a sustained amount of time.

**Figure 5: Student Teaching**

### CREDENTIALS

Figure 6 below shows that Star Teachers don’t agree that credentials make them effective teachers at the same rate as their non-Star peers.

**Figure 6: Credentials**

On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 7 being ‘strongly agree,’ rate your level of agreement with the following statement: My credentials and educational background have improved my teaching and my students’ learning.

### URBAN CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

Figure 7 below shows that Star Teachers complete more urban clinical experiences than their non-Star peers.

**Figure 7: Urban Clinical Experiences**

How many clinical experience (including field trips) did you take to Chicago Public Schools while you were a student at Illinois State University?
LIMITATIONS

The present study had two main limitations that should be considered: sample size and response rate. While we had access to a large number of in-service CPS PK–12 teachers, we still only managed to obtain a response rate of 191/1,111 (17.2%). Due to the study’s relatively low response rate, we were interested in determining insight into why some teachers completed the supplemental survey and did not complete the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener. There were 112 CPS teachers who completed the supplemental survey but did not complete the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener. Since these 112 teachers were incomplete data—since they could not be associated with a Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener score—we were not able to include their responses in the final analysis.

Because the research team wished to discover what barriers might have been attributed to this incompleteness, the researchers emailed teachers a survey, which asked them the following questions (49/112 [43.75%] teachers responded to this survey):

1. Did you attempt to log in and complete the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener? [Yes/No]
   a. If responded yes, Why did you log in? [Open-Ended]
   b. If responded no, Why did you not log in? [Open-Ended]

2. Would you have attempted to take the Pre-Screener if it was NOT incentivized? [Yes/No]
   a. If responded yes, What amount of incentive amount would compel you to take it? [Amount]

3. What would have made it easier to take the Haberman Pre-Screener? [Open-Ended]

4. Would you be willing to talk to one of the researchers on the telephone to share more about your experience with taking the Haberman Pre-Screener? [Yes/No]
   a. If responded yes, Please provide your first and last name and telephone and a time we can call you. [Open-Ended]

2. Is there anything else you would like to tell us that could help us when designing future studies that use the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener survey? [Open-Ended]

The survey results prove elucidative (see Figures 8 and 9). For one, a majority (28/35, 80%) of the teachers who responded would have completed the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener even if it was not incentivized.

**Figure 8: Question 1**

Did you attempt to log in and complete the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener?

- Yes: 34; 74%
- No: 12; 26%

Note: Of those who did not attempt to log in (n = 10), many several teachers commented that time was a barrier to why they did not complete the survey. Either they did not have enough discretionary time to complete the survey or that accessing the survey required too much time and/or that they had account issues. For instance, one teacher wrote s/he was “Too busy” while another teacher wrote: “Too much personal information and too much time.” Another teacher commented “I didn’t know my user name.”

**Figure 9: Question 2**

Would you have attempted to take the Pre-Screener if it was NOT incentivized?

- Yes: 28; 80%
- No: 7; 20%

Note: Most of those who did log-in (n = 28) commented they did so in order to complete the second part of the study. Only one person commented “Barnes and Noble” which seems to indicate many of the teachers saw value in the study and thought it worthy of their time to complete. Of the 7 teachers who indicated that no, that they would have not taken the pre-screener if it was not incentivized, no responses were in fact true “responses” per se. For instance, one teacher commented “time” while another wrote “not just the incentive. I wish that I had completed it. I would like to see ISU reaching out to alumni by giving items to them so that they can display in their classrooms. It is good to have a college atmosphere in HS classes. kids’ future.”

Questions 3, 4, and 5 were open-ended questions. Question 3 asked “What would have made it easier to take the Haberman STAR Pre-Screener?” Of those who responded (n = 49) to this question, many indicated that there were too many questions and that the directions were too complicated. Teachers mentioned the directions being complicated and that they preferred if the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener could be on the same website as the supplemental survey, which was on Select Survey.
Question 4 asked, “Would you be willing to talk to one of the researchers on the telephone to share more about your experience with taking the Haberman Pre-Screener?” 21 teachers responded “no.” Of those who responded “yes,” 11 provided their name, telephone number, and a time that they were available to speak with the research team. Sadly, due to time constraints, the research team was not able to reach out to these 11 teachers.

Lastly, question 5 asked, “Is there anything else you would like to tell us that could help us when designing future studies that use the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener?” 31 teachers responded to question 5, while 18 skipped the question. Of those who replied (n = 31), many said simplify the directions and make the Haberman website easier to navigate.

We learned from this follow-up survey that we may have had a larger sample size for this study if the process for having teachers complete the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener were more seamless. While this is a limitation that was imposed on us as a research group, future researchers who wish to use the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener in their research may consider building teachers’ accounts for them ahead of time, and providing teachers with log-in information for sake of ease.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Principal Preparation Programs would be strengthened by training higher education faculty members on how to use the Haberman STAR Teacher Live Interview. One of the most important functions of the school principal is to identify, recruit, and hire the very best teachers for his/her school; therefore, school principals would benefit from this training because they would be able to hire those teachers who display desirable dispositions.

This practice has been adopted by many PK-12 school districts across the United States. A notable example is seen in Houston, Texas. The Houston Independent School District (HISD) largely credits the Haberman STAR Teacher Pre-Screener for why its school district received the 2013 Broad Prize and $550,000 in school scholarships (R. Watson, personal communication, July 16, 2014). The research presented in this white paper has led to a 2015 Institute of Education Sciences (IES) $1.59 million research grant application. We believe that the study we carried out in Chicago will be a seedbed for future research that will and can be carried out in other large urban and metropolitan cities across our nation.
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Supplemental Survey Instrument

1. What is your name?
2. What is your e-mail address?
3. Did you attend Illinois State University?
4. When did you complete your teacher preparation at Illinois State University?
5. What type of teaching license do you currently hold?
6. What grade level(s) are you licensed to teach?
7. Which endorsements/certifications do you currently hold?
8. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 7 being ‘strongly agree,’ rate your level of agreement with the following statement: My credentials and educational background have improved my teaching and my students’ learning.
9. What teacher preparation program did you complete at Illinois State University?
10. When did you begin your studies at Illinois State University (YYYY)?
11. When did you complete your teacher preparation studies with Illinois State University (YYYY)?
12. What degree(s) did you receive from Illinois State University?
13. Did you live at home while completing your student teaching?
14. While student teaching, did you live within the school’s community?
15. How many clinical experiences (including field trips) did you take to Chicago Public Schools while you were a student at Illinois State University? a. If these trips were part of a redesigned course/program, please list the course(s).
16. Did you participate in any of the following mentorship programs as a teacher in Chicago Public Schools (in-house/school sponsored, CNTC, Golden Apple, Illinois State University/Pipeline Mentoring Program, Other, None)?
17. Did you complete your student teaching in the Chicago Public School District?
   a. If no, where did you student teach?
18. If yes, did you complete any of the following programs (PDS, TST, Other)?
19. For your student teaching placement in Chicago Public Schools, what was the name of the school at which you were principally placed and what grade level(s) did you student teach?
20. What was the classification of the school where you completed your student teaching?
21. If your school is selective enrollment, which if the following categories best fits your school (Classical, Regional Gifted Center, International Gifted, Academic Center, High School, High School with International Baccalaureate Program, Charter, Contract, Other)?
22. Did you participate in any projects/programs with the Chicago Teacher Education Pipeline or related urban teaching initiatives as a student at Illinois State University?
23. Did you ever live in Chicago for 3 or more weeks during your time as an Illinois State University student (through STEP-UP, student teaching/PDS, etc.)? a. If Yes, in what community did you reside (Little Village, Auburn Gresham, etc.)?
24. On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being ‘poor’ and 5 being ‘excellent,’ how well do you feel Illinois State University prepared you for teaching in Chicago Public Schools?
25. Please explain your rating for the question above.
26. What grade level(s) are you currently teaching?
27. What subject(s) are you currently teaching?
   a. If Special Education/Support Services, which subjects are your focus within special education/support services?
28. With what other grade(s) and discipline area(s) do you have prior PK-12 CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE? Classroom Experience includes formal full-time experience as a PK-12 teacher.
29. With what other grade(s) and discipline area(s) do you have prior PK-12 TEACHING EXPERIENCE? Teaching Experience includes times an individual is in both formal and informal settings that provide exposure to teaching methods, curriculum, and classroom climates by interacting among peers and with pre-service and in-service teachers as well as with teacher educators. The experience may include children, youth, or adults.
30. Are you currently employed in Chicago Public Schools?
31. What type of teaching position do you currently hold?
32. At what Chicago Public School(s) are you currently employed?
33. What grade levels does your school offer?
34. What is the classification of your school?
35. If your school is selective enrollment, which if the following categories best fits your school (Classical, Regional Gifted Center, International Gifted, Academic Center, High School, High School with International Baccalaureate Program, Charter, Contract, Other)?
36. When were you hired by the Chicago Public School District? (YYYY)
37. What is your birth date?
38. Write in how many years of formal PK-12 CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE you have. This refers to complete school years. Classroom Experience includes formal full-time experience as a PK-12 teacher.
39. Is your school unionized?
40. How would you describe the socioeconomic makeup of your school?
41. Why did you seek employment in Chicago Public Schools?
42. Do you currently hold National Board Certification? a. If Yes, in what year was it completed? (YYYY)
43. Please rate your agreement with the following items (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Neutral, Slightly Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree): a. I will be teaching 5 years from now.
44. How long do you plan to be a classroom teacher?
45. What is your gender?
46. Please select your race/ethnicity.
47. Are you a native English speaker? a. If no, what is your primary native language?
48. Are you proficient in any language(s) other than English? a. If Yes, please specify the language(s).
49. Please select the highest level of education you have completed.
50. Are you currently completing coursework for another degree or certification area? a. If yes, please specify for what degree/certification and what college/university.
Nicholas D. Hartlep, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations at Illinois State University in Normal, IL. He teaches courses on multicultural education, social and cultural foundations of education, and the model minority stereotype. Hartlep received his Ph.D. in Urban Education (Social Foundations of Education) in 2012 at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee from the Urban Education Doctoral Program (UEDP). During his doctoral studies, he was awarded several awards and an Advanced Opportunity Program (AOP) Fellowship. He has published numerous peer-reviewed articles, books, book chapters, edited volumes, and conference papers on the topics of urban education, Asian Americans, the “model minority stereotype,” and critiques of whiteness and neoliberalism. He is the author of two books on the “model minority” stereotype: *The Model Minority Stereotype: Demystifying Asian American Success* (Information Age Publishing) and *The Model Minority Stereotype Reader: Critical and Challenging Readings for the 21st Century* (Cognella Publishing), and the co-editor of *Unhooking from Whiteness: The Key to Dismantling Racism in the United States* (Sense Publishers). Hartlep is a National Trainer for the Haberman Educational Foundation (HEF).

Sara A. McCubbins, M.S., is a doctoral student in the School for Teaching and Learning at Illinois State University. She received her M.S. in Chemistry Education at Illinois State University and holds a teaching certificate for secondary science and English, as well as middle level science and language arts. She has published numerous books on topics relating to interdisciplinary project-based curriculum and performance-assessment based curriculum. Her interests include informal learning environments, curriculum development, professional development for teachers, university and community outreach, and student attitudes towards science.

Christopher M. Hansen, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Literacy Education at Illinois State University. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Georgia in language and literacy education with an emphasis on social justice issues in the elementary school. Christopher has presented at numerous national and international education research conferences on pre- and in-service teacher preparation, gender study of teachers, teacher dispositions, and qualitative methodology.

Guy J. Banicki, Ed.D., is an Assistant Professor of Educational Administration. Dr. Banicki has served in public education for 35 years as teacher, principal, and superintendent. He has been Adjunct Professor at Eastern Illinois University and Northern Illinois University. He received a Certificate of Advanced Studies in School Business Management and specializes in School Finance, the Superintendency, and Community Engagement.

Grant B. Morgan, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology at Baylor University. He earned a Ph.D. from the University of South Carolina in education research and measurement with emphasis in advanced quantitative methods. Grant has published numerous methodological studies on the use of multilevel, mixture models, and factor analytic models in peer-reviewed journals. Although his primary research interests are methodological in nature, Grant frequently collaborates with scholars across disciplines, which has included urban education, music education, healthcare management, and post-secondary student success.