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ABSTRACT

Thomas Allen Oestreich II

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE APPLITRACK TEACHERFIT HIRING SELECTION TOOL WHEN COMPARED WITH A TEACHER’S SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

Many scholars indicate that the hiring of teachers is one of the most vital tasks of a school district. This is because hiring the best candidates can be extremely impactful on student achievement. Utilizing data in all aspects of a school organization is taking on a more valuable role, as many states require reporting metrics on student achievement and teacher evaluation. The increasing cost of teacher turnover is presenting school districts with financial burdens as teacher retention is becoming a major issue for many school districts; especially urban school districts that may not receive as many applicants to their district. Moreover, with a teacher shortage facing school districts across the nation, it is critically important to hire the best teachers and avoid the costly teacher contract cancelation process when making a poor hire.

A screening tool such as the Applitrack TeacherFit can be of service to a school administrator responsible for hiring by examining behavior based characteristics measured by a research based teacher selection tool. The purpose of this study is to determine if the Applitrack TeacherFit selection assessment tool has a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation gathered for all new
teachers hired at an Indiana urban school district during the 2013-2014 school year. Overall results of this correlational study yielded a non-significant relationship between the TeacherFit selection tool and a teacher's summative evaluation; however, there were practical significant points shared in this study that can be beneficial to school districts when considering a teacher selection tool as part of their hiring process.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Many scholars indicate that the hiring of teachers is one of the most vital tasks for a school district (Ebmeier & Ng, 2006; Stronge & Tucker, 2000; Koenigsknecht, 2006; Pillsbury, 2005). This is because hiring the best candidates can be extremely impactful on student achievement (Stronge & Hindman, 2003; Donaldson, 2011; Clement, 2009; Shakrani, 2008; Goldhaber, Grout & Huntington-Klein, 2014; Grigsby, Schumacher & Vesey, 2012; Stronge, 2007; Jacob, 2012). Ingersoll (2004) notes that, “Few educational issues have received more attention in recent times than the problem of ensuring that our nation’s elementary and secondary classrooms are all staffed with quality teachers” (p.1).

As states require increased reporting metrics on student achievement and teacher evaluation, utilizing data in all aspects of a school organization is taking on a more valuable role (Coggshall, Lasagna & Laine, 2012). Data is also being utilized in the hiring process to assist school districts in staffing our classrooms with highly effective teachers. School districts are looking to add analytical steps in order to provide principals and those screening candidates for building level interviews an opportunity to have a tool in order to sift through the many teaching candidates that apply for a specific position (Sawchuck, 2011; Clement,
A school district may receive up to 300 or more applications for one elementary teaching position in a desirable school district. Often, these numerous applications are sorted alphabetically. If a candidate has a last name that begins with the letter, “T”, their application may never be viewed. Contrastingly, school districts that serve schools with high populations of poor, low achieving and minority students may have difficulties identifying quality candidates from a low applicant pool. (Barnes, Crow & Schaefer, 2007; Hanushek, Kain & Rivkin, 2004; Jacob, 2007). Therefore, the importance of having a hiring screening tool to sort and identify top candidates through the use of researched based metrics with teacher behavioral characteristics is essential for identifying the best teachers in an applicant pool.

A screening tool such as the Applitrack TeacherFit can be of service to a school administrator responsible for hiring. The Applitrack TeacherFit has been in existence since 2008 and approximately 300 school districts across the country use Applitrack TeacherFit. (Applitrack, 2015) “The TeacherFit tests identify applicants who possess the characteristics of teachers deemed “high performing” by both subject matter and research experts.” (Applitrack, 2015). Based upon a set of research based behavioral questions in the form of a likert scale, school administrators can access a screening report that is said to predict future teacher success up to 90% on applicants that score a 7, 8 or 9. The Applitrack TeacherFit assessment measures teacher qualities of (a)
Fairness and Respect, (b) Concern for Student Learning, (c) Adaptability, (d) Communication and Persuasion, (e) Planning and Organization, and (f) Cultural Competence. This assessment provides administrators with a score (1-9) for each characteristic as well as an overall score to use in making teacher-hiring decisions. The report can be easily accessed for administrators making teacher selection decisions and also suggests interview questions based upon a candidate’s score on the assessment. When sifting through the number of teacher applicants for a specific opening, the administrator can also easily sort the candidates by their overall TeacherFit score. The ease of identifying teacher applicants by their TeacherFit score allows administrators to sort through numerous qualified candidates. However, is it an effective measure of a candidate’s overall teaching ability when compared to the teacher’s summative evaluation?

The school district and teacher data referenced and utilized throughout this study is located in Marion County of Indianapolis, Indiana. The district serves over 11,000 students in grades kindergarten through twelve and the district employs over 1,600 employees including 742 teachers. The district is comprised of seven elementary schools, a developmental preschool, three middle schools, a career center and one large comprehensive high school. The district is diverse in many different ways through race, culture, socioeconomic status and religion. However, the diversity of the teaching staff does not similarly reflect the
diversity of the students and community as is mirrored in many other school communities across the county (Collins & Kritsonis, 2006). The breakdown in ethnicity of the students of this Indiana School district is as follows: 39.8% African-American; 30.3% White; 18.7% Hispanic; 7.4 Multiracial and 3.7% Asian. The district has 42.6% of its students on paid lunch, 51.2% on free lunch and 6.1% receiving reduced lunch. In 2013-2014 71.1% of the district’s students passed both portions of the state-wide assessment, ISTEP, while 73.6% of its students passed the ECA assessment at the high school level. This rich diversity of the students is valued among the community and is viewed as both a strength and challenge in the district. The urban setting and demographics of the school district make this a meaningful district to utilize in this study that can serve as a comparative model for future researchers.

**Statement of the Problem**

Hiring quality teachers can be a time consuming and expensive process; however, the cost of not hiring great teachers to a school district can cost schools extra time and money to move through the teacher contract cancellation process (Barnes, Crowe & Schaefer, 2007; Carroll, 2007). With metrics playing an increasingly critical role in all aspects of education, it is important to examine the effectiveness of such tools as districts strive to provide the best teachers for their students and communities. Moreover, the increasing cost of teacher turnover is
presenting school districts with financial burdens as teacher retention is
becoming a major issue for many school districts; especially urban
school districts that may not receive as many applicants to their district
(A. Jacob, 2012).

Principals and educational leaders often state the hiring of new
teachers to a school district is some of the most important work that a
school district will engage in to determine its overall success. (Ebmeier &
Ng, 2006; Stronge & Tucker, 2000; Koenigsknecht, 2006; Pillsbury,
2005). Teachers are the single most important variable in determining
the overall success of a student (Rockoff, 2004; Clement, 2015;
Shakrani, 2008; Tucker & Stronge, 2005). It is critical for school
districts to hire the best and brightest teachers on the front end to work
with children. When this does not happen, educational leaders must
focus their time counseling ineffective teachers out of the profession or
going through the time-consuming teacher cancellation process.
Instead, by hiring highly effective teachers with strong teacher-driven
characteristics from the start, those leaders can spend their time
engaging together to examine student data, share effective teaching
practices and collaborate positively in professional learning communities
to ensure student growth and success (DuFour, DuFour & Eaker, 2008).

Jim Collins (2001) in his book, Good to Great, suggests putting the
right people on the bus, in the right seats, while driving the bus in the
right direction all together. Having a teacher hiring selection tool can
assist with solving the problem of putting the right people on the bus. The selection tool can also provide feedback to those hiring teachers of important characteristics that lead to teacher success. However, while these teacher hiring selection tools are becoming increasingly relied upon by school districts, are they accurately identifying high quality teacher candidates for district classrooms? “We can work hard to select outstanding teachers initially, or we can pay later for not doing so” (Gordon, 1999).

We have reached a time where districts should be beyond identifying teacher candidates through a simple online application. Districts need to progress towards an online application process that should be user friendly for those leaders searching for teaching candidates (Sawchuk, 2011). They should be able to easily sort and identify key pieces of teacher selection information at the click of a mouse or touch of the screen. The application software should be able to easily provide licensing information to identify which candidates are qualified for a specific position as well as other key characteristics when determining which teaching candidates possess the qualifications in order to be considered for any position. If this process is not simple and easy for candidates, they will take their application to other surrounding school districts.

Finally, metrics beyond simply selecting a candidate because they went to a certain university or have a grade point average that meets a
district’s criteria are necessary in order to make the hiring selection process less subjective. However, these metrics should be evaluated and researched in order to determine that districts are making the most informed decision possible when selecting teaching candidates to interview in their school districts.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine if the Applitrack TeacherFit selection assessment tool has a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation gathered for all new teachers hired at an Indiana urban school district during the 2013-2014 school year.

The researcher will examine the scores achieved on the Applitrack TeacherFit online assessment of new teachers hired to this urban school district in Indiana in 2013 and will correlate those assessment scores with each new teacher’s summative 2013-2014 evaluation rating. The Indiana school district evaluation incorporates three separate domains consisting of preparation of learning, effective instruction and professional practice with sixteen different indicators as well as teacher assessment of student achievement and growth measures.

The findings revealed through this research will provide readers with rich information on using metrics in the hiring process and will also provide valuable information on teacher evaluation, teacher selection
tools, and the justification of the cost of teacher turnover. Moreover, the Indiana school district can use this data to guide future professional development for new teachers, as each indicator of the teacher evaluation summative scores will be analyzed to show strengths and weaknesses in teaching. Furthermore, this research will be valuable information to all school districts. It will help districts confront the challenges presented in the teacher selection process, as it is becoming more difficult and competitive to screen and select high quality teachers.

**Research Questions**

The research questions addressed in this study will examine the following:

- Does the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment tool serve as a valid predictor of future teacher effectiveness measured by a teacher’s summative evaluation?
- Do the overall summative teacher evaluation domains have a statistically significant relationship using a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score?
- Does the overall TeacherFit score have any relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation score using the 16 indicators of the evaluation’s Teacher Performance Rubric?
- Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment have a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s overall summative evaluation score?
Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening selection tool have any relationship with any of the 16 indicators assessed by evaluators in the teacher’s summative evaluation?

**Definition of Terms**

**Applitrack TeacherFit Assessment** – An online screening tool assessment that measures the teacher qualities of (a) Fairness and Respect, (b) Concern for Student Learning, (c) Adaptability, (d) Communication and Persuasion, (e) Planning and Organization, and (f) Cultural Competence. This assessment provides administrators with a score (1–9) for each characteristic as well as an overall score to use in making teacher-hiring decisions.

**Indiana School District Summative Evaluation** – The evaluation tool used by the school district in order to evaluate teachers while providing them with a summative evaluation score of 1.0 – 4.0.

**Indiana School District Teacher Performance Expectations Rubric (TPER)** – The summative evaluation rubric is broken down in three domains consisting of (a) Preparation for Learning, (b) Effective Instruction, and (c) Professional Practice. Each of these domains contains defined indicators related to the specific domain. The final piece of the rubric contains student achievement and growth measures that are defined by content area and grade level for each teacher.
**Teacher Effectiveness** – For the purposes of this study, teacher effectiveness is defined as a teacher receiving an effective or highly effective summative evaluation based upon the Indiana school district’s teacher evaluation tool.

**Teacher Evaluation** – The process of providing teachers feedback based upon their observable and documented evidence in the classroom.

**Teacher Hiring Selection/Screening Tools** – A set of optional tools that school districts can choose to use during the hiring process in order to identify highly qualified teacher candidates.

**Behavior-Based Interviewing (BBI)** – An interview technique that, “depends on creating specific questions to ascertain the past experiences, skills, and behaviors of the candidate” (Clement, 2009, pg. 23).

**Delimitations of the Study**

**Time**

This study utilizes teacher evaluation data for new teachers hired to one Indiana urban school district for the 2013 – 2014 school year. This was the first year the school district implemented the Applitrack TeacherFit screening tool and was also the second year that the school district had a state mandated evaluation system where all teachers received a summative evaluation incorporating value added measures and a teacher effectiveness rubric.
Location

This study focuses on a single Indiana school district and new teachers hired in this urban school setting. Although the location is set to a single school district, the cultural and socioeconomic diversity of the district lends to relevance in many other different settings across the United States. Moreover, due to the fact that the teaching candidates take the Applitrack TeacherFit assessment online and offsite, it is possible that they could have received assistance when performing this assessment.

Evaluators

Each evaluator brings their own set of judgments on what is effective teaching. It is nearly impossible to standardize the evaluation process when there is quite a bit of subjectivity with the number of different evaluators in the school district. Although each evaluator underwent specific evaluation training from the school district, scores placed on the Teacher Performance Expectations Rubric are subjective based upon that evaluator’s perception of quality teaching.

Teachers

Teacher data utilized were limited to the number of new teachers hired to one Indiana school district for the 2013-2014 school year. While not all new teachers hired to this school district were brand new to the profession, a high number of teachers came straight from colleges and
universities. Teachers were not limited to first year teachers in this study due to the size of the population. TeacherFit scores could be influenced by the number of years of experience a teacher may have inside the classroom. Moreover, the teacher data utilized in this study are from teachers that were hired into the school district. Naturally, since these teachers were hired to the district, a limitation would be the potential range of the model since an assumption would indicate that the district does not have teachers of low quality.

**Teacher Evaluation**

There are multiple influences within the teacher evaluation process ranging from student factors, achievement measures as well as individual evaluator variables. These variables are outlined further in the literature review; however, it is important to recognize the numerous variables that can have an overall impact on this research.

**Assumptions**

This study operated under the following assumptions.

**Number**

The number of teachers represented in the Indiana school district’s teacher evaluation model is representative of teachers in a large, urban school district in Indiana. Additionally, the number of newly hired teachers in this school district is similar to the number of newly hired teachers in other similar districts across the area.
**Fidelity**

Indiana school district school administrators and teachers implemented and utilized the teacher evaluation model with fidelity. The district utilized an online platform called OwnIt! in order to track that the proper number of observations were conducted according to administrative evaluation guidelines and that the summative evaluation was fully complete including local and state student data measures.

**Data**

TeacherFit and teacher evaluation data that were provided to the researcher are accurate and error-free.

**Teachers**

With studying teachers that were hired into the school district, an assumption centers around the scores of these newly hired teachers as being on the high end of the TeacherFit assessment.

**Evaluators**

Evaluators were trained on the evaluation model in the district and the majority of the evaluators hold a valid Indiana administrator license.

**Summary**

Putting a great teacher with children in every classroom is the single most important factor in determining student achievement and success (Ebmeier & Ng, 2006; Stronge & Tucker, 2000; Koenigsknecht,
The stakes are too high in today’s educational climate not to make this a primary focus in every school district. With varying teacher hiring selection tools available on the market, it is important to study the effects of utilizing these tools in school districts in order to determine if they are a prudent use of district funds.

One Indiana urban school district has made the choice to partner with an online teacher hiring selection tool program in order to identify the best candidates to interview and hire in their school district. Does the Applitrack TeacherFit online selection tool provide the Indiana school district with the high quality candidates they seek to work with their students when compared with those teacher’s summative evaluation? Are the behavioral characteristics measured by the TeacherFit assessment statistically significant when compared to aspects of the Indiana school district’s evaluation tool? “The biggest issue facing school leaders, researchers and others in the education community is quantifying how much particular teacher characteristics matter and whether it is possible to predict teacher performance” (A.Jacob, 2012, p. 3).

With the educational stakes as high as ever in the current climate of educating students, it is critical to gain an edge in identifying high quality teachers to work in classrooms. Having a strategic hiring process in place while utilizing metrics can make the teacher selection process as objective as possible when searching for candidates to take to the next
level of the hiring process.

This study will focus on the significance of using such metrics in the teacher hiring selection process and will add to the growing body of research in identifying high quality teaching candidates to the field of education.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature for this study examines the relevant written work related to the teacher hiring process. The literature review focuses on providing a historical context for the hiring process as well as applicable literature examining the various phases of the hiring process including a detailed review of current teacher selection tools and assessments. The researcher also analyzed literature related to teacher evaluation and its role as a high-stakes tool in today’s educational landscape.

Research on hiring teachers has a wide range but limited depth (Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Goldhaber, Grout & Hungtinton-Klein, 2014). It is universally accepted by researchers that hiring a teacher is one of the greatest factors determining student success (Donaldson, 2011; Ingersoll, 2004; Bowman, 2005; Ebmeier & Ng, 2006). Bowman (2005) ascertains, “A teacher who cannot perform up to expectations can lower the quality of education for an entire school, as every student who passes through his or her classroom will be ill-prepared for the next grade” (p. 396). Hiring the right teacher for the right position and their contribution to student success is also not an idea that is unique to the field of education. Gary L. Gordon (1999) stated, “companies throughout the private sector are learning in the late 1990s that the most important
asset of any organization is not its physical resources but its employees” (p. 304).

**Historical Context for the Teacher Hiring Process**

Bowman (2005) provides a historical and legal context to the hiring process. Preliminary studies in the 1940s attempted to study hiring as a single step. By the 1960s, researchers attempted to break down the hiring process into segments to analyze the rationality behind hiring decisions (Bowman, 2005). “Beginning in the 1960s, interviewing practices in the United States began to be influenced by federal legislation, including the Equal Pay Act (1963), Civil Rights Act (1964), Age Discrimination Employment Act (1967), and Americans with Disabilities Act (1990) among others” (Hindman & Stronge, 2009, p. 2). Ultimately, validity has improved in the hiring process but often organizations use determinations that cannot be legally considered in the hiring process such as race, age of the candidate or the mood of the interviewer. During the 1990s the ideas of Person-Job Fit and Person-Organization Fit were introduced into organizations and a greater emphasis was placed on evaluating a candidate’s skills and experiences for a specific job opening and whether their personal characteristics and belief systems matched that of the hiring organization (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2009; Bowman, 2005).

Bowman (2005) conducted research to establish whether or not school districts have given consideration to the ideas of Person-Job Fit
and Person-Organization fit during the hiring process. Bowman (2005) compared a superintendent’s versus a building principal’s approach to the hiring decision. Both individuals based hiring decisions upon Person-Job fit and Person-Organization fit, but the emphasis was in different places. Bowman’s research proved that principals are overall more concerned with Person-Organization fit while a superintendent is more likely to be concerned with Person-Job fit. Principals in general have significant contact with a teacher and are more concerned with their fit in the overall culture of the school while superintendents place greater emphasis on hiring a well-qualified applicant (Bowman, 2005). Cranston (2012) examined the dichotomy of fit in the hiring process amongst a group of principals in Canada. He ascertains that the notion of fit is an important part of the hiring process. Finally, researchers also began to analyze what type of information is useful in predicting a candidate’s future success during the interview and hiring phase. (Hindman & Stronge, 2009).

Researchers in the field of education have also attempted to analyze every phase of the hiring process beginning with teacher recruitment, a teaching candidate’s initial application, screening the applicant, the interview itself, and the final hiring decision. It is widely known that the interview in itself is not a useful measure of future teacher performance (Nichols, 2004; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014). Researchers have also attempted to answer the question regarding the characteristics of an
effective teacher. Stronge and Hindman (2003) state that, “We can greatly improve student achievement if we come to an understanding of what constitutes an effective teacher and then seek out teachers who demonstrate those qualities and behavior” (p. 49). A growing body of research over the years has identified many effective teaching practices and it is recognized that effective teachers:

- Understand subject matter deeply and flexibly;
- Connect what is to be learned to students’ prior knowledge and experience;
- Create effective scaffolds and supports for learning;
- Use instructional strategies that help students draw connections, apply what they’re learning, practice new skills, and monitor their own learning;
- Assess student learning continuously and adapt teaching to student needs;
- Provide clear standards, constant feedback, and opportunities for revising work; and
- Develop and effectively manage a collaborative classroom in which all students have membership (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel and Rothstein, 2012, p. 13).

Once a teacher is recruited or makes the decision to apply to a given school district, the hiring process usually contains two selection tools that guide the hiring decision. The tools consist of a job application
and interrelated documents, along with the interview. The human resources department of most school districts will screen the initial applicant pool and then building level administrators will conduct the interview process to select a teaching candidate to hire for a given position (Stronge & Hindman, 2003).

Narrowing down the applicant pool to determine which candidates will interview for a given teaching position is a critical step in the process. School districts throughout the United States are facing a wide-range of issues when it comes to hiring. Some Midwest districts have thousands of candidates for a handful of positions while other districts in different regions of the country must select a teaching candidate from a pool of teachers on emergency licenses. Despite the issue, the reality is that school districts must find the best candidate to move through the process. (Clement, 2009). “Because the selection of qualified classroom teachers is essential to the quality of education delivered to students more emphasis must be placed on improving the process of identifying and selecting high-quality teachers” (Gimbert & Chelsey, 2009 pg. 52).

**Teacher Selection Tools**

There are numerous ways for school districts to screen their candidate pool for the interview process. A large number of school districts mine the field by wading through countless applications and selecting candidates based on characteristics such as one’s major, years of teaching experience, university an applicant attended or other basic
criteria (Stronge & Hindman, 2003). As stated by Stronge and Hindman (2003), “in essence, these and other prerequisites would become gatekeepers to the teacher selection process” (p. 50).

Another strategy school districts have implemented is the use of a teacher selection tool. A teacher selection tool is a tool that school districts can implement to identify highly qualified teaching candidates during the screening and interview process. “The developers of these instruments maintain that the use of these in the selection and hiring process can assist in assessing teacher characteristics and that these instruments bring a level of objectivity to hiring processes (Shumacher, Grigsby, & Vesey, p. 3).

**Applitrack TeacherFit Selection Tool**

The Applitrack TeacherFit online screening tool is just one of a few screening tools on the market for school districts to consider as a pre-employment screening tool. “The TeacherFit and Job Fit screening assessments evaluate an applicant’s likelihood of being successful in the position to which he or she is applying” (Westman, 2010). Frontline Technologies, formerly Aspex Solutions, acquired the TeacherFit screening assessment tool from Polaris Educational Systems in 2010. Dr. John Arnold was the president and primary researcher of Polaris and currently provides further development and ongoing validation research for the TeacherFit online assessment. Arnold, Chambers and Schmitt (2014) concluded through a technical report provided to Frontline
technologies that, “overall the evidence regarding the quality of the TeacherFit instrument is excellent” (p. 23). These researchers concluded that, “The TeacherFit tool, used with other available data on teacher candidates, can be a valuable source of information of job-related skills and abilities” (Arnold, Chambers & Schmitt, 2014, p. 23). Sioux Falls School District (2013) in South Dakota conducted their own internal study of the Applitrack TeacherFit tool and reported 84% accuracy of the 111 teachers that were hired into the district that completed the TeacherFit assessment. The results also showed that 7% of the new hires performed better than predicted from the results of the TeacherFit tool (Raths, 2014). The Sioux Falls (2013) school district gained these results by obtaining administrator feedback on each new teacher at an interval of 6 and 12 months on the six different dimensions that the tool measures. While there is very little research available on the specific Applitrack TeacherFit assessment screening tool, further research is certainly recommended as nearly 300 school districts across the country use Applitrack TeacherFit (Applitrack, 2015). Furthermore, comparison studies are nearly non-existent in literature when examining the Applitrack TeacherFit selection tool correlated to a teacher’s performance evaluation.

In addition to the Applitrack TeacherFit online selection tool, there are other similar tools on the market that school districts can use in order to identify top teacher candidates to interview. “Nationwide, school districts
draw on the purported expertise of many employment screeners in an attempt to employ teachers with a proclivity to succeed in the classroom. At question is the usefulness of employment screening tools” (Gimbert & Chesley, 2009, p. 51). While studies have been conducted on the topic of teacher selection tools, there have not been many studies that have examined the selection tool’s predictive success when comparing the tool to future teaching performance (Gimbert & Chesley, 2009). However, Metzger and Wu (2008) examined results from Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) studies and they concluded that the, “predictive validity was uniformly modest.” “Our findings of the TPI’s moderate predictive validity is in line with relationships found in other research on hiring interviews” (Metzger and Wu, 2008, p. 932). When examining a specific teacher selection tool, it is also important to recognize other similar tools on the market and know what they are attempting to provide to school districts in order to have a baseline to ensure the tools are research-based and are measuring attributes that school districts would be seeking of quality teacher candidates.

**Gallup Teacher Perceiver Tool**

One popular alternative is the Gallup TeacherInsight online selection tool. The Gallup Organization developed this tool and released a new version in February 2011 that uses value-added test scores as part of their research. The tool is based on the Teacher Perceiver and Urban Teacher Perceiver Interview tool and has been on the market for
approximately 20 years (St. Norbert College, 2015). This research-based online tool has three types of questions that are asked of candidates that include multiple-choice, open-ended and likert scale type questions. The focus of these questions centers on the three platforms of teaching philosophy, relationships and instructional practices (Gallup, 2015).

- Teaching philosophy: To what extent is there a mission to teach, to what extent is teaching not a job, but a mission, a calling?
- Relationships: How does the candidate create relationships with colleagues, students and parents?
- Instructional approaches: Does the candidate see a class or a group of individuals? (St. Norbert College, 2015).

Along with the online portion of the teacher selection process, Gallop (2015) offers an additional step in order to identify the most outstanding teachers. The second step is a structured interview where district administrators are trained by Gallup in order to deliver the structured interview questions as well as interpret the data from those interviews. The structured interview questions, “places the candidate in hypothetical situations and asks for responses, or it calls for examples from previous behavior” (Gordon, 1999). The Gallup tool can also be used as a source for guiding future professional development based upon the scores achieved from new teachers that have been hired to the district utilizing the Gallup process (Gordon, 1999). While it is important to recognize a
teacher’s disposition when identifying quality teachers, it is equally as important for teachers to recognize how they arrived at their own thinking (Schussler, Bercaw & Stooksberry, 2008). The dispositions and characteristics measured in selection tools can provide districts with an objective measure in order to find candidates with the qualities to be an effective teacher in the future (Schumacher, Grigsby & Vesey, 2012).

Gimbert and Chesley (2009) examined the Urban Teacher Perceiver selection tool as well as the Praxis Series assessment to determine if these two screening measures were an effective predictor of teacher performance when compared to the teacher’s performance assessment. While the researchers with the Urban Teacher Perceiver Interview found a statistically significant relationship, there was not a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s Praxis score. The researchers called for further research on the topic of the predictability of employee selection tools. Regan and Hayes (2011) studied data from the Gallup TeacherInsight tool with math and science teachers that took the TeacherInsight assessment initially and were rated as both high and low on the assessment while measuring different variables including a teacher’s summative evaluation rating. “Teachers with a high and a low TeacherInsight rating showed comparable performance scores by the third year of employment” (Regan & Hayes, 2011, p. 14). Moreover, Math and Science teachers are among the most difficult teachers to replace in the event of teacher turnover (Ingersoll & Perda, 2010). Regan and
Hayes (2011) indicated that, “As perceiver tools allow school districts to identify highly talented teacher candidates, it is through district support and professional development where the teachers can truly master their skills of effectiveness in the classroom” (p. 15). Chingos & Peterson (2010) concluded that it is easier to select a great teacher than to train one when examining teacher effectiveness. Chingos and Peterson (2010) also went on to conclude that professional development increases teacher effectiveness after they are hired; however, professional development is not as impactful on a teacher’s effectiveness once they have been in the profession for at least ten years. This important research by Regan and Hayes (2011) along with Chingos and Peterson (2010) illuminates data from a teacher selection tool, but also points out that over time, professional development provided by a school district is also a major influence on beginning teacher performance.

**Haberman Star Teacher Interview**

The Haberman Star Teacher Interview is another teacher selection tool on the market that is available to school districts as a pre-employment screening tool. Dr. Martin Haberman was a professor and researcher at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Based on his over 30 years of work in the field of education, he developed the Haberman Star Teacher Interview. His research centers on that of finding highly qualified teachers and principals for students that come from disadvantaged, low-income backgrounds that tend to attend urban, high
poverty schools (Haberman Foundation, 2015). “In essence, Haberman believes that teacher selection is more critical than teacher training. You simply can’t train teachers to work in an urban setting if they don’t have certain personal characteristics to make them stick it out in the long term” (O’Donovan, 2012, p. 26). Haberman’s pre-employment interview consists of 50 questions of which there are three possible answers for the candidate to choose from to identify the best answer. There are 10 dimensions addressed in the Star Teacher Interview.

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 organization.

8. **Explains Teacher Success** deals with the criteria the respondent uses to determine teaching success and whether these are relevant to teachers in 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 poverty schools.

10. **Fallibility** refers to how the teacher plans to deal with mistakes in the classroom (Haberman Foundation, 2015).

The Star Teacher Interview assesses a candidate’s knowledge and skills for those districts that address the needs of lower income students (Haberman Foundation, 2015). “The term Star Teachers designates teachers who are so effective that the adverse conditions of working in failing schools or school districts do not prevent them from being a successful teacher” (Haberman, 2004).

In order for administrators to become Star Teacher interviewers, they must attend a daylong training. Additionally, this researched-based
tool champions a 95% accuracy rate that predicts which teachers will stay and which teachers may leave the district or fail (Haberman Foundation, 2015). Haberman categorizes those teachers that fail as “quitters/failures” and validates his research by comparing answers from his own selection tool of the “quitters/failures” verses the star teachers that are identified by his tool. “From his on-going research, Dr. Haberman crafted an interview which gets to the heart of what teaching should be for children, especially those who live in poverty” (Haberman & Stafford, 2004). The focus of Dr. Haberman’s research has not been on which candidate knows the curriculum best or how their pedagogy separates them from others, instead his focus has been on finding the attributes and behaviors of teachers that have been successful with working with high-risk students from low-income families. Baskin, Ross and Smith (1996) studied the Haberman Star Interview and found limited predictive validity of the interview scores when examining evaluation scores in conjunction with the Urban Teacher Selection Interview. Moreover, they found very low correlations between the actual in-person interview and performance evaluation rankings (Baskin, Ross and Smith, 1996).

Ryan and Alcock (2002) believe it is “prudent” for school districts to use teacher selection tools that are on the market. School districts should develop standards based upon teacher selection tools to avoid “haphazard hiring” while holding off a flood of inept teachers to the
profession (Ryan & Alcock, 2002, p.66). The researchers further recommended that in-district professional development could also be, “based on the skills, knowledge, and dispositions gleaned from these instruments” (Ryan & Alcock, 2002, p. 66). Selection tools offer districts the opportunity to be more strategic in the hiring process. While no selection tool should serve as an end all in order to make recommendations to hire teachers, it can benefit school districts and find candidates that may best fit with their school district. Jacob, Kane, Rockoff & Staiger (2009) also came to the conclusion that, “while there may be no single factor that can predict success in teaching, using a broad set of measures can help schools improve the quality of their teachers” (p. 1). Robertson-Kraft and Duckworth (2014) also warned of using a single measure alone to hire teachers. Their study defined “grit” as passion and perseverance for long-term goals and developed a way to measure grit in order to predict teacher effectiveness. “Despite its predictive validity, policymakers should proceed cautiously when using this measure of grit during the screening process and continue to consider a wide range of variables, not just those that are easy to measure, when making hiring decisions” (Robertson-Kraft and Duckworth, 2014, p. 14). School districts can skate on thin ice when solely using a teacher selection tool as a stand-alone decision maker in hiring teachers. Chicago Public Schools (CPS) made the decision in 2011 to use a teacher selection tool score as a minimum employment
requirement to hire teachers. Candidates for teaching positions were not allowed to move forward in the hiring process without a qualifying score on the teacher selection tool, even if a principal made a recommendation to hire that candidate. CPS used a customized version of the TeacherFit assessment to screen candidates; however, this decision by their Director of Human Capital caused waves amongst principals of the district (Harris, 2011). Any selection tool, whether the Haberman Star Interview tool or the Gallup selection tool should always be used as one piece of data in the hiring process and not as an instrument to preclude candidates from making it to the interview stages or beyond.

**HumanEx Ventures**

Another popular selection tool is the HumanEx Ventures for Excellence hiring interview products. HumanEx is a two-part process where the candidate first takes an online assessment that is similar in effect to the other online selection tools on the market that measures attitudinal and behavioral characteristics. The candidate will answer timed, multiple choice questions and HumanEx provides the district with a graphical analysis of each candidate’s results (HumanEx, 2015). If the candidate scores an acceptable level on this online portion of the selection process as determined by HumanEx, they then move on to the structured interview portion of the process. At this level, trained administrators conduct a phone interview of open-ended questions that touch upon different characteristics of highly effective teachers. “Most
hiring authorities would agree that teacher characteristics (the teacher as a person) are important factors in making effective hiring decisions” (Schumacher, Grigsby & Vesey, 2012, p. 3). These characteristics are broken down into the following HumanEx teacher interview themes (HumanEx, 2011):

**Drives and Values Themes**
- Mission / Passion
- Trust
- Achiever

**Work Style Themes**
- Responsibility
- Discipline
- Results Orientation
- Flexibility
- Explainer

**Relationship Themes**
- Empathy
- Positivity
- Team 1 (colleagues)
- Team 2 (the home)
- Developer

**Influence Themes**
- Influence

**Thought Process Themes**
- Mastery
- Problem Solver

For each structured interview question asked, the interviewer hand scores the answer based upon a research-based set of answers from successful teachers provided by HumanEx. The phone interview is also recorded so that the administrator can go back and listen to answers if
necessary when scoring candidate’s answers. If the candidate does not
give a correct or similar answer to what HumanEx research suggests,
they do not earn the point, even if the interviewer feels that the answer
would be acceptable. In order to be certified to conduct the teacher
selection interview, school personnel must be trained and pass an
examination. The Ventures for Excellence teacher selection tools offer
school districts a research-based process in order to identify top
candidates during the pre-screening portion of the hiring process. This
process lends as more of a centralized hiring process where a school
district can pass along teacher candidates that have passed both
HumanEx screeners through the online assessment and structured
interview. Those candidates can then be passed along to schools to
select a candidate from a pool of teachers that have successfully made it
through the process.

Teacher selection tools allow school districts to add a research-
based measure to the teacher hiring process. These tools can serve as a
valuable aid for both school districts that receive hundreds of
applications as well as those districts that only receive a handful of
applications in order to identify teachers with strong characteristics and
attitudes reflective of highly effective teachers. While these selection
tools offer districts a rating or summary score of how the candidate
performs on these selection tool assessments, it is important that school
districts utilize these tools as a piece of data in the hiring process and
not an end all to automatically eliminate candidates. More and more districts are adding the element of a teacher selection tool into their arsenal of the teacher hiring process.

After the number of candidates is narrowed down for an open teaching position, the next step in the process is typically an interview. “The use of interviews within the employment process remains one of the most reasonable and widely used ways to gather data about prospective teachers” (Ebmeier & Ng, 2006 p. 203). The interview itself begins before a candidate walks in the door. Administrators conducting the interview process need to determine the specific skills and characteristics a teacher must have to be a successful candidate for a position (Clement, 2009).

At the school level, interviewers should develop and implement an interview protocol that draws on these effective teacher qualities. Before the interviews begin, interview teams should examine the position description and associated responsibilities, discuss what qualities they particularly desire in a teacher for the position, and then consider how they will assess those qualities they particularly desire in a teacher for the position, and then consider how they will assess those qualities (Stronge & Hindman, 2003, p. 51).

**Behavior-Based Interviewing**

One of the techniques used in interviewing is behavior-based interviewing or BBI. A behavior-based style of interview focuses on open-
ended, behavior-based questions that help an administrator to fully understand how a candidate would react in certain situations. The questions also focus on gaining information about a candidate’s previous experiences to see how those experiences relate to the selection criteria (Clement, 2015). For instance, an interviewer may ask questions that lead with phrases such as “tell me about a time when”. The logic behind this type of interview is that if a teacher can effectively explain past experiences, situations, and policies, then they can most likely explain information and communicate effectively to students and parents (Clement, 2009). Finally, Clement (2009) notes that, “Past behavior is the best predictor of future performance, and a behavior-based interview will aid administrators in hiring the best, most highly qualified teachers” (p.24). Using this type of interview style also helps districts move past hiring decisions based upon how an interview team “feels” about a candidate and focuses on utilizing the specific skills needed for a position to guide the hiring process.

Interviewers can implement this technique in various ways. A school district can elect to normalize the interview process and ask all candidates the same pre-established questions in a very structured interview. Alternatively, districts could elect to perform an adaptive interview format. This would allow districts the opportunity to begin an interview with the same pre-determined questions and transition to individualized questions based on a candidate’s prior responses, resume,
or screening tool results (Embeir & Ng, 2006). Using an adaptive interview technique in connection with a screening tool can afford administrators a greater opportunity. Administrators could utilize data from the screening tool report and tailor interview questions based upon the data. For instance, Harris (2011) reported on the implementation of the CPS TeacherFit Inventory in the Chicago Public Schools and it was noted that if a candidate had a lower score in classroom management then the interviewer could ask questions aimed at addressing classroom management style. Screening tool results can certainly inform the interview process by focusing on the deficiencies identified by the data received from the selection tool. School districts that choose to use these metrics can become more efficient in their interview techniques while focusing on the questions that will thoroughly provide answers on the backgrounds and experiences of each teacher candidate. Incorporating the results of a teacher selection tool during the interview process adds a strategic hiring and interview process to districts in identifying highly qualified candidates that provide a great organizational and building fit for a school district.

**Teacher Evaluation**

Teacher evaluation has taken on a new form in this era of high stakes accountability across the country (Donaldson, 2012; Popham, 2013). Gone are the days of teachers being observed in the classroom once every three years or more. Principals and evaluators are no longer
able to provide a summative one-page narrative to teachers without including value-added student measures and scores on a researched-based teacher effectiveness rubric (Hewitt, 2015). Administrators and evaluators are now mandated to observe teachers in action multiple times a year before providing a summative evaluation to teachers.

Like most states throughout the country, Indiana has undergone recent changes to the evaluation process for teachers. The state of Indiana now mandates that a teacher receive a rating of highly effective, effective, needs improvement or ineffective (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-4 (c)(4)) and the results of each teacher’s evaluation rating must be submitted to the state of Indiana (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-9). Furthermore in the state of Indiana, if a teacher is rated as ineffective or needs improvement, they do not qualify for compensation consideration for the following year (Ind. Code 20-28-9-1.5 (c)). Although the state of Indiana gives local control to school districts to develop an evaluation model, many Indiana districts initially chose to implement the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) developed model or “RISE” (Chesnut, Stewart & Sera, 2015). Are these new laws and evaluation requirements necessarily a bad thing for teacher evaluation as a whole? Researchers have stepped into action to study this new level of accountability amongst teachers in order to understand different aspects on how teachers and school districts are affected by these new teacher evaluation laws.
Researchers agree that teacher evaluation should not serve as a punitive entity in order to make teachers feel anxiety or stress about their jobs (Lavigne, 2014). “In the context of high-stakes teacher evaluation, teachers may experience greater stress from their evaluations being high-stakes, particularly if they feel such evaluations are unfair or unjust” (Lavigne, 2014, p. 19). Unfortunately, this is inherently part of the process where teachers are now feeling added pressure in the wake of new accountability (Cole, Robinson, Ansaldo, Whiteman & Spradlin, 2012). Teacher evaluation should serve as a tool for teachers to learn and grow in their teaching craft (von Frank, 2013). Furthermore, new evaluation standards for teachers provides an opportunity for improving teaching and learning while school districts are able to use this new found data to inform professional development and work with teachers who need further assistance (Goe, Biggers & Croft, 2012). Linking a teacher’s evaluation to objective student measures can help teachers inform their instruction and focus on student’s individual needs in the classroom when the data from the measures are delivered in a timely manner on a reliable test (Lavigne, 2014).

While some teachers believe that linking a teacher’s evaluation to compensation and student test scores will create competition among teachers; thus exacerbating the notion of isolationism while not sharing ideas, high functioning schools will use these data in order to create high performing professional learning communities. (DuFour, 2004; DuFour,
Eaker & DuFour, 2005; DuFour, DuFour & Eaker, 2008; Schmoker, 2011). However, when Indiana law requires that a teacher’s compensation be linked to teacher evaluation, the notion of a collaborative process left many teachers feeling as though there was more competition amongst one another rather than collaboration (Cole, Robinson, Ansaldo, Whiteman & Spradlin, 2012; Marshall, 2013). School leaders will need to build trust in order to facilitate a shared notion of collaboration among teachers in order to improve student learning for all children.

Moreover, as evaluators consider rating teacher summative evaluation scores in the bottom two evaluation categories of “needs improvement” and “ineffective” where they do not receive future compensation, it may lead to inflated evaluation scores from evaluators (Cole & Murphy, 2016). This notion could especially occur when an evaluator is deciding on scoring teachers that are between the “effective” rating, where teachers become eligible for compensation, and the “needs improvement” category where a teacher is not eligible for compensation. Evaluators may be more likely to inflate a teacher’s rubric scores to “effective” because they do not want to hold a teacher back from receiving a pay raise when that teacher’s performance was observed more in line with the “needs improvement” category. Inflated evaluation scores lead to complications with the validity of teacher evaluation scores that could
be improved upon if a teacher’s summative evaluation score was not tied to teacher compensation.

However, there are many different variables that contribute to the matter of teacher evaluation. Darling-Hammond, Amerin-Beardsley, Haertel and Rothstein (2012) list other factors that influence teacher evaluation and student achievement including:

- School factors such as class sizes, curriculum materials, instructional time, availability of specialists and tutors, and resources for learning (books, computers, science labs, and more);
- Home and community supports or challenges;
- Individual student needs and abilities, health and attendance;
- Peer culture and achievement;
- Prior teachers and schooling, as well as other current teachers;
- Differential summer learning loss, which especially affects low-income children; and
- The specific tests used, which emphasize some kinds of learning and not others and which rarely measure achievement that is well above of below grade level (p. 8).

While the factors and variables above focus primarily on students and the different factors that can be a part of teaching and learning in the classroom, there are other variables that also contribute to teacher evaluation and observation. Some of those factors include:

- Selection of the teacher’s evaluator
- Time of day and year that the teacher is observed
- Location of the school and district that the teacher is observed
- Type of evaluation model used
- Type of training provided to evaluators
- Inter-rater reliability practices conducted amongst evaluators
- Percentages designated toward an evaluation rubric and student measures in the teacher evaluation model
- Number of observations conducted in a particular school year for each teacher
- Length of each type of teacher observation conducted
- Number of instructional indicators used in the evaluation model
- Total number of days the teacher is in attendance during the school year

Hill, Charalambos, and Kraft (2012) contend that districts must move beyond simply working on the rater-reliability of evaluators and focus on a system that works to “produce reliable teacher scores” (p. 56). There are multiple influences in the process of teacher evaluation and it is important to recognize the different variables when examining teacher evaluation summative data along with student measures assigned to a teacher’s summative evaluation.

The new data provided to the state from Indiana school districts on teacher evaluation can serve as a high stakes tool to study teacher effectiveness. These evaluation models in Indiana schools and across the
country are based upon research of effective teachers from authors such as Danielson, Marazano and others (Danielson, 2006). There have been very few studies completed tying teacher evaluation data to teacher effectiveness by examining teacher selection tools (Goldhaber, Grout & Hungtinton-Klein, 2014). These new found data can be extremely useful as it provides researchers an opportunity to examine a research-based tool that provides student measures and data based upon a teacher’s performance. Moreover, because of the numerous issues that the state of Indiana has experienced with their statewide student assessment, ISTEP, many Indiana school districts only have a year or two worth of current evaluation ratings (Schneider & Cook, 2015).

An evaluation model can serve as a valuable tool as a number of districts seek to link teacher evaluation and the hiring process (Sawchuk, 2011). If a district’s evaluation model truly measures the effectiveness of a teacher; then the traits, characteristics and teacher performance expectations should be used to mold and form interview questions to identify the most outstanding teachers (Danielson, 2007). Whereas evaluation models of the past centered on a subjective narrative based on a small number of observation(s) each year, newly developed evaluation models assess teachers on a number of research-based indicators that define effective teaching. Teacher effectiveness and evaluation work seamlessly together as districts and states use research-based models to evaluate teachers.
Teacher Evaluation now serves as a high-stakes tool where researchers can use these data to strengthen the studies of educational research.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to determine if the Applitrack TeacherFit selection assessment tool is a valuable tool for selecting candidates to interview as part of the teacher hiring process. Obtaining this information can be extremely advantageous for school districts as they focus on being more strategic about hiring in order to seek out a competitive edge in the high stakes arena of teacher hiring (Sawchuk, 2011). The research questions selected for this study and data collected from an Indiana school district will determine the research methods and design of this study. The following research methodology is aimed at answering the subsequent research questions:

- Does the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment tool serve as a valid predictor of future teacher effectiveness measured by a teacher’s summative evaluation?
- Do the overall summative teacher evaluation domains have a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score?
- Does the overall TeacherFit score have any relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation score using the 16 indicators of the evaluation’s Teacher Performance Rubric?
• Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment have a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s overall summative evaluation score?

• Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening selection tool have any relationship with any of the 16 indicators assessed by evaluators in the teacher’s summative evaluation?

**Research Design and Data Analysis**

For the purposes of this study, the researcher has selected a descriptive quantitative research approach. Creswell (2005) discusses the history of quantitative research and the three characteristics that have emerged to define this method of research practice, as it is known today. The three research characteristics of quantitative studies outlined by Creswell (2005) are:

• an emphasis on collecting and analyzing information in the form of numbers

• an emphasis on collecting scores that measure distinct attributes of individuals and organizations

• an emphasis on the procedures of comparing groups or relating factors about individuals of groups in experiments correlational studies, and surveys (pg. 41).

Based upon the principles of quantitative research, the researcher in this study is going to collect data and analyze the data to compare the
relationship between the teacher’s Applitrack TeacherFit score and a teacher’s summative evaluation data. In order to achieve this outcome, the researcher has chosen to utilize a descriptive quantitative correlational methodology study. Creswell (2005) defines a correlational research design as:

> the correlation statistical test to describe and measure the degree of association (or relationship) between two or more variables or sets of scores. In this design, the researchers do not attempt to control or manipulate the variables as in an experiment; instead they relate, using the correlation statistic, two or more scores for each individual (p. 325).

From a statistical standpoint, the researcher will be using the collected data from an Indiana school district to compare the two sets of data in order to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship. This correlation is the measure of a straight-line relationship of the two primary variables included in the study.

The researcher will also perform a simple regression analysis and a multiple regression analysis in order to determine if the independent variables of the TeacherFit overall score and their six individual job requirement dimensions could predict future performance with the dependent variable of a teacher’s summative evaluation score and the sixteen performance indicators. “To see what impact multiple variables have on an outcome, researchers use regression analysis” (Cresswell,
The regression method uses an equation in order to receive an output and can also be used to examine multiple independent variables. “Multiple regression is an extension of simple regression where there are multiple independent variables predicting a single dependent variable” (Hoy & Adams, 2016). There are assumptions that the researcher must consider when utilizing a simple and multiple regression model. Osborne and Waters (2002) identify four regression assumptions listing normality, linearity, reliability and homoscedasticity assumptions. Assumptions associated with regression assume that variables have normal distributions and are also linear in nature while reliability measures and the assurance of the variability of errors need to be taken into account in order to avoid Type I or Type II errors (Osborne and Waters, 2002). Moreover, Pedhazue (1997, p. 3) states that, “Knowledge and understanding of the situations when violations of assumptions lead to serious biases, and when they are of little consequence, are essential to meaningful data analysis”. Noting these assumptions for regression analysis is critical in examining data in this study.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is the statistical program instrument selected by the researcher to analyze the research questions. This program was selected due to its ability to provide the types of statistics that best provide research-based results with regard to the research questions. Additionally, the program has the
ability to create graphs and tables that will be beneficial for sharing research results.

Finally, the researcher will interpret and report the results of the correlation study and complete the study.

**Population**

The population of this study includes all new teachers that applied and were hired to an Indiana school district for the 2013-2014 school year. The new teachers included in this study range from first year educators to experienced teaching professionals with varying years of experience. The Indiana school district has a total of 742 teachers in their district and hired 88 new teachers in the 2013-2014 school year that will be included in this study. Additionally, out of the 88 teachers that will be studied, 50 (57%) of the teachers were hired at the elementary level and 38 (43%) were hired at the secondary level of teaching. In regards to the gender of this population, 67 (76%) of new teachers were female and 21 (24%) were identified as male. The breakdown in ethnicity of these 88 teachers is as follows: 8 (9%) are African-American, 1 (1%) Asian, 2 (2%) Hispanic and 77 (88%) are Caucasian. This target population was not a part of any type of sampling from the population as all new teachers hired to this Indiana school district for the 2013-2014 school year are included for the purposes of this study. Finally, all new teachers hired in the district for the purposes
of this study have a TeacherFit score and a summative evaluation score that were provided to the researcher by the Indiana school district.

**Instrumentation**

The instrumentation used to gather the data for this study is two-fold and also includes a statistical program used to analyze quantitative data. The first instrument consists of the TeacherFit online selection tool that each teacher candidate answers when they fill out their online application. There are 110 questions that each candidate answers in the form of a likert scale. These questions are situational in nature related to circumstances that are encountered within many teaching positions. Moreover, there are short vignettes that the candidate reads and then responds to questions posed if they are (a) Extremely Likely, (b) Very Likely, (c) Likely, (d) Neither, (e) Unlikely, (f) Very Unlikely or (g) Extremely Unlikely to take action on the situational question provided. Furthermore, there are questions that applicants answer that indicates if they agree or disagree with an educational statement. The applicant’s options for these types of questions are (a) Strongly Disagree, (b) Disagree, (c) Neither, (d) Agree or (e) Strongly Agree. Overall, it typically takes the applicant 15-20 minutes to complete the assessment and a report is then generated for the administrator reviewing applicants for each teaching job posted.

The TeacherFit candidate summary report provides district hiring personnel with the name of the candidate, ID of the candidate and the
date and time that the candidate took the assessment. Additionally, there is a score summary in the form of a table that lists each job requirement characteristic, the overall score, score level of the candidate and a bar graph with the score achieved on the assessment in each characteristic category and overall TeacherFit score. In addition to the score summary table, the report defines each characteristic or dimension and then provides an interpretation of the score as well as what the score means in the achieved range. The report denotes that the TeacherFit report is confidential and that hiring personnel should not share the report with the applicant or other personnel not involved in the hiring decisions of the district. Finally, the report includes an interview report where it suggests interview questions to ask the candidate should they be granted an interview and also suggests potential answers to look for based upon the candidate’s response to the provided interview questions.

The second instrument used in this study is the Teacher Performance Evaluation tool that was developed by the Indiana School district. District administrators serve as evaluators of teachers during this process and the administrators are trained each year on the evaluation tool as well as classroom observation techniques. Indiana’s 2011 law on Staff Performance Evaluations (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5) mandates a summative annual evaluation for all teachers. This annual evaluation is utilized to determine a teacher’s overall effectiveness and is linked to teacher compensation. “The law states that components of the
evaluation include both classroom observations and “objective measures of student achievement and growth,” such as scores on statewide standardized tests of local assessments (Ind. Code 20-28-11.5-4(c) (2) & Chesnut, Steward, & Sera, 2015). Due to the increased accountability of Indiana’s 2011 performance evaluation law and the state’s emphasis on an annual summative evaluation as an indicator of teacher effectiveness, this allows the researcher to utilize a high stakes tool in order to examine the relationship between the TeacherFit assessment and the summative evaluation.

The first component of the evaluation system centers on different evaluation evidence that provides documentation of a teacher's attainment of performance expectations. The administrator that serves as the teacher’s primary evaluator executes this evidence in the form of formal and informal observations. A teacher's tenure in the school district will determine how many of each formal and informal observation(s) a teacher will have as well as what time of year these observation(s) will take place. A first year teacher within this Indiana school district will have a minimum of two informal and two formal observations. Generally, an informal observation usually lasts between 10-15 minutes while a formal observation takes place during the length of a class period or block. After each formal observation, a post-observation conference is scheduled between the teacher and his or her
evaluator to reflect upon the performance indicators within the teacher performance expectation rubric.

The teacher performance expectation rubric is the main tool utilized by administrators that evaluate teachers and this rubric is used to provide a score with a range from 1-4 on a teacher’s summative evaluation. There are four categories on this instrument where evaluators can score teachers. They are: Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Improvement Necessary (2) and Ineffective (1). During an informal or formal observation, the evaluator evaluates a teacher in one of these categories within the different domains and indicators while observing them. The evaluator may not score every domain or indicator during one observation, but will provide a score for what is observed during that observation time frame. In the event that a teacher did not receive an assessment on every indicator within the domains from observations or the teacher feels that the evaluator did not have an opportunity to assess a particular indicator at their desired level, the teacher may present artifacts to be reviewed by the evaluator to document attainment of the performance expectations. Examples of artifacts may include lesson plans, assessments, student work, technology integration, professional development presentations or other materials of a similar nature. The range of scores for an overall summative evaluation is as follows:

- Highly Effective = 3.50 – 4.00
- Effective = 2.50 – 3.49
- Improvement Necessary = 1.75 – 2.49
- Ineffective = 1.00 – 1.74

The evaluator has professional discretion when placing a teacher’s summative score within these ranges based upon previous observations and artifacts presented. For example, an administrator can score an indicator as 2.25 based upon the summative work of the teacher and does not need to simply score an indication as 1-4.

The teacher performance expectations rubric accounts for 80% of the teacher’s summative evaluation. The primary student measure accounts for 12% of the teacher’s summative evaluation and the student secondary measure lends 8% of the evaluation as shown in Table 3.1 below. This teacher rating calculation is used for most teachers in the district.

Table 3.1 Teacher Rating Calculation – Most Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain I Subtotal =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain II Subtotal =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain III Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Student Measure =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Student Measure =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher evaluation rubric also allows for a calculation of a teacher allowing for only one primary measure to count for 20% of the teacher’s summative evaluation. Typically, this is used for teachers when student
achievement and growth data would not be readily available. These unique teaching roles may include counselors, reading specialists, theater teachers and media specialists. Table 3.2 below reflects their teacher rating calculation.

Table 3.2 Teacher Rating Calculation – Single Measure Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Measure Teacher</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain I Subtotal =</td>
<td>÷ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain II Subtotal =</td>
<td>÷ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain III Subtotal</td>
<td>÷ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Total</td>
<td>÷ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Student Measure=</td>
<td>÷ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there are times in a school year when teachers go on leave for maternity or medical reasons. In the event where a teacher is not present in the classroom for at least 120 days, student growth and achievement measures may not apply due to a shortened academic school year; however, the state of Indiana requires a summative evaluation score for all teachers. In this event, the district would exempt the teacher from student achievement and growth measures per their guidelines and their rating calculation would be solely based upon the teacher performance rubric at 100% and is reflective in Table 3.3.
As noted earlier, 80% of the teacher’s summative evaluation score lies within the teacher performance rubric’s three domains. This instrument serves as a tool that evaluators reference based upon a researched set of domains and educational performance indicators that defines quality and effective teaching practices. A performance level is scored for each indicator within each domain.

Domain 1 focuses on preparation for learning with four separate performance standards:

- 1.1 Plans for a student program of instruction in accordance with adopted curriculum
- 1.2 Demonstrates an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning
- 1.3 Uses a variety of planning resources
- 1.4 Plans and prepares for the needs of all students
Table 3.4 Domain 1 Preparation for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Plans for a student program of instruction in accordance with adopted curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Demonstrates an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Uses a variety of planning resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Plans and prepares for the needs of all students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domain 1 Total Possible Points = 16

Subtotal for Domain divided by 4 =

Domain 2 encompasses the highest percentage of the teacher’s rubric score at 55% of the three domains and emphasizes effective instruction with eight separate performance standards:

- 2.1. Develops and maintains a positive classroom climate
- 2.2 Communicates high expectations for all students
- 2.3 Demonstrates a mastery of subject/content and standards
- 2.4 Uses instructional strategies and resources to teach for understanding
- 2.5 Differentiates instruction to meet the needs of all students
- 2.6 Engages all students in learning
- 2.7 Helps students practice and deepen new knowledge through direct and explicit instruction, cooperative learning, inquiry methods, and independent practice
- 2.8 Assesses student learning and uses assessment data to adjust instructional practices for student success
Table 3.5 Domain 2 Effective Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 2 Effective Instruction</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1. Develops and maintains a positive classroom climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Communicates high expectations for all students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Demonstrates a mastery of subject/content and standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4. Uses instructional strategies and resources to teach for understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5. Differentiates instruction to meet the needs of all students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6. Engages all students in learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7. Helps students practice and deepen new knowledge through direct and explicit instruction, cooperative learning, inquiry methods, and independent practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8. Assesses student learning and uses assessment data to adjust instructional practices for student success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domain 2 Total Possible Points = 32

Subtotal for Domain divided by 8 =

Domain 3 centers on professional practice and stresses participation in learning communities with four separate performance standards:

- 3.1 Works with colleagues in a respectful, collegial manner in the ongoing cycle of development, implementation, evaluation of curriculum and professional learning communities
- 3.2 Communicates effectively to establish and maintain two-way lines of communication with students and parents
- 3.3 Reflects on practice, data and student work to improve future instruction
- 3.4 Uses different forms of professional development to improve instruction
All three domains have a total of 16 performance indicators and each indicator is defined within a table for each performance level of highly effective, effective, needs improvement and ineffective.

**Procedures**

After the researcher determined the research direction of this study, the Superintendent of schools and Assistant Superintendent in this Indiana school district were contacted for written approval and consent for utilizing the school district selection tool data and evaluation data connected with this study's research questions and study design. The Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent granted permission to access the data requested through the Human Resources department. The Assistant Superintendent then provided a formal, written letter of consent to the researcher. An Institutional Review Board application was filed and then approved on July 19, 2016 by Indiana University. The research included collecting data on all newly hired employees to this Indiana school district for the 2013-2014 school year. New teacher data
of the Applitrack TeacherFit scores and summative teacher evaluation data from the 2013-2014 school year were provided to the researcher from the Human Resources Coordinator. These data were submitted to the researcher in the form of an excel spreadsheet with the following data:

- Overall TeacherFit score for every teacher
- Scores for each TeacherFit measured characteristic for each teacher including, (a) Fairness and Respect, (b) Concern for Student Learning, (c) Adaptability, (d) Communication and Persuasion, (e) Planning and Organization, and (f) Cultural Competence.
- Overall Summative Evaluation Scores for every teacher
- Individual Domain Scores from the Summative Evaluation for every teacher of (a) Preparation for Learning, (b) Effective Instruction, and (c) Professional Practice.
- Individual Indicator Scores from the summative evaluation of teachers of (a) four indicators within purposeful planning, (b) two indicators within climate, (c) five instruction indicators, (d) one assessment indicator, and (e) four professional practice indicators.
- Primary and secondary summative student achievement and growth data for teachers

The human resources coordinator went into the Applitrack system of the district to pull the data into an excel spreadsheet and accessed the
district’s online teacher evaluation platform to download these data into excel. To ensure the anonymity of each teacher in this study, the data were not submitted to the researcher with names. A numerical code was assigned to each teacher and the human resources coordinator saved a copy of this code with the corresponding teacher if needed. For the purpose of this study, the numerical code was not attached to any names and the researcher did not identify the teacher names at anytime. Furthermore, although the researcher has access to these data as the Director of Human Resources in the district, the researcher only accessed the data provided from the Human Resources Coordinator for the purpose of this study.

Finally, the data submitted to the researcher in the form of an excel spreadsheet will be transferred and inputted into the aforementioned Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis to address the research questions of this study.

**Summary**

This study will focus on analyzing the data collected from the Indiana school district based upon the selected research questions. The researcher has selected a quantitative research approach while examining a correlation method with regression analysis. The independent variable(s) will focus on the TeacherFit scores of the new teachers to the district while the dependent variable(s) will center on the teacher’s summative evaluation scores. However, when using the
correlation method, the independent and dependent variables can often be interchangeable and the researcher will examine all aspects of this methodology. The instrumentation of this study focuses on the two tools and the procedures that have been clearly defined.

In the next chapter, the researcher will analyze the collected data on the proposed research questions and will share findings as it relates to the topics of teacher selection tools and teacher evaluation.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The focus of this research is to examine if the Applitrack TeacherFit selection assessment tool has a relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation. The researcher will examine five areas to analyze the data in order to determine the significance of utilizing a teacher selection tool. The following results and analysis are aimed at answering the subsequent research questions:

- Does the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment tool serve as a valid predictor of future teacher effectiveness measured by a teacher’s summative evaluation?
- Do the overall summative teacher evaluation domains have a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score?
- Does the overall TeacherFit score have any relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation score using the 16 indicators of the evaluation’s Teacher Performance Rubric?
- Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment have a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s overall summative evaluation score?
- Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening selection tool have any relationship with any
of the 16 indicators assessed by evaluators in the teacher’s summative evaluation?

The ensuing results are based upon the aforementioned research questions utilizing a correlational research design in order to determine the relationship between the Applitrack TeacherFit selection tool and a teacher’s summative evaluation. Applicable tables, graphs and data are presented in the statistics and analysis section for each research question. Further descriptive statistical data that support the research results can be found in Appendix A.

**TeacherFit Assessment and the Summative Evaluation**

**Statistics and Analysis**

The first research question in this study examines whether the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment tool serves as a valid predictor of future teacher effectiveness measured by a teacher’s summative evaluation. Table 4.1 provides a model summary for the overall TeacherFit score of the teachers analyzed with their summative evaluation. The R in the summary serves as the correlation between the two variables and calculates at .144. This indicates a low correlation and finds that there is little to no linear relationship when examining the first research question. The R Square is the square root of R and can be useful in determining variability related to the research question being examined verses other factors (Howell, 2012). The R Square for this
model is .021 or can be described as 2% of the variability of a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score is related to their summative evaluation while the other 98% may be related to other factors.

Table 4.1 Model Summary of TeacherFit and Summative Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.144²</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.35334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score

The independent variable used in this regression analysis of the first research question is the overall TeacherFit score with the dependent variable serving as the summative teacher evaluation rating. The independent variable is typically used to predict the dependent variable in this correlational research design.

A scatterplot used in Graph 4.1 details the scores from the dependent and independent variables with a best-fit or regression line based upon the 88 results from newly hired teachers to the district. The graph shows that there is no relevant relationship between the variables, as the plots are not charted in any particular relationship with the best-fit line. The R-value of .144 displayed in table 4.1 confirms that there is a very weak linear relationship between the variables. The 3.01 on the fit line serves as the y-intercept and the 0.04 indicates the slope of the regression line.
Graph 4.1 Scatterplot of TeacherFit and Summative Evaluation

As the plots of data on the scatterplot show in graph 4.1, there is little to no evidence that the TeacherFit score is a good predictor for a summative teacher evaluation in this study.

**TeacherFit and the Rubric Domains**

Further examination and analysis focused on the overall TeacherFit scores of the new hires with the separate domains of the
teacher evaluation model. The three teacher evaluation domains are preparation for learning, effective instruction and professional practice.

**Statistics and Analysis**

**Domain 1: Preparation for Learning**

Preparation for learning focuses on the teacher using a variety of planning resources in order to plan and prepare for the needs of all students. This domain expects teachers to plan their instruction in accordance with the adopted curriculum while possessing an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning. While the total teacher performance rubric accounts for 80% of a teacher’s summative evaluation, domain 1 accounts for 25% of the performance rubric.

While there is a higher correlation in the model summary with an R-value of .211 shown in table 4.2 for Domain 1 of the teacher evaluation model than compared to the overall summative teacher evaluation, this indicates a slight correlation, but is still relatively low. The R Square value of .044 indicates that 4% of the variability can be attributed to domain 1 while 96% may be contributed to other factors.

Table 4.2 Model Summary of Domain 1: Preparation for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score
The TeacherFit overall score serves as the independent variable while domain 1: preparation for learning is the dependent variable.

The scatterplot for domain 1 in graph 4.2 provides a pictorial image of scores with this domain along with the summative teacher evaluation score. The R Square value of 0.044 is higher than the overall R Square value of 0.021 in the first research question; however, it is not statistically significant as there are many variables not a part of the equation that impact this correlation. The graph shows that there is no relevant relationship between the variables, as the plots are not charted in any particular order with the best-fit line. This is evident by the R-value in table 4.2 of .211 that shows a non-significant relationship.

Graph 4.2 Scatterplot of Domain 1: Preparation for Learning
Domain 2: Effective Instruction

The effective instruction domain accounts for 55% weight of the evaluation rubric as a whole while all domains comprise of 80% of a teacher’s summative evaluation. This domain holds the highest importance for a teacher’s evaluation and has a direct relationship with student learning. When correlating these data with a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score, the correlation in table 4.3 indicates an R-value of .141. The correlation shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between domain 2 and a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score. Furthermore, the R Square value of .020 denotes that 2% of the variability can be attributed to domain 2 while 98% can be attributed to other factors when predicting a teacher’s domain 2 score from their TeacherFit assessment overall score.

Table 4.3 Model Summary of Domain 2: Effective Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.34813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score

Domain 2: effective instruction serves as the dependent variable while the TeacherFit overall score is the independent variable.

Finally, the scatterplot for domain 2 in graph 4.3 also shows a low R-squared value of 0.020 that is lower than domain 1 and also lower than the overall TeacherFit score when correlated with the summative
evaluation as a whole. This visual representation shows individual plots with little to no degree of relationship based upon the regression line.

Graph 4.3 Scatterplot of Domain 2: Effective Instruction

Domain 3: Professional Practice

The final domain examined in conjunction with a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score is domain 3: professional practice. Domain 3 focuses on participation in learning communities with indicators that examine data, communication, collaboration and professional development for
teachers. This domain accounts for 20% of a teacher’s performance rubric score.

Table 4.4 displays a correlation R-value of .079. This is the lowest correlation of all three-domain results and the summative evaluation has a non-significant relationship with the professional practice domain. The model summary also shows the correlation value of domain 3 with an extremely low R Squared value of 0.006. Less than 1% of the variability can be attributed to this domain.

Table 4.4 Model Summary of Domain 3: Professional Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.079a</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.38616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score

The dependent variable entered into this equation is domain 3: professional practice with the independent variable serving as the overall TeacherFit score.

The scatterplot produces a y-value of 3.29 with a slope of 0.02 that provides further evidence of an extremely low correlation of domain 3. Graph 4.4 clearly demonstrates that there is no relevant relationship between the variables as they are plotted all over the graph and not in conjunction with the best-fit line. The R-value in table 4.7 supports this, as the correlation is .079 and is an extremely low correlation. This R-value confirms a non-significant relationship and is not significantly
different than a 0.0 correlation that would indicate categorically no relationship.

Graph 4.4 Scatterplot of Domain 3: Professional Practice

**TeacherFit and the 16 Performance Rubric Indicators**

The third research question examines whether the overall TeacherFit score has any relationship with a teacher’s summative
evaluation score using the 16 indicators of the evaluation’s Teacher Performance Rubric. There are three different domains as part of the summative evaluation rubric as analyzed in the previous research question and there are 16 different indicators embedded in the three domains. These indicators are listed in chapter 3 and are also referenced throughout this chapter. Additionally, the researcher ran a correlational analysis of each indicator and how the evaluation variables correlated amongst each other within the 16 summative evaluation indicators for additional analysis of the teacher evaluation rubric itself.

Overall, there was very little to no relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation score using the 16 indicators of the evaluation Teacher Performance Rubric when correlated to their overall TeacherFit score. Indicator 1.2, that measures demonstrating an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning, provided the highest correlation at .292 and indicator 2.6, described as engaging all students in learning, had the second highest correlation at .219 as displayed in table 4.5. According to the correlation matrix in table 4.5, the overall TeacherFit score had a significant correlation with evaluation rubric indicator 1.2. This indicator in domain 1: preparation for learning shows a slight level of significance at the 0.01 level.
Moreover, there were also five of the 16 indicators that have negative correlations. Indicator 3.2, defined as communicates effectively to establish and maintain two-way lines of communication with students and parents, has a negative correlation of -.113 and indicator 2.8, that measures assessing student learning and uses assessment data to adjust instructional practices for student success, has a negative correlation of -.089 as also displayed in table 4.5. These negative indicators show that the higher overall TeacherFit score a candidate has, their evaluation
score indicators decrease; however, it is important to note that these negative correlations are not significant.

After examining the TeacherFit overall score in conjunction with the 16 evaluative indicators, the researcher analyzed each evaluation component with one another. The evaluation components correlate moderately to moderately strong with one another. Indicator 2.1, defined as developing and maintaining a positive classroom climate, along with indicator 2.4, which measures using instructional strategies and resources to teach for understanding, has a moderately strong correlation of .775. Additionally, indicator 2.3, defined as demonstrates a mastery of subject/content and standards, with indicator 2.4 has a correlation value of .751. These are the highest correlations calculated in this study and are displayed in table 4.6. They show that the evaluation rubric indicators line up similarly with one another and are statistically significant. One may expect this to occur as the rubric indicators are related, as this is the focus of the evaluation instrument. Moreover, the evaluator completing the evaluation rubric may decide to mark a teacher with all 3’s across the board as the indicators are related together thus providing an explanation for the high correlation among the indicators.
Table 4.6 Correlation Matrix with Selected Rubric Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>2.4 Uses instructional strategies and resources to teach for understanding</th>
<th>2.1 Develops and maintains a classroom climate that supports student learning</th>
<th>2.3 Demonstrate subject knowledge/standards and how to teach them to students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Uses instructional strategies and resources to teach for understanding</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 1 .775** .751**</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Develops and maintains a classroom climate that supports student learning</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .775** 1 .625**</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Demonstrates subject knowledge/standards and how to teach them to students</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .751** .625** 1</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
<td>79 79 79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Overall, after applying the correlational research design to this research question, there is little to no relationship among the variables associated with the overall TeacherFit score when compared with the 16 individual evaluation rubric indicators. However, when analyzed further examining the 16 indicators with one another, a moderately strong correlation was evident in many of the indicators showing a strong association within the evaluation rubric itself.

**Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the Summative Evaluation**

The penultimate research question as part of this study examines if any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment have a statistically significant relationship with a
teacher’s overall summative evaluation score. The six characteristics measured by the TeacherFit assessment include, fairness and respect, concern for student learning, adaptability, communication and persuasion, planning and organizing and cultural competence. These six characteristics are defined further as each dimension is analyzed with the summative evaluation.

**Statistics and Analysis**

**Fairness and Respect**

The TeacherFit characteristic of fairness and respect represents aspects of fairness for teachers working with students while respecting the individual and collective values and differences of all people in an educational setting. The correlation of this dimension with a teacher’s summative evaluation is 0.197 as evidenced in the model summary on table 4.7. This dimension indicates a non-significant relationship with a teacher’s overall summative evaluation. The R Square value of 0.039 indicates that 3.9% of the variability can be attributed to the fairness and respect characteristic while 96.1% may be contributed to other factors.

Table 4.7 Model Summary of Fairness and Respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Fairness and Respect
The independent variable is the TeacherFit characteristic of fairness and respect and the dependent variable serves as the overall summative evaluation.

The scatterplot in graph 4.5 shows a visual representation of all scores of a teacher’s overall evaluation within their fairness and respect TeacherFit dimension. The points on the scattergram show an uncorrelated relationship as they fall all over the graph with no particular relationship with the regression line.

Graph 4.5 Scatterplot of Fairness and Respect
The scatterplot supports the R-value of the model summary in table 4.7 of .197 and further serves as evidence of a non-relationship between the variables. These data suggest that fairness and respect is not a key variable to predict a teacher’s summative evaluation.

**Concern for Student Learning**

The TeacherFit dimension, concern for student learning, centers on motivating students while addressing their individual learning needs in the classroom. Moreover, genuinely enjoying teaching students and providing positive feedback to them is also a part of this characteristic. Table 4.8 demonstrates an extremely low correlation between the concern for student learning dimension and a teacher’s summative evaluation. The correlation yields a .050 R-value and it is unlikely that this one variable has any predictive validity with the other with an R Square value of .002. The R Square value indicates that less than 1% of the variability can be attributed to the concern for student learning characteristic. There are other variables that are impacting these data that are not part of the equation in the model summary.

**Table 4.8 Model Summary of Concern for Student Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.050a</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.35661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Concern for Student Learning
The independent variable in this model is the TeacherFit concern for student learning characteristic and the dependent variable is the overall evaluation score.

Further data presented through the scatterplot in graph 4.6 shows a display of scores that are not associated in any particular pattern with extremely little to no statistically significant relationship based upon this regression analysis. The visual representation in graph 4.6 displays data points that do not align with the best-fit line.

Graph 4.6 Scatterplot of Concern for Student Learning
Adaptability

The third dimension measured with the TeacherFit assessment is adaptability. This characteristic measures how a teacher responds and adapts to changing situations as well as possesses creative problem solving skills. Moreover, this dimension looks at how a teacher handles stress and alters tactics to accomplish goals. The model summary in table 4.9 posts a correlation of .198 displayed as the R-value. Moreover, the R Square value measures at .039 or 4% of the variability can be attributed to adaptability when correlating with a teacher’s summative evaluation. An R-value of .198 indicates a small linear relationship with this simple regression model.

Table 4.9 Model Summary of Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.34996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Adaptability

The independent variable is the TeacherFit adaptability characteristic and the dependent variable is the overall evaluation score.

Once again, the scatterplot in graph 4.7 illustrates data that are spread out throughout the visual graph and do not have a strong linear relationship. The adaptability dimension does show a stronger
correlation than the previous two TeacherFit characteristics; however, it is still relatively low when examining the degree of relationship.

Graph 4.7 Scatterplot of Adaptability

![Scatterplot of Adaptability](image)

Overall, while examining this research question, the adaptability characteristic has shown the strongest level of relationship; however, it is not at a significant level.

Communication and Persuasion

The fourth dimension centers on a teacher’s ability to speak clearly and accurately with voice inflection while also framing his or her dialogue
in a context that can bring about consensus with all educational stakeholders. The model summary in table 4.10 calculates an R-value of .036. This is the lowest correlation presented thus far in the research and it could be concluded that this TeacherFit characteristic has no linear relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation in this Midwest school district. This very low correlation also lists an R Square value that barely registers at .001 indicating that the variability in these data relies on other factors other than the communication and persuasion characteristic.

Table 4.10 Model Summary of Communication and Persuasion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.036a</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.35683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Communication and Persuasion

The dependent variable used in this regression analysis of the fourth research question is the overall TeacherFit score with the independent variable serving as the communication and persuasion TeacherFit dimension.

Graph 4.8 provides a scatterplot that shows no significant linear relationship with the communication and persuasion TeacherFit dimension. Furthermore, there is a non-significant relationship between the two variables researched and the R-value in table 4.10 provides further evidence as it shows the lowest correlation of the study at .036.
Planning and Organizing

The fifth characteristic analyzed is the TeacherFit dimension of planning and organizing. This dimension can be defined simply as planning ahead and ensuring one is thoroughly organized and prepared in all aspects of teaching. The model summary provided in table 4.11
provides an R-value of .258 and is the highest correlation presented among the six dimensions when compared with the overall teacher summative evaluation. While this correlation is the highest of the six dimensions, it is still considered a slight correlation. The R Square value is .066.

Table 4.11 Model Summary of Planning and Organizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.258*</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.34499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Planning and Organizing

The independent variable entered into this equation is the TeacherFit characteristic of planning and organization and the dependent variable is the overall summative teacher evaluation.

The scatterplot shown in graph 4.9 exhibits an overall non-signification relationship with the best-fit line; however, does provide to be the highest correlation among the six TeacherFit characteristics. The regression line does show a slightly more positive relationship between planning and organizing and overall evaluation variables as compared to the other TeacherFit characteristics displayed on graph 4.9. The R Square value supports this slightly higher correlation at .066 on table 4.11 as well as the R-value at .258.
The final TeacherFit characteristic examined the cultural competence dimension. Cultural competence as defined through Applitrack measures what level the teacher, “is cognizant of how cultural background influences teaching style and works to incorporate diversity into the classroom and lesson plans.” This characteristic can serve as a useful measure for culturally diverse school districts as well as school districts that strive to hire culturally responsive teachers through identifying teachers that possess cultural competent traits.
Table 4.12 provides a model summary for the TeacherFit dimension of cultural competence in relation to the teacher’s overall summative evaluation. The R in the summary serves as the correlation between the two variables and calculates at .049. This indicates a low correlation and finds that there is little to no linear relationship when examining this dimension. The R Square for this model is .002 or can be described as less than 1% of the variability of a teacher’s TeacherFit cultural competence score is related to their summative evaluation while the other 99% plus may be related to other factors.

Table 4.12 Model Summary of Cultural Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049^a</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.35663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Predictors: (Constant), TF: Cultural Competence

The dependent variable used in this regression analysis of this research question served as the overall TeacherFit score with the independent variable serving as the culture competence characteristic.

Graph 4.10 plots the scores from the dependent and independent variables with a best-fit line. The graph shows that there is no relevant relationship between the variables, as the plots are not charted in any particular relationship with the best-fit line. The R-value of .049 displayed in table 4.12 of the model summary confirms that there is a very weak linear relationship between the variables.
This dimension has the second weakest correlation among the six TeacherFit characteristics measured and shows that this dimension is not a useful tool in predicting a teacher’s overall summative evaluation.

**Multiple Regression of the Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the Summative Evaluation**

A multiple regression analysis of the six TeacherFit characteristics serving as independent variables with the overall teacher summative
evaluation as the dependent variable was further examined. The model summary in table 4.13 indicates an R-value of .373 and an R Square of .139. While the correlation of .373 is higher utilizing the multiple regression analysis, it is still limited in predicting a teacher’s overall summative evaluation score. However, this is the highest correlation calculated using the multiple regression model compared with analyzing each individual TeacherFit characteristic individually through the simple regression analysis. This indicates that collectively the variables have a better relationship with the summative teacher ratings than the individual variables, as it is advantageous to use multiple data points to evaluate teachers and not solely focus on one aspect or variable to evaluate teachers on their performance.

Table 4.13 Multiple Regression Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.34129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Cultural Competence, TF: Adaptability, TF: Planning and Organizing, TF: Fairness and Respect, TF: Communication and Persuasion, TF: Concern for Student Learning

It is also important in a multiple regression model to examine the coefficients and look at the beta scores to see where the biggest impact takes place when using all the variables together of the TeacherFit characteristics. Table 4.14 provides this data while the TeacherFit characteristic of adaptability shows the largest impact with a beta score
of .359. This indicates that adaptability has the highest effect in raising a teacher’s summative evaluation score. If the school district were to focus on one of the TeacherFit characteristics, they would want to focus on the adaptability score specifically when looking for teachers that would achieve a higher summative teacher evaluation rating. These results provide a practical significance through this multiple regression lens as a school district may focus more on the adaptability characteristic when hiring teachers.

Table 4.14 TeacherFit Coefficient Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>13.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Fairness and Respect</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Concern for Student Learning</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>-1.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Adaptability</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>2.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Communication and Persuasion</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-1.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Planning and Organizing</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Cultural Competence</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation

When examining the concern for student learning characteristic in table 4.14, the higher score a teacher achieves on this dimension, the lower the teacher’s overall summative evaluation score with a negative beta score of -.302. This is also the case for communication and persuasion with a negative beta score of -.180. The school district may
want to proceed with caution when evaluating candidates using these two characteristics while looking to hire teachers that will achieve superior summative evaluation scores. Finally, it is important to note the .713 data point of sig. for culture competence. This indicates that 71% of the time, scores earned in this dimension are due to random chance.

Overall, adaptability is the only significant rating through the multiple regression analysis; however, it is not at a very high level.

**Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the 16 Performance Rubric Indicators**

The final research question examines whether any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening selection tool have any relationship with any of the 16 indicators assessed by evaluators in the teacher’s summative evaluation rubric. The extensive correlation matrix in Appendix A depicts this question and also provides correlations of each TeacherFit characteristic with one another to determine validity among the TeacherFit assessment tool.

When examining each of the six TeacherFit characteristics with all 16 evaluation indicators, there were several data points that stand out. First, the researcher examined the highest correlations among all TeacherFit characteristics with the 16 indicators. Evaluation indicator 1.2, defined as demonstrates an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning, held the highest
correlations across the board with the TeacherFit assessment characteristics. This evaluation indicator correlated the highest with the TeacherFit characteristic of fairness and respect (.316); concern for student learning (.245); adaptability (.276); and planning and organization (.350). Additionally, the planning and organization dimension also had among the higher correlations with domain 1 of the teacher effectiveness rubric. Other higher correlations with planning and organization include: indicator 1.1, defined as plans for a student program of instruction in accordance with adopted curriculum (.326); indicator 1.3, that measures using a variety of planning resources (.314); and indicator 1.4, defined as plans and prepares for the needs of all students (.273) as displayed in table 4.15. It makes sense that domain 1 of the teacher effectiveness rubric that is defined as purposeful planning and the TeacherFit characteristic of planning and organization would have the highest correlation. However, even though these correlations have been identified as the highest, they are still not meaningfully significant as these data indicate a low correlation when examining this research question.
Conversely, the researcher examined the lowest correlations in table 4.16 among the 16 evaluation indicators and the six TeacherFit assessment characteristics. Fairness and respect correlated with evaluation indicator 2.8, which measures assessing student learning and using assessment data to adjust instructional practices for student learning.
success, at -.003. The concern for student learning TeacherFit characteristic along with evaluation indicator 3.2, defined as communicates effectively to establish and maintain two-way lines of communication with students and parents, calculated at -.169. Evaluation indicator 3.2 also held a negative correlation with the adaptability characteristic calculated at -.143. The communication and persuasion characteristic also held a low correlation with indicator 2.8 at -.148. The planning and organization characteristic held an extremely low linear relationship with evaluation indicator 3.4, which measures using different forms of professional development to improve instruction, with a correlation of .036. Finally, the culture competence TeacherFit assessment dimension correlated with indicator 1.4, defined as planning and preparing for the needs of all students, shows a -.114 correlation. All of these correlation figures between the 16 evaluation rubric indicators and the six TeacherFit assessment characteristics show no statistically significant linear relationship and even where the highest linear relationships were present, the results are still non-significant.
Table 4.16 Correlation Matrix of TeacherFit and Selected Rubric Indicators

Finally, similar to research question three, where the researcher analyzed each of the 16 individual evaluation indicators with one another, similar research for the six TeacherFit assessment characteristics were also examined with one another and data is outlined in table 4.17. This is useful to examine the validity of the instrument being utilized in this study. The TeacherFit data provided a moderately strong correlation when correlating the six TeacherFit characteristics with one another.
The highest correlation was recorded between the concern for student learning and the overall TeacherFit score at .806. This is a statistically significant correlation showing a strong association with the TeacherFit assessment tool itself. Moreover, adaptability also displayed a strong correlation with the overall TeacherFit score in the data with a correlation of .761. Among the six characteristics, concern for student learning and adaptability correlated together with a score of .720. Finally, adaptability and the communication and persuasion characteristics held a high correlation of .694.

Table 4.17 TeacherFit Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TeacherFit Assessment Score</th>
<th>TF: Fairness and Respect</th>
<th>TF: Concern for Student Learning</th>
<th>TF: Adaptability</th>
<th>TF: Communication and Persuasion</th>
<th>TF: Planning and Organizing</th>
<th>TF: Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TeacherFit Assessment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.806**</td>
<td>.761**</td>
<td>.741**</td>
<td>.631**</td>
<td>.563**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Fairness and</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.749**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.505**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Concern for Student</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.806**</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.726**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>.480**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Adaptability</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.701**</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.726**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Communication and</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.741**</td>
<td>.477**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.365**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Planning and</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.631**</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Cultural Competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Overall, the 16 evaluation indicators as well as the six TeacherFit characteristics have a strong association within themselves in the model; however, there is not a significant relationship when correlating the 16 evaluation indicators with the six TeacherFit characteristics. None of the variables match up as a strong linear relationship with each other when examining this research question other than the tools themselves correlating strongly.

The final chapter will provide a summary of the data to explain the findings along with further implications for this research.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine if the Applitrack TeacherFit selection assessment tool has a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation gathered for all new teachers hired into an Indiana urban school district during the 2013-2014 school year. The hiring of high quality teachers is paramount in the current educational climate where we are seeing a significant decrease of teaching licenses being granted to first-time Indiana educators (Cavazos, 2015). Moreover, the number of students entering the field of education is trending downward as more and more students in the state are choosing fields outside of education (Strauss, 2015). Furthermore, many Indiana school districts are currently struggling to fill teaching positions as their school year starts due to a shortage of teaching candidates in the state of Indiana (Ladwig, 2016). Many researchers agree that the teacher plays an extremely important role on the impact of student achievement in the classroom (Stronge & Hindman, 2003; Donaldson, 2011; Clement, 2009; Shkrani, 2008; Goldhaber, Grout & Huntington-Klein, 2014; Grigsby, Schumacher & Vesey, 2012; Stronge, 2007; Jacob, 2012; Marzano, 2010). The issue of finding quality teachers coupled with a high stakes teacher evaluation system that ties a teacher’s compensation to how they are evaluated each
year has created a sense of urgency for Indiana school districts as well as schools of education in the state to cultivate and find high quality educators. This study illuminates all of these critical educational issues in order to determine if there is a relationship between a widely used teacher selection tool and a teacher’s summative evaluation.

**Research Questions**

The research questions examined in this study focused on investigating the following:

- Does the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment tool serve as a valid predictor of future teacher effectiveness measured by a teacher’s summative evaluation?

- Do the overall summative teacher evaluation domains have a statistically significant relationship using a teacher’s overall TeacherFit score?

- Does the overall TeacherFit score have any relationship with a teacher’s summative evaluation score using the 16 indicators of the evaluation’s Teacher Performance Rubric?

- Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening assessment have a statistically significant relationship with a teacher’s overall summative evaluation score?

- Do any of the six characteristics defined within the Applitrack TeacherFit screening selection tool have any relationship with any
of the 16 indicators assessed by evaluators in the teacher’s summative evaluation?

**Results**

A brief summary of the results of each research inquiry is shared below.

**TeacherFit Assessment and the Summative Evaluation**

The first research question examined if the overall TeacherFit score serves as a valid predictor of future teacher effectiveness as measured by the teacher’s overall summative evaluation. The result was that the TeacherFit assessment tool does not serve as a valid predictor of success with a teacher’s summative evaluation score. There was a very low correlation between these two variables and the result did not display a significant relationship. While there has been very little published research conducted on teacher selection tools in conjunction with future teacher performance (Gimbert & Chesley, 2009), this finding is consistent with Regan and Hayes’s (2011) research with math and science teachers using a teacher selection tool. The research by Regan and Hayes (2011) was conducted in a similar manner to this research and they concluded that the greatest growth observed with teachers is through professional development and district supports provided to teachers. The use of the selection tool with the addition of professional development and district supports during a teacher’s time in the classroom may yield stronger results in a teacher’s summative evaluation. Ultimately, the data from this research question showed no
evidence that the TeacherFit score is a good predictor for a summative teacher evaluation in this study.

Additionally, this result has implications for school district policy and practice on teacher selection. As school districts continue to face funding constraints by the state of Indiana (Stokes, 2014; Davies, 2015), it is critical to analyze teacher selection tools that are the most successful in selecting quality teachers to ensure the best use of district resources. Moreover, as the state of Indiana is in the midst of a teacher shortage (Will, 2016), state policy can be shaped in order to assist districts in identifying outstanding teachers while encouraging young people to enter the teaching profession. Although there was not a relationship between the TeacherFit assessment score and a teacher’s summative evaluation, it is still important to consider the use of a research-based tool during the selection process as a metric in identifying quality teachers.

**TeacherFit and the Evaluation Rubric Domains**

The next question examined the relationship between the summative evaluation domains and the overall TeacherFit score. The three domains consist of preparation for learning, effective instruction and professional practice. The preparation for learning domain provided the strongest relationship with the overall TeacherFit score; however, this correlation provided only a small relationship overall and was not statistically significant. The effective instruction domain provided the
second highest correlation among the three domains and also showed a non-significant relationship among the variables. Finally, the professional practice domain had the lowest relationship with the overall TeacherFit score and also provided a non-significant relationship. These research findings are consistent with the research of Goldhaber, Grout and Huntington-Klein (2014) indicating an insignificant relationship between a teacher screening instrument and teacher effectiveness. The authors went on to say that although the data were statistically insignificant, it was still meaningful as the results provide practical significance. A possible explanation for the aforementioned results may lie within specific characteristics of the TeacherFit when compared with the domains of the summative teacher evaluation model. The preparation for learning domain had the strongest correlation among the three domains and its indicators resemble most closely with the planning and organization TeacherFit dimension. Although the results with this research question were not significant, the strongest correlation showed among the preparation for learning domain, which is closely linked to the TeacherFit characteristic of planning and organization.

**TeacherFit and the 16 Performance Rubric Indicators**

The aim of this question was to examine if the 16 teacher performance rubric indicators provided a relationship with the TeacherFit overall score. Overall, the 16 indicators did not correlate well with the TeacherFit score; however, there were points that aligned better
than others. Indicator 1.2, defined as demonstrates an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning, provided the highest correlation of all 16 indicators and displayed a significant correlation with the overall TeacherFit score. Evaluation rubric indicator 1.2 showed the only significant relationship in this study when analyzed with the overall TeacherFit score. This indicator does relate closely with the planning and organization characteristic of the TeacherFit assessment. From a practical standpoint, the district may not need to focus their professional development plan on this indicator as teachers that achieve a high TeacherFit score are predicted to perform well in this evaluation rubric indicator. However, the district could use the results of the TeacherFit assessment in order to personalize or customize their professional development needs for newly hired teachers. Additionally, indicator 2.6, that measures engagement of all students in learning, had the second highest correlation, but provided a non-significant correlation.

There were many insignificant relationships among these results and two indicators displayed a negative, non-significant relationship. The researcher then took this analysis a step further and examined if the 16 teacher performance indicators held any relationship among each other. Indicator 2.1, that measures developing and maintaining a positive classroom climate, along with indicator 2.4, defined as uses instructional strategies and resources to teach for understanding held
the highest correlation and all of the indicators lined up moderately strong with one another suggesting a strong association with the teacher performance rubric itself.

**Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the Summative Evaluation**

The penultimate research question flipped the variables and examined the six individual TeacherFit characteristics or dimensions while investigating their relationships with the overall teacher summative evaluation score. The data showed that overall when examined individually, there was no significant relationship with a summative evaluation score. However, when examining the six characteristics together, the results provided a modest correlation. This indicates that collectively the TeacherFit characteristics have a stronger relationship with the summative teacher ratings than the individual characteristics taken alone. It seems then that it is advantageous to use multiple data points to evaluate teachers and not solely focus on one aspect or characteristic to evaluate teachers on their performance. The notion of using multiple measures in the process of hiring teachers coincides with much of the literature on teacher hiring (Jacob, Kane, Rockoff & Staiger, 2009; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014). The TeacherFit characteristic of adaptability displayed the strongest correlation among all six TeacherFit characteristics. This finding suggests that administrators responsible for hiring may want to place more weight on
this dimension when making important hiring decisions on teacher candidates as well as considering other important hiring metrics.

Furthermore, administrators conducting interviews of teachers that are selected to move forward in the interview process can use the results of the six characteristics of the TeacherFit assessment to focus interview questions on characteristics where teachers did not score as high or the administrator wants to explore a certain TeacherFit characteristic with more depth. While the literature on teacher hiring indicates that the interview in itself is not a useful measure in predicting teacher performance (Nichols, 2004; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014), it can be advantageous not only to use a teacher selection tool as an additional measure but also to further use the data through the interview process.

**Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the 16 Performance Rubric Indicators**

The final question related all six TeacherFit characteristics with all 16 teacher effectiveness indicators to gather information on any data points that may show a strong relationship. Overall these correlations showed no significance. However, there were several data points that stood out suggesting practical significance. The indicator with the highest correlations was 1.2, defined as demonstrates an understanding of how students develop and learn in the planning for student learning. This summative evaluation indicator held the highest correlation across the board with individual TeacherFit assessment characteristics and also
displayed the only significant relationship when correlated with the overall TeacherFit assessment. There is a similarity between this rubric indicator that is listed in domain 1 of purposeful planning and the TeacherFit characteristic of planning and organization. These two variables showed the strongest relationship in the study and it can be argued that they measure similar characteristics of quality teachers rather than predicting a strong rubric indicator evaluation score. Conversely, the fairness and respect characteristic and indicator 2.8, which measures assessing student learning and uses assessment data to adjust instructional practices for student success, held a negative correlation and provided no statistically significant relationship between the two variables. The concern for student learning TeacherFit characteristic along with evaluation indicator 3.2, defined as communicates effectively to establish and maintain two-way lines of communication with students and parents, provided a negative, non-significant correlation. Interestingly, these two variables would seem on the surface to have a relationship as concerned teachers would want to establish communication lines with parents.

Finally, similar to research question three, where the researcher analyzed each of the 16 individual evaluation indicators with one another, similar research for the six TeacherFit assessment characteristics were also examined. Among the six characteristics, concern for student learning and adaptability held the highest correlation and this
relationship proved to yield results of a moderately high correlation. While the specific items of each instrument are related to each other there is a non-significant relationship when examining the 16 evaluation indicators with the six TeacherFit characteristics as well as the overall relationship when the two tools are analyzed together. A possible explanation for these results involves how each tool measures success. The TeacherFit assessment is a self-evaluation tool and scores teachers based upon answers they provide in the form of a Likert scale. With the teacher summative effectiveness rubric, an administrator is evaluating the teacher and may have a tendency to use the middle of the rating scale thus impacting the results within this study. The notion of simply rating much of a domain or the entire rubric with a similar score could impact the variability in the results. This can have implications for state and district policy with ensuring inter-rater reliability and training for teacher evaluators as the paradigm has recently shifted in how states and districts are required to evaluate teachers (Donaldson, 2012; Popham, 2013).

Overall, the 16 evaluation indicators as well as the six TeacherFit characteristics have a strong association within themselves in the model that speaks to the validity of each instrument used in this study; however, there is not a significant relationship when correlating the 16 indicators with the six TeacherFit characteristics.
Conclusions and Implications

Identify a teacher selection tool that best fits a school district

Overall, the data from this study showed that there was not a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ summative evaluation and their assessment score received upon completing the TeacherFit assessment within this Midwest school district. Although the data suggest that the Applitrack TeacherFit is not a valid predictor of teacher performance on a summative evaluation conducted by evaluators in this district, this tool may still be a useful measure in hiring teachers. It is also important to note that it is not the intention of a selection tool such as the Applitrack TeacherFit assessment to measure teacher performance (Metzger & Wu, 2008). The selection tool measures characteristics and dispositions of teacher candidates identified in effective teachers. School districts’ use of the TeacherFit assessment score as the only measure in determining teacher candidates selected to be a part of the interview process or the next step in the hiring process would be detrimental to identifying outstanding teacher candidates (Harris, 2011). To utilize any selection tool in this manner would leave out many phenomenal teaching candidates. Examining ways and measures to improve the teacher selection process can save school districts money in the long run to avoid teacher turnover as well as the costly contract cancellation process (Jacob, 2016). The art of hiring is not a perfect practice and those tasked with hiring teachers should not
place all of the weight of hiring teachers on one characteristic or data measure (Clement, 2015; O’Donovan, 2012). The over emphasis on one teacher selection tool or measure alone is unlikely to predict teacher success. However, in the current educational climate that focuses on data and assessments, school boards and superintendents may be requesting additional measures as evidence of strategic hiring practices when selecting outstanding teachers and the Applitrack TeacherFit assessment may be an essential data point to include (Sawchuk, 2011). It is important to utilize multiple data points when hiring teachers as it can limit the hiring process when a district representative focuses too much on only one measure.

Finally, if the school district continues to utilize this selection tool as part of the hiring process, it is important to continue to evaluate the tool each year in order to analyze additional data used in the assessment process. The district should consider using the built in administrator survey from Applitrack similar to the Sioux Falls School District (2013) report in order to have administrators rate each new teacher hire at a six month interval during that teacher’s first year in the school district. This way the district can track each newly hired teacher and disaggregate the data in order to improve their hiring selection practices in the future. This Midwest school district should proceed cautiously as there was little to no predictive validity with the TeacherFit selection tool when correlated with a teacher’s summative evaluation; however, it would be
advantageous to proceed with cataloging administrator feedback on each new hire before making a decision to discontinue the Applitrack TeacherFit selection tool as part of their teacher selection process.

**Focus on teacher characteristics that a district desires**

It is imperative for school districts to identify the characteristics that they desire in teacher candidates. When that process has taken place, those responsible for hiring should focus their decisions on characteristics and dimensions that best fit their school or school district. Dispositional factors are being utilized more and more in the hiring process through behavior based interviewing and selection strategies as school districts are searching for candidates that possess characteristics the districts are searching for in teachers (O’Donovan, 2012; Hindman & Strong, 2009). Once the district has gone through the process of identifying what teacher qualities are important to their community and stakeholders, they may want to identify a selection tool that best fits their beliefs. Since this Midwest school district resides in an urban setting, it may be advantageous to examine the Haberman Star Teacher selection tool assessment as this tool focuses on identifying high quality urban teachers (Haberman, 2004). Each of the selection tools marketed to school districts measures different effective teacher qualities. The district should evaluate if the Applitrack TeacherFit assessment is the best fit. The cost of each of the selection tools is also a
factor to consider when going through this process as well as the time it will take to train administrators on the tool itself. However, in a larger school district such as this Midwest school district included in this study, the cost of the Applitrack TeacherFit selection tool is minimal when considering the overall district budget. Smaller school districts may not have this luxury and may need to use a more critical lens when evaluating the overall cost of teacher selection tools. Ultimately, the Applitrack TeacherFit assessment tool may still be the best fit for this Midwest school district; however, it is important to engage in a process of first identifying the characteristics the school district desires in effective teachers and then matching those characteristics with a selection tool that best represents what the district values.

**Develop a comprehensive teacher evaluation tool**

It is important to develop a comprehensive teacher evaluation tool and this urban school district has successfully completed this task as evidenced in chapter three of this study. This research has many implications for district and state policies not only on teacher selection, but also with teacher evaluation as a whole. The evaluation tool data coupled with the TeacherFit assessment data can be utilized to inform future professional development offered by the school district. However, in order to feel confident about using these data, evaluators performing observations and completing evaluations should be trained on the
evaluation model (Murphy, Cole, Pike, Ansaldo, & Robinson, 2014). Inter-rater reliability research should also be performed by the district to determine if the school district is implementing the evaluation model with fidelity across all schools. Moreover, continued evaluation training for administrators that evaluate teachers should be ongoing in any school district. Of all the 88 summative evaluations submitted in this study, 97.7% were rated effective or highly effective. The district’s evaluation results are similar to state data shared by the Indiana Department of Education where a majority of Indiana teachers were rated in the two highest categories for this school year (Elliott & Cavazos, 2015). However, continued training of evaluators not only assists with teacher perceptions on equity in evaluations, but also provides data that can be more relevant, valid and reliable to teachers knowing that the school district is immersed in a practice of continual improvement and reflection with the teacher evaluation process.

Finally, administrators can use the evaluation and TeacherFit data in this study to focus on continued improvement and rubric indicators that they believe yield high effectiveness strategies concentrated on increasing student achievement outcomes. The individual schools can implement a targeted instructional feedback process with teachers based upon the individual teacher effectiveness rubric data indicators. Teachers can also be a part of this process by reflecting on indicators they feel they need the most feedback with and administrators would
focus on these areas during observations throughout the school year. The purpose of this process is to inform the school improvement plan and focus conversations in professional learning communities on instructional teaching practices through the lens of the teacher effectiveness rubric indicators (DuFour, 2004). Data provided in this study can serve as evidence to begin this process. All of this ties into teacher selection as more and more teachers are examining evaluation models when searching for school districts with teacher openings. Collaborative practices revolving around teacher evaluation can be a factor that teachers are considering when applying to school districts and a teacher selection tool comes into play when selecting teachers from the overall pool. Moreover, if a school district truly values their teacher evaluation model, administrators should frame their interview questions around the rubric indicators to teacher candidates. The developed interview questions from the evaluation model can serve as a tool in identifying key characteristics of effective teachers while tying in evaluation as another data measure through the interview questions related to the evaluation model. The teacher evaluation tool is extremely important in this study and also critical for school districts to develop a researched based rubric to be a part of the summative evaluation that includes teacher feedback. This notion also serves as part of the teacher selection process and can be linked back to using the teacher evaluation model to identify important effective teacher characteristics that can
ultimately assist in selecting a teacher selection tool that best fits a school district.

**Video interview platforms as a teacher selection tool in the future**

Finally, as school districts continue to utilize technology as part of their hiring process, video interview platforms can provide school districts with another useful measure in identifying and selecting teachers in the future. This furthers the notion of a teacher selection tool and is a different type of tool that can be used as a stand alone tool or in conjunction with a prescreening assessment like the Applitrack TeacherFit. Utilizing a video platform for interviewing will be something that more and more districts may focus on as part of the selection process (Tolan, 2015). Having teachers submit video responses to predetermined interview questions as part of the application process will provide administrators responsible for hiring another tool in order to observe video responses and screen teacher candidates. While written responses on paper and online teacher applications are common, not many districts utilize a video based platform to screen teacher candidates. This is similar to conducting a phone screener pre-interview without the video. Interview companies such as Spark Hire and ViewYou provide school districts with advanced video technology in order to obtain additional measures in the screening process. This process can also save those responsible for hiring valuable time as they would not have to
sit through a 30-minute interview if they knew in the first five minutes that they were not interested in the candidate. As communication is a characteristic in the Applitrack TeacherFit while other dispositional factors are becoming more important for school district personnel, a video based platform may be another solution for identifying the best teachers for a school district. Finally, as this research has suggested the use of multiple data points when selecting teachers, the video interview selection tool can be a useful tool to include during the interview process as another important measure.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

There are various recommendations for future research that can be considered based upon this teacher selection research study. First, one can examine the replication of this study using a larger population and sample size in order to improve generalizability. While the goal of this specific study was not to aim for generalizability, it focused on assisting a single school district in deciding whether the TeacherFit selection tool has predictive validity with a teacher’s summative evaluation. This overall study was limited in size and scale with one urban school district and further research into this topic could focus on a larger scale.

Including data with a similar study that incorporates more than one school year and tracks data over time would also be valuable. This could be advantageous in examining the difference between beginning
teachers versus experienced teachers over a period of time. Does the TeacherFit selection tool better predict the success of experienced teachers over beginning teachers? Further research into this topic may serve the body of research on teacher selection well into the future.

Future researchers could replicate this study and include teachers from rural, suburban and urban areas to reveal if there are differences among the geographical locations. This study was limited to an urban teaching area and other geographic locations may provide similar or contrasting research results. Future studies could focus on teachers from one of these geographical areas or a larger study could examine data from all three locations together.

Further study of the TeacherFit selection tool compared with other selection tools on the market discussed in this study would serve this topic well in the future. Researchers could gather data from teacher selections tools mentioned in this study such as the Gallop Teacher Perceiver tool or the Haberman teacher selection tool using teacher summative evaluation data. A comparison between the different teacher selection tools on the market and their relation to teachers’ summative evaluation would offer a rich contrast and may add significant results to this growing body of research.

Moreover, a researcher could examine different teacher evaluation models and rubrics while replicating the study using the different
evaluation models with the TeacherFit assessment tool in order to determine any differences or similarities in the results. There are many different evaluation models being used among school districts in the state of Indiana and an examination of the different models could be beneficial for not only teacher selection tools, but also for teacher evaluation as a whole.

The Applitrack TeacherFit selection instrument has also developed an Urban TeacherFit selection tool as well as a TeacherFit tool for special education teachers. Further inquiry into these two tools from Applitrack could warrant additional research. While all of the teacher selection tools have similarities among them, there are different effective teaching characteristics that are measured and they may have a stronger relationship with the teacher evaluation model than others.

Researchers could also use the data in this study or examine future teacher selection tool and evaluation data in order to study the effectiveness of student teaching or residency experiences of future teachers. Is it more advantageous for a student at the university level to student teacher for an entire year or only a semester? There are varying time length requirements of student teaching experiences from universities all over the country and a study to examine which experiences produce the most prepared teachers would enrich this growing body of research.
Finally, a mixed methods approach may be beneficial to examine qualitative data gathered from administrators and teachers regarding teacher quality and perceptions of the teacher evaluation model. Research shows that there is anxiety among teachers regarding teacher evaluation as it is being tied to compensation in many states (Cole, Robinson, Ansaldo, Whiteman & Spradlin, 2012; Powell, 1999). A mixed methods approach may tease out these fears about evaluation and provide other valuable information through the combination of a quantitative and qualitative process.

As previously noted, many scholars indicate that the hiring of teachers is one of the most vital tasks for a school district (Ebmeier & Ng, 2006; Stronge & Tucker, 2000; Koenigsknecht, 2006; Pillsbury, 2005). School districts are faced with many challenges and the ability to identify, select and hire a high quality teacher can be extremely impactful on student achievement. When hiring the best teachers on the front end, school districts can save valuable time and limited resources in order to focus on curriculum and effective teaching practices rather than counseling ineffective teachers out of the profession. Utilizing multiple measures in selecting and identifying highly effective teachers can increase the success of a school district both academically and financially through the development of a strategic hiring process.
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APPENDIX A: ANOVA AND COEFFICIENT DATA RESULTS

TeacherFit Assessment and the Summative Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>1.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.737</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation
b. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>16.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TeacherFit Assessment Score</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation

TeacherFit and the Performance Rubric Domains

Domain 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>4.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>13.329</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.950</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Domain 1: Preparation for Learning
b. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>14.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Domain 2**

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>.189b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.422</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.635</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>16.433</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeacherFit Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain 3

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.467b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12.824</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.904</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Domain 1: Preparation for Learning
*b. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score
*a. Dependent Variable: Domain 2: Effective Instruction
*b. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score
*a. Dependent Variable: Domain 3: Professional Practice
*b. Predictors: (Constant), TeacherFit Assessment Score
Coefficients$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.294</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>16.257</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeacherFit Assessment Score</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Domain 3: Professional Practice

Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the Summative Evaluation

Fairness and Respect

ANOVA$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>3.486</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.537</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation
b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Fairness and Respect

Coefficients$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.984</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>20.183</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Fairness and Respect</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>1.887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation
### Concern for Student Learning

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.937</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Concern for Student Learning

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Concern for Student Learning</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation

### Adaptability

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>3.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.532</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Adaptability

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>17.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Adaptability</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation
### Communication and Persuasion

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.950</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Communication and Persuasion

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>17.735</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Communication and Persuasion</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation

### Planning and Organizing

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>6.120</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.236</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Planning and Organizing

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>17.849</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Planning and Organizing</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>2.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation
### Cultural Competence

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.653b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.938</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation  

b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Cultural Competence

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>26.981</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF: Cultural Competence</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation

### Multiple Regression of Six TeacherFit Characteristics and the Summative Evaluation

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>.052b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9.435</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Evaluation  

b. Predictors: (Constant), TF: Cultural Competence, TF: Adaptability, TF: Planning and Organizing, TF: Fairness and Respect, TF: Communication and Persuasion, TF: Concern for Student Learning
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