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How does a principal, a site-based hiring team, or others responsible for staffing the school know who will best be able to reach the children who are at-risk, difficult to motivate, and challenging to teach? Basing teacher selection on research gives helpful guidance, however, to this difficult dilemma. The Haberman Star Teacher Selection Interview has been shown to discover the teachers who will succeed in increasing student achievement, who will stay longer, and do a better job. Moreover, this research-based interview, demonstrating a 97% accuracy, takes only about 30 minutes to perform. It is helpful in increasing teacher quality and decreasing the likelihood of time-consuming and expensive litigation should teachers perform poorly. In addition to technical expertise in teacher selection, the interview provides in-depth orientation pedagogies effective with at-risk students.
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Over the past forty years Martin Haberman has developed more teacher education programs which have prepared more teachers for children in poverty than anyone in the history of American education. The most widely known of his programs was The National Teachers Corps, which was based on his intern program in Milwaukee. He is an advisor to alternative certification programs around the country and has developed effective ways of bringing more minorities into teaching. His interview for selecting teachers and principals who will be successful with children in poverty is used in 130 cities throughout the country. 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" carefully selected teachers and principals.

Professor Haberman grew up in New York City. His formal education includes bachelors and masters degrees in sociology from Brooklyn College and New York University. These were followed with a second masters and a doctorate in Education from Teachers College, Columbia University. Rhode Island College (1989) and the State University of New York (2001) have awarded him Honorary Doctorates of Human Letters.

In addition to an extremely long list of publications (8 books, 50 chapters, 200 articles and papers) and numerous research studies, Professor Haberman served six years as the Editor of the Journal of Teacher Education, and eleven years as a dean in the University of Wisconsin trying to apply the successes of extension in rural America to the problems of life in urban areas.

Professor Haberman has served on eleven editorial boards. He holds several awards for his writing, a Standard Oil Award for Excellence in Teaching, a special award from The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and AACTE Medals for offering a Hunt Lecture as well as the Pomeroy Award. He is a Distinguished Member of the Association of Teacher Education and a Laureate of Kappa Delta Pi. The University of Wisconsin Board of Regents has named him a Distinguished Professor. His book, Star Teachers of Children in Poverty, is in continued demand. His latest book is Star Principals of Schools Serving Children in Poverty.
HISTORY OF THE INTERVIEW

Between 1958 and 1961 as part of my work supervising student teachers in a fifth year masters level program offered by Teachers College, Columbia in the Harlem schools of New York City, I reached the following conclusions:

1. Teacher education is not a generic process. The preparation of teachers for urban, multi-cultural schools is a distinctive enterprise.

2. Mature college graduates who are adults with work and life experiences are more likely to be successful in urban schools than traditional students in undergraduate programs.

3. Selection is significantly more important than training. It is easier and wiser to select people with attributes that will enable them to succeed in metropolitan schools, than it is to expect that individuals who might be sexist, racist, uncreative, uninterested in the world of ideas, rigid, moralistic, humorless, or fearful will be transformed by virtue of completing a traditional teacher education program.

4. Urban teacher preparation actually occurs in schools, with children, while functioning in the role of teacher with the help of a coach or mentor and not as an undergraduate in a generic teacher education program.

5. Since exceedingly few college faculties have ever taught in urban, multi-cultural schools, the best teacher educators are practicing classroom teachers who are effective with urban children and youth.

During this period I thoroughly reviewed the literature related to the MMPI (Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory) as well as other personality tests. Two of my mentors at the time were Irving Lorge and Robert Thorndike who helped me see that written tests of personality could not predict who would be an effective teacher and that it was conceptually not reasonable to expect personality dimensions to remain constant across different school situations. Previously, A.S. Barr and his doctoral students at the University of Wisconsin in Madison in the 1930s and 1940s had also attempted to identify universal teacher attributes that would predict success but they could not, except in general terms, relate teacher traits to pupil outcomes. By 1960 David G. Ryan of the University of Texas had captured the imagination of teacher educators with his exhaustive analysis of what makes a good teacher. Ryan’s conclusions were stated as personal characteristics such as humor, enthusiasm, creativity, etc., which not only reflected personality dimensions but which began to relate to the work of the teacher. But the issue remained: Are these teacher characteristics which can be reasonably taught to large numbers of undergraduates in teacher education programs, or is it more reasonable to select and prepare individuals already predisposed to manifest these characteristics?

At the same time Robert K. Merton presented a sociological analysis of professions in which he put forward the concept of mid-range functions. In Figure 1, I have applied this concept to the task of predicting traits that individuals can be expected to demonstrate regardless of the situations in which they are placed. At the other extreme (right) are the situational demands of teaching as it is practiced in a specific school or institution. Merton argued that both extremes were dysfunctional. It is not possible to generalize from personality dimensions to how individuals will behave across the range of school situations they may encounter. We all know “shy” aggressive,” and other types of teachers who might be successful in some schools but not others. At the other extreme, it is also useless to attempt to specify the precise behaviors required of effective teachers in a given situation. For example, the State of Wisconsin has officially recognized 227 effective teacher behaviors and many more might be generated if specific situations were fully examined.

To negotiate between these extremes Merton advocated that each profession develop mid-range functions; that is, cluster, chunks, or groups of behaviors that particular practitioners must demonstrate in order to be effective. These are relatively small in number and while they manifest an individual’s personality, they are sufficiently behavioral so that observers can identify what effective teachers do.
Figure 1. BASES FOR PREDICTING TEACHER SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY TRAITS</th>
<th>SITUATIONAL DEMANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(What are effective, constant teacher characteristics?)</td>
<td>Mid Range Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(What behaviors would be effective for all teachers in a given situation?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifying the Mid-Range Functions

Observing 124 student teachers over a three year period in New York City schools (1958-1961) enabled me to identify 18 "Stars" and 14 "Failures". "Stars" were those individuals defined by all supervisors and cooperating teachers as equal or better in performance than satisfactory, experienced teachers after only the first few weeks of their teaching. "Failures" were those who all others (cooperating principals, teachers, and college supervisors) agreed should not be teaching and who screened themselves out of teaching. By comparing these extremes, eight mid-range functions were identified: organizational skills, stamina, creativity, human relations, planning, discipline, teaching, and staff analysis. Comparing the performance of these functions seemed to account for the difference between "Stars" and "Failures."

In 1962 I began to further refine the process of identifying mid-range teacher functions and trying to translate them into questions that might be used in selection interviews. If we could identify potential success in urban teaching by using an interview, much time and effort might be saved and much inconvenience might be avoided. Individuals with high potential for urban teaching and with satisfactory undergraduate GPAs, might be screened out. Most of all, children and youth would not have their time wasted. In the traditional situation of utilizing inappropriate selection criteria, children and youth are, in effect, used as the screening mechanism. Once an individual has an appropriate skills level (approximately 8th grade reading and math levels are required in most states) and a satisfactory GPA in university study, there is little further screening until the actual failure with children and youth. Fifty percent of beginning teachers fail or quit in their first 5 years of urban teaching. In some cities this turnover occurs in 3 years. As a result of this non-system of selection, it is children and youth who serve as the actual selection process. Because GPA, skills tests, grades in student teaching, and personal references are the typical selection criteria currently in use and because these criteria do not predict effectiveness in urban schools, we have a revolving door for beginning teachers in urban districts. Children and youth most in need of greater stability in their lives are most likely to experience the most teacher turnover.

The first selection interviews were conducted in Milwaukee in 1962. I had been asked to develop a fifth year intern program for liberal arts graduates to become teachers in the Milwaukee Public Schools. The model we developed became the National Teacher Corps in 1965. In these 3 years (1962-1965) 108 interns were admitted and followed through their first year of teacher practice. In this period we refined interview questions to more accurately reflect mid-range functions that distinguished between outstanding teachers and failures. We evaluated the interview instrument by checking our initial predictions against how interns actually performed in their subsequent teaching. In this three year period the interview was a research tool for evaluating predictions and not actually used to screen people in or out of the program. The 108 admitted (on traditional criteria) were then ranked by two interviewers in terms of how well they did on our interview. The following scheme was used to categorize our predictions.

Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of "before" assessments based on our interview against "after" evaluations based on actual teaching performance can be seen in figure 3.
Figure 3. Comparison of Original Intern Interviews with Actual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our operational definition of an error was the following:

1. Assessing any individual as any category other than Failure on the interview who subsequently fails as a teacher.
2. Assessing any individual as a Failure who subsequently achieves any higher level in teaching practice.
3. Misplacing a candidate by more than one category. This means that a person assessed as a Star who proved to be High would not be considered an error unless he proved to be Average and vice versa.

*Defining these mis-assignments as mistakes we made 3 errors on the first 108 candidates interviewed.*

"Performance" was operationally defined as the sum of the evaluations of those who had actually observed and supervised the interns, i.e., the cooperating teachers, principals, and college supervisors. The self evaluations of interns were also considered.

Beginning in 1966 the Urban Teacher Selection Interview was used to select college graduates for the Milwaukee Intern Teaching Program. At the time of the program's termination in 1973 approximately 1,500 interns had completed the interview and the program.

Interviews were always conducted by two professionals: one faculty member representing the School of Education of UV-Milwaukee and one representative of the Milwaukee Public Schools, usually a central office supervisor. During this period several classroom teachers who served as cooperating teachers were also trained to conduct the interview and to serve on the two-person interview teams.

In the eleven years the program was operational there were five different Directors who utilized different pairs of individuals to conduct these selection interviews. *In every year Directors reported less than a 5 percent error between prediction and performance.*

The Chicago Trials

In 1966, the Great Cities Research Council was comprised of fifteen great cities each represented by its Superintendent of Schools and the Dean of the School of Education of a major teacher preparing institution in each of the cities. Superintendents frequently invited their deputies to represent them at these meetings and Deans were sometimes represented by a designated faculty member. At that time, Milwaukee was the thirteenth largest school system and I attended these meetings as a representative of the UWM School of Education. Evelyn Carlson was the Associate Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools and was also a frequent attendee. As is common during many periods, the Chicago Public Schools were short of regularly prepared, certified teachers. In 1966, approximately 1,000 college graduates without teacher preparation were hired and appointed on probationary licenses. With the help of Ms. Carlson, I followed-up this population. In May of 1967 there were only 167 of these individuals still teaching. We interviewed this population and discovered that they had not all survived their first year on the job (with no special help or supervision) because they were particularly effective. Indeed, most of them were "strong, insensitves.” Comparing our interview against the ratings of supervisors we found less than a 5 percent error.
Figure 4. PREDICTING THE SUCCESS OF CHICAGO FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS WITHOUT TEACHER PREPARATION (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modifications in Questions

At this point it would be useful to review the nature of the interview questions and how they were transformed and refined as a result of the numerous trials. First, it must be recognized that seven of the most critical Mid-range Functions have never been utilized in the interview because we have never been able to develop questions which adequately assess or predict their manifestation in subsequent practice; these are organizational skills, stamina, commitment to teaching, focus on effort, ability to coach, acceptance of “problem” students, and motivational ability.

The complete description of these functions is in Star Teachers of Children in Poverty (Kappa Delta Pi, West Lafayette, IN 1995). A summary of these functions is in “Selecting Star Teachers for Children and Youth in Poverty,” Kappan, June 1995.

In over thirty-five years of comparing Stars and Failures two truths have remained constant. First, there are no Mid-range Functions more critical to the success of an urban teacher than organizational skills and emotional/physical strength. Second, there are no ways we have ever devised which will enable us to interview individuals and predict their organizational skills and stamina. These functions seem to be beyond our ability to create interview questions. Fortunately, there are seven other Mid-range Functions for which interview questions have been developed and refined and which do predict subsequent success in urban teaching. Following is a brief review of how the original Mid-range Functions were clarified and refined as a consequence of the iterative process.

Creativity was originally used to describe the first Mid-range Function. We soon realized that successful teachers demonstrated more than alternative-seeking behavior. They were manifesting problem solving skills; the ability to define and evaluate as well as the ability to generate options. After a few years we realized that we were also seeing teachers demonstrate these functions with tenacity and commitment. In recent years we have used the term “Persistence” to denote both the creative and problem solving functions and to emphasize that the work of the teacher requires their continuous application. As used in our interview therefore “Persistence” refers to the total process of continually seeking solutions to never-ending problems.

The second Mid-range Function was originally identified as human relations skills and referred to the effective teacher’s ability to get along with other adults, colleagues, and administrators in the school setting. Through subsequent trials this skill was refined further since substantial numbers of Failures were sometimes liked by other adults. The critical dimension here is not popularity or getting along “but how effective teachers protect their pupils right to learn in situations which may be contrary to school rules or norms.” This Mid-range Function is particularly relevant in urban schools which are highly bureaucratic and overly organized. To better pinpoint the function the term became clarified as “Protecting Students Learning” since it refers to the effective teacher’s willingness to support student learning in the face of or even against school policy. The third Mid-range Function refers to the effective teacher’s ability to apply generalizations about teaching, learning, and development to his/her particular classroom. Originally, this function was termed “planning but by the iterative process of trial and re trial it soon became clear that what
was meant was beyond traditional notions of teacher planning. Successful teachers were consistently distinguishable from failures by their ability to apply principles to practice, or to generalize from their practice about the principles they were demonstrating.

The fourth Mid-range Function evolved into two parts. Originally labeled discipline, it soon became evident that what was meant was the effective teachers ability to not blame the victim and accept accountability for teaching all children. At the same time effective urban teachers realize they cannot love every pupil but are still responsible for teaching even the less lovable and especially the unlovable.

The fifth function was originally termed "teaming," then "bureaucracy," and finally "burnout." This evolution refers to the continuing distinction between Stars and Failures to explain and act on their perception of the causes and cures of low teacher morale.

The final function was originally termed self-analysis. This has evolved into fallibility to more adequately account for both the ability to study ones behavior and motives and to recognize and accept oneself and others as human beings.

In sum, the actual Mid-range Functions have not changed. The original distinctions between Stars and Failures have remained constant. What has been refined through the numerous trials and validations of the interview over the years have been the terms used to identify the Mid-range Functions and the questions used in the Interview to get at these functions. Figure 5 summarizes the original and current terms used to denote the seven components of the Interview. The interview document itself and its accompanying procedures of administration further clarify this development.

For a more complete explanation of the Mid-range Functions, see "Interview Questions to Accompany the STAR Teacher Selection Interview Contina" and the "STAR Teacher Selection Interview" itself.

**Figure 5. ORIGINAL AND CURRENT TERMS FOR IDENTIFYING MID-RANGE FUNCTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Creativity, Problem Solving</td>
<td>I. Persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Human Relations Skills</td>
<td>II. Response to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Planning</td>
<td>III. Application of Generalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Discipline</td>
<td>IV. Approach to At-Risk Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Teaming</td>
<td>V. Personal/Professional Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Self-analysis</td>
<td>VI. Burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>VII. Fallibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring**

The interview is not scored by assigning points. Each interviewer places an X on each of the seven continua. At the completion of no more than three interviews both interviewers discuss and agree upon a ranking of the three candidates. The candidates are not only ranked but assigned a category (Star, High, Average, Failure as in Figure 1). Each subsequent set of three interviews requires the interviewers to fit the additional 3 candidates into the total rank order and to place each candidate in a category. Both the ranking and categorization of candidates is done by discussion and mutual agreement between the two interviewers. If the interviewers agree that a candidate goes off the extreme left of any continuum on any one of the seven functions the candidate is considered to have failed. The seven functions are divided into two subparts yielding a total of 14 continua. Each candidate must therefore avoid being rated on the extreme left end of any continuum on all fourteen subparts. Again, the basis of this procedure is the teaching behavior of successful Stars as that behavior is distinguishable from Failures. The "right" answers come from star teachers, the "wrong" ones from failures. It is easy (and appealing) for readers to simply "feel" or "believe" that they agree or disagree with these functions and overlook the basis of their derivation.
More Recent Developments

Urban school districts, particularly those in states with alternative certification, have used the interview to help select college graduates without teacher training as beginning teachers. This is the population and purpose for which the interview was developed and its most appropriate use. In some cities candidates selected as teachers also have coaches or mentors to help them and in some places there is also supporting coursework. In many cities both on-site coaches and some classes are offered to beginners. So long as the individual being interviewed is a college graduate and the teaching position subsequently performed is in an urban school serving poverty students, the interview is being used with the population and for the purpose it was developed.

Teacher educators in traditional university teacher education programs have long sought to apply this instrument to the prediction of success in student teaching in urban schools with undergraduates. I resisted this pressure for many years because student teaching seems to me to be an inadequate criterion of effectiveness. It is possible for a poor, even inadequate student teacher to appear better than s/he really is because the classroom is actually set up and managed by someone else—a cooperating teacher. It is, in effect, not a fair test of the student teacher and therefore an inadequate criterion for judging the interviews ability to predict success. A second reason for my reluctance is the relative ease of the student teaching experience when compared to the extraordinary pressure on a beginning urban teacher of children in poverty. Thus far, only universities with special programs preparing urban teachers use the interview.

I first used the instrument to predict subsequent success in student teaching in fall 1985 with a group taught by Jack Stillman in the School of Education, UVU. At this point I began using Dr. Linda Post as my interviewing partner. We interviewed, categorized, and ranked 14 of them. Professor Stillman's personal judgement of how well the student teachers achieved was the criterion of "success." He ranked and categorized his students at the end of their student teaching. The results were as follows: we concurred on the single Failure; and disagreed slightly on the number of Stars. Our rankings were essentially identical with his categorization being somewhat higher; that is Stars, including Rank 4 and Highs, extended several ranks deeper into the list. Given the way errors in categorization are calculated, this trial was 100% accurate. I then undertook several subsequent trials with undergraduates in regular programs against the criterion of college supervisors' ratings of success in student teaching.

We also conducted two trials with student teachers in Exceptional Education. One group had 22 and a second 26. With the exception of one disagreement by interviewers, there was 100 percent prediction against the final evaluations of student teacher supervisors.

Continuing with Dr. Linda Post as my interviewing partner, we began a summer program in human relations training for undergraduates in University of Wisconsin System institutions. These students were required to take classes but, more importantly, to work in the summer schools of the Milwaukee Public Schools for six weeks. These were all undergraduates, mostly sophomores, having their first direct experiences as well as their first urban, multi-cultural experiences.

The criterion of success was the judgement of college supervisors regarding students' interactions with children during this six week period. In summer 1989, we ran a trial of 22 students. In 1990, we interviewed sixteen. In both cases there were minor differences between our initial ratings and subsequent practice. These differences merely refer to how deep into the rank order a particular category (i.e. Star, High, Average) went into the list in effect, the supervisors' ratings were somewhat higher than the initial interviewers in both years there was again 100% predictability between the initial interview and subsequent practice. This means, as errors in categorization are calculated, there were no Failures overlooked and no individuals whose categorization was miscalculated by more than one category.

Since 1985 there have been individuals and groups of student teachers who we have interviewed and compare against their subsequent student teaching success. In 1992, S.M. Ross and M. Baskin did a factor analysis validating the interview's ability to predict success in student teaching ("Selecting Teacher Candidates via Structured Interviews: A Validation Study of the Urban Teacher Selection Interview," Memphis State University).

Although we have been totally accurate in predicting their "success" these trials with student teachers are of little interest to me. I am not convinced that student teaching is a worthwhile criterion to use since the large number of student teachers who are judged to be "A" and who subsequently fail in urban schools is too large to ignore. The almost total dependence on the cooperating teacher, as well as the absence of accountability, makes student teaching a flawed model for preparing urban teachers.
Research Highlights

Over the past forty years there have been numerous doctoral dissertations validating the interview. One of the earliest was Predicting Classroom Behavior of Urban Teacher Candidates Through the Use of a Classroom Behavior Task by R.J. Lesniak, University of Syracuse Ph.D. dissertation, June 1969. Another of these was Utility of the Modified Haberman Interview in Higher Education, a PhD. dissertation by Col. Rebecca St. Storey, University of Texas. Two other doctoral dissertations have demonstrated that the interview predicts which teachers will escalate or de-escalate student misbehavior. (Fred Cheseik 1999, Mary Fostia 2000, both at Loyola University Chicago.) Two other doctoral dissertations (Leslie Teske at UCLA 1995 and Sueanne McKinney at Old Dominion University, Virginia 2001) support the stability of the functions and their strong resistance to traditional college courses and experiences.

The basic process by which the interview is validated is by each school district following its new hires into practice. First year performance is then compared to answers and scores on the interviews. In some districts, first year performance is evaluated by principals, ratings, or questionnaires; in other districts, student achievement data are used. At all instances, teachers selected by the interview have been as effective as other first year teachers or more effective even if they have had no teacher training. Where the interview has been used to select experienced regularly certified, traditionally prepared teachers, those selected by the interview have been rated as more effective than new hires selected by other means.

The research and evaluation of the instrument is an ongoing process in districts using the interview. There are now whole schools where all the teachers were selected by the interview, e.g. Buffalo, N.Y., Spring Branch, Texas. In these cases, the achievement levels have moved from unacceptable levels to among the highest in the district. In effect, selecting effective teachers is a reform strategy if the teachers are grouped into the same school.

1994 Training

1. Uvalde, TX March 23
2. Washington, DC April 20
3. Region XIII June 9
4. Minneapolis, MN June 27
5. Region X October 11
6. Region IV November 14

1995 Training

1. Minneapolis, MN February 9
2. Sacramento, CA March 10
3. Irvine, CA March 11
4. Uni. S. Florida, Tampa July
5. Browningville, TX November 17
6. Minneapolis, MN December 7
7. Uvalde, TX 1995
8. Irving, TX 1995
9. Region XX 1995
10. Newark, NJ 1995
11. CA. Teacher Cred. 1995

1996 Training

1. Washington, DC January 20
2. San Diego, CA January 25
3. Conroe, TX February 16
4. Las Vegas, NV March 18
5. Rochester, NY March 21
6. Spring Branch, TX May 7
7. Newark, NJ June 1
8. Sacramento, CA July 19
9. Uvalde, TX July 30
10. Poughkeepsie, NY September 10

1997 Training

1. Tampa, FL January
2. Orlando, FL January 14
3. Las Vegas, NV March 18
4. Tampa, FL March 21
5. Plainview, TX April 7
6. Rochester, NY April 28
7. Orlando, FL June 10
8. Exton, PA June 17
9. Wichita, KS September 16
10. Rochester, NY October 19
11. San Juan, CA October 19
12. San Francisco, CA November 3
13. Tampa, FL November 13
14. Washington, DC December 5
15. San Francisco, CA December 12

1998 Training

1. San Francisco, CA January 4/15/16
2. Minneapolis, MN March 19
3. San Francisco, CA March 12
4. Washington, DC May 1
5. Poughkeepsie, NY June 9/10
6. Jacksonville, FL July 7/8
7. Cobb County, GA July 17
8. Rochester, NY August 19
9. Sacramento, CA October 7
10. Tampa, FL October 19
11. Spring Branch, TX October 23
12. Houston, TX October 28/29
13. Long Beach, CA November 9
14. Region X, TX November 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999 Training</th>
<th>2001 Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>January 5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Washington, DC</td>
<td>January 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wichita Falls, TX</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Galveston, TX</td>
<td>February 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. West Contra Costa, CA</td>
<td>February 8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Elkhart, IN</td>
<td>February 22/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Yonkers, NY</td>
<td>March 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>March 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Washington, DC</td>
<td>March 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>March 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wissahickon, PA</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>April 17-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Galveston, TX</td>
<td>May 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>May 25/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>June 22/23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cal State Teach, CA</td>
<td>June 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Washington, DC</td>
<td>July 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Washington, DC</td>
<td>July 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Washington, DC</td>
<td>October 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>November 1/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Kilgore, TX</td>
<td>November 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Rochester, NY</td>
<td>November 17/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Philadelphia</td>
<td>December 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 Training</th>
<th>2001 Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UT Arlington</td>
<td>January 20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>January 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Littleton, CO</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UC Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>February 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Governor State Univ</td>
<td>February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>February 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>March 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. E. Lansing, MI</td>
<td>March 8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Greenfield, CA</td>
<td>March 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Albany, NY</td>
<td>April 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Albion, MI</td>
<td>April 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Omaha, NB</td>
<td>May 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fullerton, CA</td>
<td>June 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Spring Branch, TX</td>
<td>June 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Principal Acad.</td>
<td>July 17/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>August 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>August 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Washington, DC</td>
<td>August 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Kilgore, TX</td>
<td>September 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Chicago Heights, IL</td>
<td>October 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Englewood, OH</td>
<td>October 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Harris County, TX</td>
<td>October 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>November 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Huston Tillotson Coll</td>
<td>November 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>November 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Washington, DC</td>
<td>November 27/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Washington, DC</td>
<td>December 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Saginaw</td>
<td>December 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical reports, published articles, and papers regarding the use and evaluation of the interview are available upon request from The Haberman Educational Foundation, 4018 Martinshire, Houston, Texas 77025.
RELIABILITY STUDIES

Reliability of Instrument

Using the previous interview score as the criterion there is a predictive reliability for all those who are re-interviewed of $r + 93$

Applicants interviewed a second time (or more frequently) will pass or fail the interview, again there are no differences in the reliability of those re-interviewed based on sex, age or ethnicity.

Reliability of Interview Teams

The interviewers become reliable after six joint interviews: that is, each will score an interview within four points (out of a possible 45 perfect total score) in 80% of the cases. After six joint interviews the interviewers will pass (or fail) the same applicants in 95% of the cases.

Content Validity

The instrument was developed by identifying factors which discriminate between quitters/failures and stars. "Quitters/failures" are those who have left urban teaching with unsatisfactory ratings from supervisors or who describe themselves as unable to continue teaching. "Stars" are urban teachers identified as such by principals, other teachers, students and themselves. The level at which discriminating factors were accepted in developing the instrument was total: that is, the number of failure/quitters who passed the interview was zero. The number of stars who passed was 100%. Since 1962 groups of stars and quitter/failures have been periodically tested to validate this level of discrimination. No changes have been made in the seven factors.

Criterion Related Validity

Any test or scale may have a number of validity and reliability coefficients depending on how, when, where and by whom it is used. Each city using the interview keeps its own records and compares respondents' initial interview scores (prediction) against school principals' ratings in subsequent teaching practice. Those who pass the interview with any score (that is they avoid a zero on all seven factors) are rated satisfactory or higher by school principals 95% of the time. Another way to state this is that when the instrument is correctly administered by trained interviewers there is a 5% or 1 in 20 chance of hiring a quitter/failure.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Variations in respondents' scores can be predicted because five of the seven factors on the interview can each be readily observed in teachers' practice. The most powerful predictors of respondents' success and its cumulated explanation of the variation in scores is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Item</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Cumulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minority Sub-groups

No significant differences between male and female respondents in pass/fail rate. No differences in the distribution of their scores.

Age does discriminate.

1 out of 10 respondents under 25 pass.

1 out of 3 respondents over 30 pass.

(This is a statistically significant difference.)

Ethnicity

60% of African Americans pass the interview

51% of European Americans pass the interview

(This is not a statistically significant difference.)

Southeast Asian, Hispanic and other culture groups have been specifically tested to determine possible test bias. None has ever been identified: that is, knowing ethnicity in advance (unlike age) will not enable one to predict the pass rate.

Retention

This has been followed in Milwaukee for eight years (and in other cities for varying duration's.)

Milwaukee Eight Year Study

137 - Followed up

3 - Teaching elsewhere

2 - Unknown

1 - Deceased

113 - Classroom teachers

18 - Asst. principals/supervisory

* Retention rate in district = 95%

This retention rate compares with a turnover rate among those hired without the interview of 50% who leave within a three year period.

Legal Validation

In Rodriguez vs. The Chicago Board of Education (1996) a jury trial held that the interview was a valid instrument which the Chicago Schools had a right to use. The decision in the case was that the schools acted unfairly by ignoring the interview results in the hiring of a teacher.
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ’s)
ABOUT THE HABERMAN SELECTION INTERVIEW PROCESS

Zeros

• What do I do when someone scores a zero (“silver bullet”)?
  If you hear a zero, probe three times. Do not lead the candidate; rather, reflect what they said
  back to them (Rogerian style) in order to be sure you have their thinking if you as an interviewer
  neglect to probe three times, you must put them on the scale at 0.5.

• If a candidate scores a zero, should I continue the interview?
  Yes. For reasons of propriety, liability and courtesy, you should give all candidates interviews of
  approximately the same length. And while it rarely happens, it is also possible that even after
  three probes, a candidate will inch on the scale of one question while answering another.

• If a person fails a question, do I have to finish the interview?
  Yes, because it would not be comfortable for one applicant to have a 5-minute interview and
  another to have a 25 minute interview. For fairness as well as legal reasons, it is a good idea to
  complete the whole interview with every candidate.

• Does one zero fail an applicant?
  One zero in any of the 14 questions fails an applicant, but you must remember to probe three
  times. If you neglectfully forget to probe, you must give the candidate a .5 on the scale.

Number Of Interviewers

• Can I interview alone or should there be a group of people interviewing?
  While a group is not necessary, Dr. Haberman strongly recommends interviewing in pairs. This
  promotes Interrater reliability, helps interviewers recall details of the training, builds consensus for
  candidates and prevents “your work against mine” type of challenges. Scores may vary as much
  as one full point and can be averaged. Careful note-taking during the interview by one or both
  interviewers increases interview accuracy.

Trainer Of Trainers

• Am I now certified to train others in the interview?
  No. The HABERMAN INTERVIEW PROCESS is taught only by certified trainers. The
  Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc. does NOT provide a Train the Trainer Model.
(FAQs - Continued)

Professional Agreement

- Am I now certified to train others in the interview?
  The professional agreement signifies that you will not coach others how to pass the interview; you will not reveal the questions to or discuss questions with individuals who have not been trained and you will not modify the instrument, which is well researched. We urge you, however, to discuss the interview with others who have been trained, to practice and consult with one another and delve into written background materials in order to strengthen your understanding and level of competence in giving the interview. Like most of what we do as teachers, interviewing takes practice!

Discrimination & Prejudice

- Does the instrument discriminate against subgroups or populations in any way?
  Data demonstrates that the interview does not discriminate unfairly against any ethnic or gender group. It may, however, identify individuals who are immature, unfamiliar with poverty or lack resilience.

- Is the Interview prejudiced against certain groups such as new college graduates, particularly minorities or gender groups?
  Data support that it is not. Individuals who pass the interview and who are stars tend to demonstrate character, maturity, and resilience regardless of age, background, or gender.

General

- How long does an interview take after I become accustomed to giving it?
  About 25 - 35 minutes or so on average.

- The Interview originated over concern for urban children. Does this mean it is helpful only for schools in urban centers?
  Extensive research verifies the effectiveness of the instrument for urban populations. However, training has occurred in rural and suburban centers and principals report excellent results. Recent literature about the interview call it a "star" teacher interview, and Haberman Educational Foundation leaders are now convinced that, because the at-risk population is growing and most children are at-risk in some way, every child could benefit from having a Haberman-screened "STAR" teacher-- those who demonstrate the qualities sought.
The Haberman Foundation was initiated in 1993 to continue the search for new and better ways to find excellent teachers and principals for the 15 million children and youth in America who live in poverty. Because these children have few, if any, choices regarding their future, it is critical that their teachers are carefully selected and trained for excellence. That is the mission of the Haberman Educational Foundation.

DELIA STAFFORD, President
The Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc.
The Star Teacher Selection Interview

The Star Teacher Selection Interview is the culmination of 30 years of research and development by Dr. Martin Haberman of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He has demonstrated that we can identify potentially successful multicultural teachers by using an interview process. Much time and effort can be saved and children's education need not be interrupted by teacher turnover.

Fifty percent of beginning teachers fail or quit in the first 3-5 years of teaching. GPA, skills tests, grades in student teaching and personal references are the typical selection criteria currently in use. These criteria do not predict effective classroom teaching in at-risk schools; thus we have a revolving door for teachers in difficult districts.

Thirty years of use, research, and development have produced The Star Teacher Selection Interview. Applicants’ scores on this instrument correlate highly with their success as first-year teachers in multicultural classrooms. Questions on the interview address seven teacher beliefs/characteristics or “mid-range functions”:

Mid-range functions include:
- Persistence
- Response to authority
- Application of generalizations
- Approach to at-risk students
- Personal/Professional orientation
- Burnout
- Fallibility

The seven functions are divided into two subparts yielding a profile of 14 characteristics and building a significant profile of teacher ideology, ability, and predispositions.

In addition to the services outlined in this brochure, The Haberman Educational Foundation maintains The National Center For Alternative Teacher Certification Information. Through the center, relevant information is accumulated and disseminated. We maintain data on State policies regarding ATC programs, listings of publications and books, our own newsletters, books and materials, provide grants to qualifying school districts, and a speakers bureau — all immediately available to you as a powerful advocacy tool. Call for additional information - (713) 667-6185.

Our Simple Vision:

"Providing children in poverty with principals and teachers of excellence."

...M. Haberman
Teaching Principals And Site-Based Teams How To Select Teachers Who Will Succeed with Children at Risk

Not All Children Are As Lucky As Ours.

For some children, school is the only chance they get for a genuine shot at the American dream. Their parents may not be able or willing to help at home; their may fight child abuse, alcoholism, drugs, environmental violence, or other "at-risk" factors. Yet, school can be a saving factor in these young lives if teachers are predisposed to think of their jobs as an opportunity to make a difference.

But how do we know if the teacher we are interviewing will try to make a difference? Have the skills and attitude to do so? Or do they just want a job?

The Haberman Star Teacher Interview is a day-long training event which teaches principals and site-based teams how to spot teachers who are "stars" with the children who are often difficult to teach and to spot those who will fail.

The day-long training consists of video-based instruction designed to acquaint principals with the ideology and "look-fors" of a 14-questions interview. The interview is 97% accurate in predicting which teachers will succeed and stay with at-risk youth and which will fail. The Haberman Educational Foundation is uniquely able to provide this training to school districts because of the in-depth knowledge HEF Foundation consultants have of Dr. Haberman’s Star Teachers of Children in Poverty (KDP 1995) and their frequent contact with the author.

Trainers Dill & Stafford are the only two trainers currently certified by the interview’s author to ensure a high quality training experience in a selection device that really works.

Why screen and select carefully? We don’t have enough applicants now!
- Selected teachers stay longer, avoiding expensive turnover
- Identifying stars and eliminating failures avoids costly "deselection" later
- Research shows little matters more than the teacher when it comes to raising test scores.

The Haberman Educational Foundation can be reached at:
1-800-667-6188 or at d.staff@iz.net.com or stillhome@mid nets.net

It matters what teachers believe. Star teachers base their attitudes, actions, and expectations on a set of beliefs and ideologies. It’s hard to be an excellent teacher of children in poverty, yet one good teacher can change the life of a poor child.

"Our simple vision: Finding teachers for children in poverty"
Alternative Certification of Teachers and Principals

In the mid-1980's, a series of national reforms in education led to the development of innovative procedures to attract capable leaders from business and industry into teaching. At present, 43 states provide routes to Alternative Certification of Teachers.

One of the major initiatives of The Haberman Educational Foundation is the development of mid-career and private teacher preparation programs using alternative teacher certification strategies. This initiative is implemented as follows:

- Building Alternative Certification Programs, start to finish for teachers and administrators
- Developing teacher training programs according to district needs
- Creating innovative certifications such as middle school, teaching at-risk students or students in poverty
- Structuring school district, regional and university based models
- Outlining certificate programs in special education, bilingual/ESL, mathematics, science, and English
- Detailing strategies to make the programs self-funding
- Rule making and implementation consultation
- Interpreting state and local certification procedures

Following an ATC route into the classroom, mid-career switchers from engineering, medicine, homemaking, carpentry, real estate, banking, and many other walks of life are doing what they can to "give back" to their society by renewing its youth. The Haberman Foundation seeks diligently to be an enabling force in achieving this goal.

Star Teacher Development Program

This exciting day-long workshop uses seven videotapes developed by The Association for Curriculum Development and Supervision, each exploring one midrange function of "star teachers" of children in poverty and at risk. Workshop leaders guide teachers already in classrooms toward thorough knowledge of the characteristics, beliefs, and ideologies of star teachers, encouraging reflection, renewal, and a better awareness of their own strengths and limitations.

Making learning meaningful, finding effective programs, raising test scores, and building relationships with students are all part of an effective teacher's activities. Undergirding all these daily tasks is a belief system that can be supported through professional development in the characteristics and ideologies of star teachers. This thought-provoking, powerful, day-long professional development event is the latest addition to the Haberman Educational Foundation's Star Training Series. Consultation is available for development of all facets of the program as well as all levels of certification that are specific to the needs of the school district.

Customized For Your District

The specialized training programs mentioned in this brochure are available in increments or modules the district chooses according to their specific needs. Modules of technical assistance may include: 1) Orientation and Program Planning; Candidate Selection, 2) Program Generation, and 3) Technical Assistance for Implementation.

The Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc. supports schools by offering training to district personnel and teacher educators. For more information complete and return this form.

Name ________________________________

Institution ________________________________

Address ________________________________

City __________________ State _____ Zip ______

Phone ________________________________

Indicate your specific interest:

☐ Star Teacher Selection Training
☐ Star Administrator Selection Training
☐ Alternative Certification Development Program
☐ Star Teacher Development Program
☐ ALTERNATIVE TEACHER CERTIFICATION: History, Handbook & How-To
MARTIN HABERMAN began his career as a teacher of preschool and elementary children. After receiving his doctorate in teacher education from Columbia University, he directed, codirected, or chaired a myriad of programs including the Yearlong Institute for Principals and Teachers Serving the Disadvantaged.

During the past 30 years, Dr. Haberman served as Editor of the Journal of Teacher Education and consultant to many public schools, universities, foundations, and associations. He has been instrumental in the preparation of films, television shows, and radio programs dealing with cultural pluralism and other important issues and innovations in education.

Dr. Haberman's extensive research, writing, and demonstration efforts have influenced certification laws in several states and selection procedures for numerous rural and urban school districts. Since 1972 he has received more than 15 special awards, including the Standard Oil Award for Excellence in College Teaching, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting Award for special service toward the advancement of public broadcasting, and the Pomeroy Award for Outstanding Contributions to Teacher Education.

The author of more than 12 major papers, 120 refereed articles, 20 curriculum projects, and numerous books, pamphlets, chapters, and monographs, Dr. Haberman is Distinguished Professor of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He is a member of the Laureate Chapter of Kappa Delta Pi.

Dr. Haberman has authorized Delia Stafford and Dr. Vicky Dill to be trainers for his interview processes. Working with Dr. Haberman over a decade has allowed the trainers to further the mission of The Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc.

VICKY DILL is Senior Researcher for The Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc. She has authored books on school violence, professional development, bilingual education, closing achievement gaps, school renewal, and alternative teacher certification. Dr. Dill lives in McPherson, Kansas.

DELIA STAFFORD is the President of The Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc. in Houston, Texas. Her research interests include urban education, teacher and administrator selection, alternative certification, and the education of youth at risk. For ten years she was Director of the largest alternative teacher certification program in the nation.

---

The National Center For Alternative Teacher Certification Information
at The HABERMAN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION
announces a new book!

Alternative Teacher Certification:
History, Handbook, & How-To

by VICKY DILL and DELIA STAFFORD

For many years leaders in the grassroots movement which generated numerous successful alternative teacher certification programs have been requesting a book which discusses all in one place the reasons why alternative teacher certification has been so successful. That book is now available.

For more information contact:

The Haberman Educational Foundation, Inc.
4018 Martinshire, Houston, TX 77025  (713) 667-6185 (tel. or fax)  vsdill@hotmail.com  d.staff@ix.netcom.com