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Executive Summary

The 19 public school districts throughout the state of Delaware reported hiring a total of 1,101 teachers for the 2006-07 school year. The personnel directors from the 19 districts and 17 charter schools were asked to complete an online survey. This survey requested information on the number of new hires, when personnel directors were notified of vacancies, when contracts were offered, which teaching and non-teaching positions were difficult to fill, and recruitment tools used.

This year’s late teacher hiring total mirrors the figure from last year, which was a significant decrease from prior years. Two years ago, for the 2004-05 school year, 68 percent of teachers were hired in August or later. Last year, this percentage greatly decreased; in 2005-06, 43.1 percent of teachers were hired in August or later. For the 2006-07 school year, 44.8 percent of teachers were hired in August or later.

Of the new hires, 309 were on temporary contract, an increase from 224 in the previous year (2005-06), and comparable to the 315 during the 2004-05 school year.

While difficulty in filling special education positions has decreased from last year, special education positions remain the most difficult teaching positions to fill. Special Education, bilingual/ESOL, high school math, and high school science positions were difficult to fill; elementary, physical education, english, and social science positions were not difficult to fill. The districts reported an increase in major difficulty in hiring for many of the subject areas this year compared to previous years.

While personnel directors were very positive about those who began teaching for their districts in the fall of 2006, they were somewhat less positive than last year. This less-positive sentiment has been evident for the past three years. The percent of personnel directors reporting teachers being “better prepared” than previous years decreased. The number of personnel directors reporting all new teachers as “highly prepared” decreased as well.

To supplement the survey of personnel directors, payroll-record data on teacher characteristics and mobility were provided by the Delaware Department of Education (DOE) for the state’s 16 regular public school districts, three vo-tech school districts, and 17 charter schools.

Results of the survey indicate 1,101 hires, presumably including 202 switchers as identified by DOE data, for a net of 899 teachers new to Delaware. According to DOE payroll records, there were 897 teachers who left teaching in Delaware between May
2006 and November 2006. Thirty-three percent of teachers who left in the past year had five years of experience in Delaware or fewer.

This year, for the first time, the survey included questions concerning administrator supply to gauge Delaware’s ability to fill administrative positions. The data indicate that a good deal of activity in the state is focused on school administrator recruitment and preparation.
Introduction

The 19 public school districts throughout the state of Delaware hired a total of 1,101 teachers for the 2006-07 school year. The personnel directors from each district were asked to complete an online survey requesting information on the number of new hires, when personnel directors were notified of vacancies, when districts offered contracts, which teaching and non-teaching positions were difficult to fill, and recruitment tools used. All completed the survey. In addition to the 19 regular school districts in Delaware, this year’s survey was also distributed to the 17 charter schools in the state. Thirteen of the 17 charter schools returned the survey. The charter school analysis is reported separately from the regular school district results.

This year, for the first time, the survey included questions concerning administrator supply. This was done in an attempt to gauge Delaware’s ability to fill administrative positions. This year’s survey, the sixth in an annual series of surveys, was administered through the Department of Education DEEDS website. The analysis was conducted by the Institute for Public Administration (IPA) within the College of Human Services, Education & Public Policy (CHEP) at the University of Delaware.

The Teacher Supply Survey from 2005-06 was analyzed and redesigned, with the assistance of Dr. Wayne Barton, acting director of the Professional Accountability Assessment and Accountability Branch of the Delaware Department of Education (DOE). The survey was posted on the DEEDS website from February 2007 to April 2007.

The personnel directors’ survey was supplemented with DOE data. These records include data from the payroll department and contain information through November 2006. The DOE data are analyzed in a separate section.
The reader should note that this report is based upon objective and subjective data. The DOE payroll data is relatively objective and accurate. While there are some issues with reporting teaching experience for new teachers, generally, the personnel records are valid. The survey responses from the district and charter school personnel directors include some relatively objective information, such as the number of new teachers hired for fall 2006, but also include more subjective responses, such as a personnel director’s view of the preparation of new teachers and the utility of various recruitment activities. Where responses are subjective, changes in who is reporting for a district—i.e., where the personnel director has changed—may result in survey response changes from year to year. Admittedly sometimes it is difficult to ascertain to what extent changes in responses from year to year are due to changes in directors (including the addition of new charter schools), local circumstances such as financial problems within a district and statewide trends. Thus, we do try to report five-year trends on major indicators and focus on changes from the past year throughout.
Personnel Director Survey Results

The analysis of the results of the Web-based survey of the 19 personnel directors reflects the findings about teacher hiring, critical-needs areas, non-teacher hiring, and recruitment strategies over the past five years. The first section of the report contains the results of the Teacher and Administrator Supply Survey. The data in the text and tables (see Appendix A) are reported as the percent of districts answering a question in a particular way. For example, if 12 of the 19 district personnel directors reported a response was a “major problem” related to teacher shortages in their district, the percentage of districts offering this response is indicated as 63.2 percent.

The survey instrument has been reproduced in Appendix B.

Teacher Hiring

Personnel directors report that a total of 1,101 teachers were hired by the 19 school districts for the 2006-07 academic year, which is consistent with the number of teachers hired each of the past two years. This includes 202 teachers changing districts within the state, as reported in the DOE Payroll Data Results section below. Of these hires, the hiring dates of 804 new teachers were reported (see Figure 1a). It is important to note that there are some discrepancies in the data due to varying interpretations of the first three survey questions. Some districts included temporary hires in their monthly hiring data, while others considered temporary hires separately. Two large districts did not provide any information concerning monthly totals or temporary hires.

This year’s late teacher hiring total mirrors the figure from last year, which was a significant decrease from prior years. Two years ago, for the 2004-05 school year, 68 percent of teachers
Figure 1a.  
Month that Teacher Contract was Agreed Upon: Five-Year Comparison

*two districts did not report months

Figure 1b.  
Percent of Teachers Hired August or Later: Five-Year Comparison
were hired in August or later. Last year, this percentage greatly decreased; in 2005-06, 43.1 percent of teachers were hired in August or later. For the 2006-07 school year, 44.8 percent of teachers were hired in August or later (Table 1 and Figure 1b).

The most frequently reported month for hiring remains August (225 hires), followed by June (148 hires), July (121 hires), and May (115 hires). This year, 175 teachers were hired in May or earlier. Comparatively, last year the most frequently reported month for hiring was August (300 hires), followed by July (252 hires), and May (135 hires). Last year, 247 teachers were hired in May or earlier.

Eight districts provided letters of intent to some of their recruits before actually issuing contracts, thus notifying these new teachers earlier of their new positions. There were 137 letters of intent issued by the eight school districts in the year 2006-07. During the months of April, May, and June, only 46 letters of intent (34%) were issued. By comparison, in 2005-06 there were 276 letters of intent issued by six districts, of which 80 percent were issued in April, May, and June (221). This year, 65.7 percent of letters of intent were issued in July (11), August (49), and September (30), collectively.

Between February and April, when the survey was distributed and completed, personnel directors reported a total of 16 unfilled teaching positions in the state. Unfilled positions include special education (2), technology, auto technology, biology, chemistry, physical education, science, and middle school English. This reflects an improvement compared to the past two years; last year there were 22 unfilled positions, and two years ago there were 33 unfilled positions at the time of the survey.
There were 41 Alternative Routes teachers hired for 2006-07. The number of Alternative Routes teachers decreased this year by nine and is 29 fewer than two years ago.

**Of the new hires, 309 were on temporary contracts, an increase from 224 in the previous year (2005-06) and comparable to the 315 contracts during the 2004-05 school year.** The most common reason indicated for temporary contracts was temporary needs such as pregnancy, illness, and sabbaticals; five of the 19 districts (26.3%) indicated it as a major reason, and ten out of 19 districts (52.6%) indicated it as a moderate reason. Seven of the 19 districts (36.8%) noted uncertainty of the September 30 count and teachers not yet “highly qualified” or “certified” as reasoning for temporary contracts. Financial pressures in districts also appeared to have led to temporary contracts, e.g., one district under such fiscal stress, hired teachers on temporary contracts at twice the rate of other districts. All personnel directors cited that hires after a certain date, such as the first student day or October 1, receive temporary contracts.

**In conclusion, a positive trend in teacher hiring is the continued trend of earlier hiring. However, this year there was a decreased use of the letter of intent, and, when used, they were offered later rather than earlier in the hiring process. The use of temporary contracts increased again, rivaling the number of temporary contracts issued two years ago.**

**Teacher Shortages**

Teacher shortages continued to exist in several areas. These areas are consistent with the difficulties reported by personnel directors in the past (see Figure 2). In comparison to last year, there was an increase in the percentage of districts reporting a
Figure 2.
Percent of Districts Indicating Major Difficulty in Filling Teaching Positions by Subject
major difficulty in filling all positions, with the exception of elementary school, elementary math, and physical education teachers. The areas most difficult to fill were special education, bilingual/ESOL, high school math, and high school science.

While difficulty in filling special education positions has decreased from last year, special education positions remain the most difficult to fill. This year, seven out of 19 districts (36.8%) reported that this area was the most difficult for which to hire, even though it has decreased from the 57.9 percent reported in 2005-06 (Table 2). Other subjects for which personnel directors reported having difficulty hiring were for bilingual/ESOL, foreign languages, high school math, and high school science. Fifteen out of 19 districts (78.9%) reported both high school math and special education positions as very difficult to fill. This was a very significant increase from 2005-06, where 10 out of 19 districts (52.6%) reported difficulty filling high school math positions and 11 out of 19 districts (57.9%) reported difficulty filling special education positions. There was also an increase in difficulty finding ESOL teachers. Last year, only five of the 19 districts (26.3%) indicated that bilingual/ESOL teaching positions were difficult to fill; this year, seven of the 19 districts (47.4%) denoted bilingual teaching positions as very difficult to fill.

Because personnel directors have continued to cope with shortages in critical-needs areas, this year an additional question was included concerning when critical-needs hiring occurred. Nine of the 19 districts (47.4%) reported hiring teachers in critical-needs areas early; seven out of 19 districts (36.8%) reported hiring critical-needs teachers neither early nor late; one district (5.3%) reported hiring critical-needs areas late; and two
districts (10.5%) were not sure. Thus, about half of the districts place a high priority on hiring in critical needs teachers early in the hiring process.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, districts reported ease in hiring elementary, physical education, English, and social science teachers. Hiring difficulty in all of these areas was similar to those of 2005-06. Nine out of 19 districts reported no difficulty in hiring elementary teachers. Physical education and social science positions were also not difficult to fill, with 13 out of 19 districts (68.4%) reporting those positions were not difficult to fill. Similarly, English teachers were not difficult to hire, with 9 out of 19 districts (47.4%) reporting these teachers were not difficult to hire and only 10.5 percent concluding they were very difficult to hire.

Personnel directors were asked to report the characteristics considered in hiring new teachers. The characteristics considered to a great extent were teacher certification status, with 100 percent of personnel directors noting this. Sixteen of the 19 districts reported that teacher’s coursework in the subject area was considered to a great extent; 57.9 percent noted teacher’s preparation program and degree; and 52.6 percent reported student teaching record in the district’s school (Table 3).

Special Education, bilingual/ESOL, high school math, and high school science positions were difficult to fill; elementary, physical education, English, and social science positions were not. The districts reported an increase in major difficulties for many of the subject areas compared to previous years.

Teacher Preparation

All personnel directors reported their new teachers were as prepared or better prepared than they had been in the past. Overall, 15 personnel directors (78.9%)
reported that teachers were as prepared as they had been in prior years, and four districts (21.1%) reported that teachers were better prepared than in prior years (Table 4). **None of the districts felt that teachers were less prepared than in past years** (see Figure 3). Gauging the perceived, absolute quality of new teachers, two personnel directors (10.5%) reported that teachers were all highly prepared. Thirteen other personnel directors (68.4%) reported that almost all were highly prepared.

Despite this year’s optimistic views, personnel directors have become less positive about teacher preparation over the past three years. In the 2005-06 school year, 63.2 percent of the personnel directors reported that teachers were as prepared as in prior years, and 36.8 percent felt that teachers were better prepared than in the past. In the 2004-05 school year, about half (47.4%) of the personnel directors felt that teachers were as prepared as in the past, and about half (52.6%) felt that teachers were better prepared than in the past.

**While personnel directors were very positive about those who began teaching for their districts in the fall of 2006, they were somewhat less positive than last year. This “less positive” sentiment has been occurring for the past three years. The percent of personnel directors reporting teachers being better prepared than previous years decreased. Personnel directors reporting all new teachers as highly prepared decreased as well.**

**Reasons for Teacher Shortages**

**According to the district respondents, the main reason for teacher shortages was a lack of qualified teacher candidates.** Twelve out of 19 districts (63.2%) reported that a lack of qualified applicants was the main reason for teacher shortages (Table 5).
Figure 3.
Comparison of Qualifications of Recent Teacher Hires to Those of Previous Years
(Assessment by Percent of Districts)
This is an increase from 2005-06; 10 out of 19 districts (52.6%) reported this reason last year. The second most common reason was a lack of number of teacher candidates in particular areas; 9 out of 19 districts (47.4%) noted this as a major problem. The reasons for problems related to teacher shortages have decreased in all categories (see Figure 4).

In order to help understand how the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) provisions of NCLB have affected hiring, an additional question was added to the survey this year. Personnel directors were asked to what extent particular factors affected their school district. Seventy-three percent of districts reported that HQT provisions have affected the recruitment of special education teachers to a great extent, but only about one-third judged that HQT was negatively affecting their ability to find and recruit teachers (Table 6). Thirteen of the 19 districts also indicated that HQT provisions added more “red tape” to the hiring process to a great extent. On a more positive note, ten districts (52.7%) reported that HQT provision improved the quality of teachers hired; and 12 districts (63.1%) reported that HQT provisions improved the quality of teachers already in the district. Thus, on the whole, district personnel directors were more negative than positive about the immediate impact of the HQT provisions, viewing these as making it more difficult to hire teachers, especially in special education.

**Vacancies**

The reasons teachers left districts this year, as reported by district personnel directors, were specified for 397 out of 657 (60.4%) vacancies reported, compared to last year’s 542 out of 788 vacancies reported (84.6%). Of the 633 reported reasons for teachers leaving, responses were varied (Table 6). According to district personnel, 38.4 percent of teachers for whom they reported a reason for leaving left positions because
Figure 4.
Five-Year Comparison of Percent of Districts Indicating a Major Problem in Teacher Shortages due to…

![Bar chart showing the comparison of percent of districts indicating a major problem in teacher shortages from 2002-2003 to 2006-2007.](chart-image-url)
they were retiring (Figure 5). Intrastate migration accounted for 18 percent of known vacancies. Additional reasons for teachers leaving that were not reported as a frequent problem were as follows:

- Left to take a position in another Delaware school district (N=69)
- Left to take a position in another district outside of Delaware (N=34)
- Left to relocate with family (N=26)
- Left because of illness/death (N=8)
- Left because they were dismissed (N=3)
- Left to take a position at a charter school (N=3)
- Unknown (N=260)

In order to help understand the reasons for vacancies and determine the gap between finding out about vacancies and hiring, personnel directors were asked to indicate when they learned about the vacancies. They were asked to provide the number of vacancies learned about within a given time period, starting with October 2005 or earlier and continuing month-by-month until September 2006. This provided information on when 657 vacancies were reported for the 2006-07 academic year (Table 8). Similar to last year, only 35 percent of teacher vacancies were reported by April 2005 or earlier. The largest number of vacancies, 118, was reported in May 2006, followed by June 2006 (93). This is an improvement upon last year, where the largest number for the 788 vacancies were reported in July 2005 (144), followed by June 2005 (116).

The median month that district personnel directors learned about teacher vacancies was May, and the median month during which they filled teacher vacancies was July. Last year, the median month that personal directors indicated learning about
Figure 5.
Reasons for Teachers Leaving

(N=633)

- Reason Unknown: 41.1%
- Retired: 25.7%
- Other: 6.3%
- Another Position in a Delaware District: 10.9%
- Position Outside Delaware: 5.4%
- Position in a Charter School: 0.5%
- Relocated with Family: 4.1%
- Dismissed: 4.7%
- Illness/Death: 1.3%
teacher vacancies was June, and the median month these vacancies were filled was July. **Thus, compared to last year, the median month of notification was one month earlier, but the median month during which teacher vacancies were filled remained July.**

Most districts have established strategies for teachers and other professionals to encourage early notification of plans to retire. This is to help districts learn of and, hopefully, fill vacancies earlier. This year 15 districts continued to offer incentives for early notification of plans to retire. Only four districts do not offer incentives for early notification. None of the school districts reported adding incentives this year. In contrast, last year two school districts reported adding incentives that year, and one district indicated that it planned to implement incentives for the 2006-07 school year. **Teacher-Hiring Problems**

**This year 42.1 percent of school districts reported contractual barriers or hindrances that delayed them from offering a contract to a teacher.** This is a slight decrease (one district) from last year, when 47.4 percent of the districts reported facing difficulties related to this issue. Contractual barriers or hindrances that delayed contract offerings were related to transfer clauses and are as follows:

- CBA provides for voluntary transfers before hiring externally.
- Contractual language regarding request to transfer
- Date of volunteer transfer is August 15.
- Transfers and reassignments must be reconsidered before employment is offered.
- Voluntary transfer process
- Transfers must be dealt with before hiring based on the contract.
This year an additional question was added to the survey to determine whether personnel directors tried to renegotiate these contractual barriers during the most recent collective bargaining negotiations. Of the eight districts (42.1%) that reported contractual barriers, seven districts (77.8%) tried to renegotiate their contract during their most recent collective-bargaining negotiations, indicating that districts are not only aware of these contractual problems but are trying to address them.

Personnel directors are understandably frustrated when teachers agree to a contract and then leave for another district or position. In 2006-07, 23 teachers who were offered and accepted a position later chose to take a position in another Delaware school district, nine teachers chose to take an out-of-state teaching position, and one decided not to teach. The districts reported that 134 teachers changed their minds for other reasons.

This year represents a decrease of 50 percent in teachers accepting a position and later choosing a position in another Delaware school district. Last year, 46 teachers who were offered and accepted a position later chose to take a position in another Delaware school district (compared to the 23 teachers who switched this year). In addition, 12 teachers chose to take an out-of-state teaching position, and two decided not to teach, in each case lower this year than last.

Non-teaching Position Shortages

The non-teaching position viewed as hardest to fill by personnel directors for the 2006-07 school year was that of speech therapist (see Figure 6), the same finding as for the last three years. Three-quarters of the districts reported hiring speech pathologists as very difficult, and ten out of 19 districts (52.6%) indicated speech therapist as the most difficult non-teaching position to fill (Table 9). Almost half of the
Figure 6.
Percent of Districts Indicating Major Difficulty in Filling Non-Teaching Positions
districts reported it was very difficult to hire psychologists; of the 19 districts, two (10.5%) indicated that psychologist positions were difficult to fill.

Personnel directors expected similar problems to persist in their hiring for the upcoming school year. The most common problem, which was also noted last year, centered on finding speech pathologists. Other anticipated problems include school psychologists and school administrators.

Recruitment Tools

In order to find good teachers, it is necessary for personnel directors to use effective recruitment tools. Personnel directors were asked what tools they used and the effectiveness of each tool (see Table 10). The recruitment tool that had the greatest use among school districts was the University of Delaware’s Project Search, with 17 out of 19 districts (89.5%) utilizing this tool. This year, there was a great increase in the use of district websites. Last year 68.4 percent of districts used their website for advertising positions and 52.6 percent for online applications; this year 84.3 percent advertised on their websites, and 73.7 percent utilize their websites for online applications.

This year districts increased the usage of recruitment tools that had been on a steady decline (see Figures 7a and 7b). The use of UD Project Search increased from 68.5 percent in 2005-06 to 89.5 percent in 2006-07; this increase is similar to 2004-05 usage of this recruitment tool (84.2%). The use of print advertisements increased from 36.8 percent in 2005-06 to 47.4 percent in 2006-07 but was still less than two years ago (68.4%). Three tools not listed in the data last year were used by some personnel directors: “Grow you own” teachers (15.8%), recruitment at Delaware State University (31.6%), and visitation by recruits (10.5%).
Figure 7a.
Percent of Districts Reporting Great Use of Recruitment Tools: 2006–07

Figure 7b.
Percent of Districts Reporting Great Use of Recruitment Tools: Five-Year Comparison
Resources for Personnel Recruitment

The importance of recruitment and retention was a high priority for 9 of the 19 school districts (47.4%). Four of the 19 districts (21.1%) found it to be the highest priority for the district at this time, five of the 19 districts (26.3%) found it to be a moderate priority, and one (5.3%) found it to be the lowest priority. No personnel director selected the no-priority category. **This is very different than last year, in which no personnel director reported recruitment and retention to be either moderate, low, or no priority.**

Because recruitment is a substantial part of the personnel director’s position, a specific recruitment budget may be allocated to help with organization and support. More than three-quarters (78.9%) of the districts noted having a budget set aside specifically for the purpose of recruitment efforts. Among the 13 districts providing an amount, there was great variation in the size of the budget.

- Two districts - $2,000
- One district - $2,500
- One district - $4,000
- Three districts - $4,000
- Three districts - $5,000
- One district - $7,000
- One district - $10,000
- Two districts - $15,000
- One district - $20,000
- One district - $30,000
Six districts reported having no specific recruitment budget; this is two more districts than last year.

**Administrator Hiring**

This year more detailed questions focused on administrator hiring were added to the survey analysis. Personnel directors were asked questions concerning availability of positions, vacancies, and qualifications of applicants. Personnel directors reported that a total of 63 school administrators were hired for the 2006-07 academic year. Six of the administrative positions filled were new positions. Fifty-three of the administrative positions filled replaced an incumbent or sitting administrator. (There is a slight discrepancy between the number of positions hired and actual filled positions; reported filled positions only total 59.) Thirty of the administrators hired were from inside the school district; 19 of those hired were from Delaware but outside the school district, and 14 were hired from out-of-state (see Figure 8 and Table 11). Most administrators (77.7%) were hired from within the state.

Eleven of the 63 (17.5%) hired administrators had participated in a university internship program in which they had worked in a school district with a mentoring principal. Eighteen (28.5%) of the hired administrators participated in a school district’s succession planning or program to prepare/develop administrators.

Twelve of the 19 districts (63.2%) indicated that they have their own program to prepare and develop administrators. Of the 12 districts with an administrator-development program, six districts (50%) hired an administrator who participated in such a program. Of the seven districts without an administrator-development program, only one district hired an administrator from an administrator-development program.
Figure 8.
Sources of Recently Hired District Administrators

\[(N=63)\]

- Within the Same District: 48%
- Outside of the District but Within the State: 30%
- Out-of-State: 22%
Therefore, districts with administrator-development programs were more likely to hire an administrator who had undergone an administrator-development/succession-planning program.

Twelve districts also stated that they have a program to support new principals during the induction stage (years 1-3). These results indicate a good deal of activity in the state focused on school administrator recruitment and preparation.

The personnel directors of the 19 school districts reported the reasons for 50 administrator vacancies for the 2006-07 (see Figure 9 and Table 12). The most common reason for an administrator vacancy was retirement; 21 vacancies (42%) were attributed to this factor. Personnel directors did not know why nine administrators left. Other reasons for administrators leaving the district include: took a position in another Delaware school district (11), took a position in another district outside of Delaware (4), illness/death (2), other known reasons for leaving (2), relocated with family (1).

School districts reported receiving a total of 699 applications for administrative positions for the 2006-07 school year. Personnel directors only deemed 406 applicants (58%) as qualified for these positions; however, these 406 applicants were almost seven times the number of administrator positions to be filled. Thus, it is not surprising that district personnel directors lack immediate concerns about administrator hiring.

District personnel directors were asked whether they would consider a non-traditional candidate for an administrative position, such as an individual who had not been a teacher and had not received a traditional educational leadership/administrative
Figure 9.
Reasons for District Administrator Vacancies

(N=50)

- Retired: 42%
- Don't Know: 18%
- Switched Districts Within Delaware: 22%
- Position Out-of-State: 8%
- Relocated: 2%
- Illness/Death: 4%
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degree. Six of the 19 districts (31.6%) indicated that they would consider a non-traditional applicant, while five districts (26.3%) would not consider such an applicant. Eight of the 19 districts (42.1%) indicated that they might consider a non-traditional applicant for an administrator position. Several school districts provided further reasoning concerning their consideration of non-traditional administrator candidates:

- In a non-certified position, i.e., business, facilities
- Depends upon the qualifications and skill set of the applicant and the available position
- People [who] have school experience are usually the most successful.
- The leadership training is important. Some of it can be obtained through on the job training.
- The superintendent’s office has a succession plan in place [it likes] and [wants] to continue using.
- This would ONLY apply for administrative positions that are NOT affiliated with academic leadership and obligation to student accountability.
- We probably wouldn’t consider a non-traditional candidate for an instructional position but would for a non-traditional position.

Thus, some of the possible interest in hiring non-traditional administrators is tempered by the limited role personnel directors envision for such individuals, i.e., in the district office but not in the schools.
Charter School Analysis

Teacher Hiring

Thirteen charter schools reported hiring a total of 85 teachers for the 2006-07 academic year. The most frequent month for charter school hiring was July (44%), while for school districts the most frequent month was August (28%). Charter schools conducted almost all (85%) of their hiring during the summer months—June (9), July (35), August (23). Charter school personnel directors reported there were six teaching positions that remained unfilled as of the completion date of this survey. The unfilled positions included math, middle school math, special education, two elementary school positions, and one middle school science position.

Charter schools had a limited use of letters of intent. They only issued six letters of intent in June. Charter schools only hired two teachers on temporary contracts. Eleven of the 13 responding charter schools noted that temporary needs such as pregnancy, illnesses, and sabbaticals served as a major reason for temporary contracts. Nine of the districts also indicated the remaining criteria as reasoning for temporary hiring: uncertainty of the September 30 count, teachers not yet “highly qualified” or certified, and other teacher credential reasons.

Teachers Shortages

For charter schools, hiring difficulties continue to exist in the critical-needs areas, but there is no consensus on the most difficult positions to fill. Foreign language positions were most difficult to fill for three schools. Special education and elementary positions were most difficult to fill for two schools. Other areas viewed as most difficult to fill include art, middle school math, music, and high school science.
Three schools felt that art, foreign language, and music positions were very difficult to fill. Two schools felt that reading, high school science, and special education positions were very difficult to fill.

Qualifications

The charter schools were asked to compare the qualifications for teachers hired in 2006-07 with those of prior years. Charter school respondents were slightly less positive than school district respondents. Among the 13 charter school respondents, 30.8 percent reported that their hires were more prepared than in past years, 53.8 percent reported as the same as prior years, and 15.4 percent were less prepared than prior years. In contrast, school districts reported that none of their teachers were less qualified than in past years, 78.9 percent were as prepared as prior years, and 21.1 percent were more prepared than prior years.

Reasons for Teacher Shortages

Similar to regular public school districts, charter schools found the lack of qualified applicants in particular areas to be a major problem resulting in teacher shortages. Five of the 13 charter school respondents (38.5%) cited that a lack of qualified teacher candidates in particular areas as a major problem. Almost half (46.2%) of the reporting charter schools indicated that a lack of number of teacher candidates in particular areas was a major problem. Charter schools were more positive than school districts when asked about teacher migration, teacher salaries, and teaching credentials as they relate to teacher shortages.
Vacancies

There were a total of 40 vacancies reported by the 13 charter school respondents this year. The reasons for 36 of these vacancies were reported. Eight teachers left to take a position in a Delaware school district, while three took a position in a district outside of Delaware. Two teachers left to take a position at a charter school, six relocated with family, six were dismissed, six teachers left for other known reasons, and one teacher left for unknown reasons. Four teachers retired this year—one teacher due to additional requirements for “highly qualified” teachers per NCLB, three for other reasons. Thus, teachers left charter schools for a great variety of reasons.

The survey data also indicate when the 40 vacancies occurred. Charter schools were asked to indicate how many vacancies were reported each month. The largest number of vacancies was reported in June 2006 (19), which accounts for 48 percent of the total number of vacancies in charter schools. None of the charter schools offer any incentive for early notifications of plans to retire.

Teacher-Hiring Problems

One hiring problem was that some teacher candidates committed to work and then changed their minds during July. Of these teachers, two took a position in Delaware, four took a position outside of Delaware, two decided not to teach, and two changed their minds for other reasons.

Non-Teaching-Position Shortages

Charter schools reported little difficulty in hiring non-teaching positions.

Two charter schools reported that nurse positions were most difficult to fill. Only one school, respectively, reported that the following positions were most difficult to fill:
guidance counselor, speech therapist, elementary school principal, secondary school principal, and central office administrator. These findings are similar to those of regular public school districts, except that no school district reported nurse positions as “most difficult” to hire.

**Recruitment Tools**

Personnel administrators at the charter schools in Delaware use various recruitment tools to find qualified teachers. The recruitment tool with the greatest use was print advertisements (61.5%). The Teach Delaware website was also a good recruitment resource for charter schools, with 38.5 percent reporting great use of this tool. While school districts report great use of the University of Delaware’s Project Search and district websites, charter schools reported focusing recruitment efforts on the Teach Delaware website (92.3 percent of districts with some or great use) and print advertisements (92.3 percent of districts with some or great use).

**Charter schools and school districts emphasized the use of recruitment tools differently. In fact, public school districts use a wider variety of recruitment tools than do charter schools. Also, some traditional recruitment methods were not utilized by charter schools for teacher recruitment.** Charter schools had very little use of recruitment trips; 76.9 percent of charter schools reported that did not utilize recruitment trips in neighboring states (N.J., Md., Pa.), and 92.3 percent did not utilize recruitment trips in other states. Only 10.5 percent of districts reported no use of recruitment trips in neighboring states, and 52.6 percent reported no use of recruitment trips in other states. Only 23.1 percent of charters schools greatly used University of
Delaware’s Project Search, while 89.5 percent of school districts greatly utilized this recruitment tool.

Administrator Hiring

This year, administrator hiring was added to the survey analysis. Charter schools were asked various questions concerning availability of positions, vacancies, and qualifications of applicants. Personnel directors of the state’s charter schools reported that four administrators were hired for the 2006-07 school year. One administrator was hired from inside the school, one from Delaware but from outside the school, and two were hired from out-of-state. Five of the administrative hires were for new positions, while one replaced an incumbent administrator. The charter schools did not report any administrator leaving for the 2006-07 academic year.

The 13 responding charter schools reported receiving 19 applications for administrative positions for the 2006-07 school year. Of these applicants, 14 (74%) were deemed qualified. Charter school personnel directors were more positive about the qualifications of their administrative applicants than were school districts. Only 58 percent (406 of 699) of district administrator applicants were deemed qualified. Charter schools were also more open to considering non-traditional candidates for administrative positions, for example, an individual who had not been a teacher and had not received a traditional educational leadership/administration degree. Seven charter schools (53.8%) indicated that they would consider a non-traditional candidate. Five charter schools (38.5%) would not consider a non-traditional candidate, and one school indicated maybe. By comparison, only 26.3 percent of school districts noted that they would consider a non-traditional candidate.
Consideration of non-traditional administrator candidates:

- As per our charter, the Administrator must be Delaware-certified with a military background.

- If a candidate had a successful track record in business/industry, etc. Non-traditional candidate would be considered.

- It would depend on the type of administrative position available and the various duties included.

- The person HAS to have teaching experience to understand teachers’ needs. I worked with someone who was not a teacher but became an administrator, and he was a disaster.

To add another perspective regarding teacher recruitment, hiring, and retention in Delaware, the analysis of payroll data and teacher migration in the state is presented in the next section.
DOE Payroll Data Results

To supplement the survey of personnel directors, data on teacher characteristics and mobility (obtained from payroll records) were provided by DOE for the 16 regular public school districts and the three vo-tech districts.

This section of the report analyzes data about teachers in Delaware who leave the Delaware teaching ranks (“exiters”) and teachers who remain as teachers in Delaware but change school districts (“switchers”). The net losses and gains of each school district were examined to determine how exiters and switchers are affecting districts throughout the state.

The DOE data indicate that there were 1069 new teachers hired for the 2006-07 school year, including switchers identified by DOE data. Results of the survey indicate 1,103 hires, which included 202 switchers, for a net of 870 teachers new to Delaware. The data therefore have a discrepancy of 34 teachers, perhaps due to different times of measurement or definitions.

Exiters: Departing Teachers

According to DOE payroll records, there were 897 teachers who left teaching in Delaware between May 2006 and November 2006. This is 11.3 percent of the teacher workforce in the state, a decrease from 12.9 percent who had left the previous year. The absolute number who left teaching this year was less than last year—897 versus 1,007—but still slightly greater than two years ago (867). On average, these individuals left the teaching profession at 37 years of age, with the largest numbers leaving at ages 27 and 54, respectively (Figure 10).
Figure 10.
Age of Teachers Leaving Delaware Teacher Positions
Of departing teachers, 46.9 percent held bachelor’s degrees and 44.3 percent held master’s degrees. Among all teachers in the state, 45.5 percent held bachelor’s degrees and 52.9 percent held master’s degrees. This year, the average education accomplishment of teachers who left teaching in Delaware is lower than those who did not leave teaching. Last year, there was no significant difference in the average education accomplishment between those teacher groups. This year, departing teachers were less likely to have earned master’s degrees.

As in previous years, the most striking characteristic of departing teachers is that large a percentage leave soon after they start teaching in Delaware. Among the 897 teachers who left, 97 teachers exited teaching within one year of Delaware teaching experience or less (see Figure 11a). Another 59 teachers left within the first two years of employment. Thus, 17.2 percent of teachers who left their teaching positions in Delaware did so within their first two years of teaching in the state (see Figure 11b). In addition, 48 teachers left with three years of experience; 58 teachers left with four years of experience; and 41 left with five years of teaching experience. Thus, 33.8 percent of teachers who left in the past year did so with five years of experience in Delaware or fewer. This percentage is slightly higher than last year’s 30.9 percent but slightly lower than two years ago (34.9%). These statistics indicate that many teachers in Delaware, like those across the nation, tend to leave the profession very quickly after starting.
Figure 11a.
Number of Teachers Leaving Delaware Teaching Positions by Years of Experience

Figure 11b.
Cumulative Percent of Teachers Departing Within the First Few Years of Service
Switchers: Intrastate Migration

The analysis now turns from examining teachers who left Delaware teaching positions to those who changed positions within the state. There were 202 teachers who switched districts prior to and during the 2006-07 academic year. These switchers represent 2.6 percent of the total teacher workforce in the state. Intrastate teacher migration is rather evenly spread among counties.

When analyzing migration by district, there was a correlation between district wealth and teacher turnover. District wealth was measured by the 2005-06 District Wealth Index provided by the DOE, with higher indices indicating greater wealth. Teacher turnover was measured by the percentage of teachers who left the district given the base of fall 2005 teachers in the district. With the exception of the Christina School District, the highest turnover rate was experienced in districts that were smaller and had less wealth. Christina suffered the highest turnover (5.2%), presumably due to its highly publicized financial problems. The second highest turnover rate was experienced by Capital (3.6%), with a below-average wealth index of 0.67. Other districts with higher turnover and low wealth indices include Delmar (3%), Woodbridge (2.8%), and Caesar Rodney (2.9%).

The majority of teachers changing districts were female (75.2%). This figure is about the same as the overall percentage of females in the state teacher workforce (76%). Last year, females comprised 71.8 percent of the teachers who changed districts. There was little change in the gender ratio of switchers from the 2005-2006 to 2006-07 school year.
The average age of switchers was 35, with an average of 7.2 years experience. According to the *Delaware Educational Personnel Report* on the DOE website, the typical classroom teacher was 40.6 years old with 12.2 years of experience. Switchers, therefore, were younger and less experienced, on average, than teachers who remained in their positions and/or districts.

Out of the 202 switchers, 80.1 percent were Caucasian, 15.3 percent were African-American, and 3 percent were of “other” race. In the statewide teacher workforce, 87.2 percent were Caucasian, 11.1 percent were African American, and 1.8 percent were of “other” race. Therefore, African-American teachers were more likely to change districts than were their white counterparts.

**Hires/Losses of Underrepresented Groups**

The participation of underrepresented groups in the classroom is an important aspect of Delaware teaching that was also analyzed using the DOE payroll records.

Overall, DOE statistics indicate a net gain of 19 full-time African-American teachers and 22 male teachers from the 2005-06 to the 2006-07 school year (*Delaware Educational Personnel Report*). This increased the percentage of African Americans in the state’s teaching force from 10.9 percent to 11.2 percent, and males from 23.7 percent to 24.0 percent.

**Critical Needs and Teacher Movement**

The positions of switchers and movers were analyzed in order to determine whether critical-needs teachers are more likely to leave teaching or change districts. According to the *Delaware Educational Personnel Report*, the critical-needs fields of high school science teachers comprise 5.6 percent of the teacher workforce, and high
school math teachers comprise 6.4 percent of the teacher workforce. Of the exiters, 5.2 percent were science teachers and 7.2 percent were math teachers. Similarly, special education teachers comprise 12.6 percent of the exiters, while they comprise 20.6 percent of the state teacher workforce.

Of the 202 switchers reported for the 2006-07 school year, DOE reported the teaching position for 195 of them. Of these, special education, math, and science teachers represent the highest migration. Special education teachers comprise 19.5 percent of switchers, math teachers 7.2 percent, and science teachers 5.6 percent. Special education teachers represent the largest number of critical-needs teachers switching districts (38). Twenty-one of those were elementary school special education teachers (10.8 percent of total switchers), nine were in middle schools (4.6%), and eight were in secondary schools (4.1%).
Conclusions

The 2006-07 year was a mixed one for teacher recruitment and retention with some steps forward, some maintenance of past improvements, and some regression.

Like the past two years, about 1,100 teachers were hired by the 19 school districts, with about 200 of those having switched districts within the state. Late hiring of teachers across the 19 school districts stabilized at just over 40 percent, maintaining the notable progress made (i.e., the large drop in late hiring from the fall of 2005 to the fall of 2006)—this year 44.8 percent of teachers were hired in August or later, about the same as last year’s 43.1 percent but a great improvement over the 68 percent in the fall of 2004. However, the use of letters of intent committing districts to offering positions to teachers earlier than official contracts dropped to 137 this fall from 276 last year, and the number of teachers hired on temporary contracts returned to the previous level of more than 300.

While the areas of major difficulty in hiring remained relatively constant, the percentage of districts reporting such difficulties increased across the board. The greatest difficulties were in special education, high school math, high school science, technology, and, this year, bilingual/ESOL. Personnel directors reported that the most difficult areas in which to hire were in special education, high school math and science. The percent of districts having great difficulty in filling positions increased in virtually every subject area, however, suggesting personnel directors felt more pressed this year in their hiring of teachers. This fall an average of almost 30 percent of the personnel directors reported major difficulty in hiring across the areas; last year the comparable percentage was 21 percent.
Personnel directors felt positively about the preparation of those who began teaching for their district; however, they were somewhat less positive than last year. The major problem is still seen as the inadequate number of qualified applicants in particular subject areas. This extends last year’s results—personnel directors viewing teachers hired as well qualified but less so than the previous year.

On the positive side, personnel directors heard about fall 2006 teacher vacancies an average of a month earlier than in 2005 (June versus July). The average position was still filled in July, however. The total number of districts offering incentives for early notification of plans to retire increased by one district to 15.

While eight districts reported that contractual barriers delayed their offering a contract to teachers (down one from last year), seven of these eight reported they had attempted to change their contract in their most recent negotiations. Thus, the problems remain, but the districts are trying to work out a better system to hire teachers in a more timely manner.

Unfortunately, speech therapists remained the most difficult position to fill, with a majority of the districts reporting major difficulty in hiring for this position. Each year the annual survey has reported this as a major problem, and this year it remained unsolved. Indeed, personnel directors predict this problem will persist. In Delaware the licensing of speech therapists is through the Department of State (under the Board of Speech Pathologists, Audiologists, and Hearing Aid Dispensers), not DOE. Given the seeming intractability of the difficulties in hiring speech pathologists in the state, perhaps this relationship should be examined.
The trend toward the use of the Web and away from the use of print as recruitment tools continued unabated. For example, the percentage of districts using their websites for advertising positions jumped from 68.4 to 84.3 percent and for on-line applications from 52.6 to 73.7 percent in one year. The University of Delaware’s Project Search remained the most cited recruitment tool for the districts, with 17 of the 19 districts reporting great use of this event.

This year 13 charter schools did respond to the survey. In many ways the results from charters track those from the districts, e.g., in the areas where they find it difficult to hire and the major reason for this difficulty—lack of qualified candidates. Interestingly, charters seem even less aggressive and innovative than districts in their teacher hiring efforts—using fewer recruitment tools and eschewing out-of-state recruitment trips—and hiring few teachers before June.

This year administrator hiring was explored in more depth. While some issues were expected to emerge in the recruitment and retention of administrators, the personnel directors did not report major issues here. While there were 63 administrative openings filled this fall, there were many qualified candidates (almost 700 applicants, of whom a majority were judged qualified) to fill them. Districts hired half of the administrators from within their district and only 14 of the 60 positions were filled from out-of-state applicants. The availability of in-state applicants may explain why only a few districts stated they would consider non-traditional administrators and why several of those would only consider them for non-instructional positions.
The priority of teacher hiring declined a good deal this year. Last year two-thirds (68.4%) of the 19 school district personnel directors reported recruitment and retention to be a high priority; this year the proportion was less than half (47 percent).

Data reported by DOE indicate that there is a slight decrease in the absolute number of teachers who left the workforce this year. The largest number of teachers still leave early and late in their careers. One-third of teachers who left in the past year had five or fewer years of experience. This statistic is similar to the past two years. With the exception of the Christina School District, the highest turnover rate was experienced in districts that were smaller and had less wealth. Christina suffered the highest turnover (5.2%), presumably due to its highly publicized financial problems.

Last year this annual survey report indicated that “there is more good news than bad news in the hiring of educational personnel in the state.” In contrast, this year’s theme must be that while some improvements have been maintained, some regression has also occurred in the hiring of teachers in Delaware and several long-standing problems remain. Whether the failure to continue the gains of previous years is due to 1) increasing financial pressures on several school districts, which makes them more cautious and less attuned to teacher hiring, 2) the good economy, which attracts some teachers to non-teaching positions, or 3) other factors. This was not a year of major progress in improvements in Delaware’s teacher hiring.
Appendix A: Tables

Table 1. Month that Contract was Agreed Upon (Regular School Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Level of Difficulty Filling Teacher Positions by Area (Percent* of Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Moderately Difficult</th>
<th>Not Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/ESOL</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Math</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Math</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Math</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Science</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Science</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages may not equal 100% due to non-applicability or non-response.
Table 3. District’s Consideration of Characteristics of Applicants in Hiring New Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Moderate Extent</th>
<th>No Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years or teacher’s experience</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of teacher’s classroom experience</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s preparation program and degree</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ certification status</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s coursework in the subject area</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National board certification</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s test scores</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching record in district’s schools</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate of local high school</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate of Wilmington College</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate of University of Delaware</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate of Delaware State University</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Preparation of Recent Teacher Hires (Percent of Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Prepared than in Prior Years</th>
<th>21.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About the Same as Prior Years</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Prepared than in Prior Years</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Extent of Problem Related to Teacher Shortages for Fall 2006 Hiring (Percent of Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>Major Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Not a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualified teacher candidates in particular areas</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of number of teacher candidates in particular areas</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving from your district to another district</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving from your district to a district outside Delaware</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low starting salary</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low experienced salaries</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good candidates failing PRAXIS I</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good candidates failing PRAXIS II</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Reasons for Teachers Leaving Your District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took a position in another Delaware district</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a position with another district outside Delaware</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a position at a charter school</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocated with family</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness/death</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired due to No Child Left Behind</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Effects of Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) provision of NCLB (Percent of Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Moderate Extent</th>
<th>No Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality of teachers hired</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality of teachers already in the district</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to find/recruit elementary school teachers</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to find/recruit middle school teachers</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to find/recruit high school teachers</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to find/recruit special education teachers</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to find/recruit ESL teachers</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added more “red tape” to hiring process</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced pool of possible hires</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Number of Vacancies Learned About by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2004-05 (N=922)</th>
<th>2005-06 (N=788)</th>
<th>2006-07 (N=657)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October (prior school year)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November (prior school year)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December (prior school year)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January (prior school year)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February (prior school year)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March (prior school year)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April (prior school year)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (prior school year)</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June (prior school year)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July (prior school year)</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August (prior school year)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September (current school year)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October or later (current school year)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Level of Difficulty Filling Non-Teaching Positions by Area (Percent* of Districts Reporting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Moderately Difficult</th>
<th>Not Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Principal</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Assistant Principal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Principal</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Assistant Principal</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Administrator</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages may not equal 100% due to non-applicability or non-response.

Table 10. Use of Recruitment Tools (Percent of Districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Great Use</th>
<th>Some Use</th>
<th>No Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment trips in neighboring states</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment trips in other states</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Delaware website</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach for America</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD Project Search</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSU recruitment fair</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print advertisements</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting your district’s student teachers</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Alternative Routes</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your district’s website</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District website for online applications</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Grow your own” teachers from paraprofessionals and subs</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation by recruits</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11. Sources of Recently Hired District Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2006-07 (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From inside your district/charter school</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Delaware but outside your district/charter school</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From out-of-state</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know or Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Reasons for District Administrator Vacancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2006-07 (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took a position in another Delaware school district</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a position in another district outside of Delaware</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a position at a charter school</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocated with family</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were dismissed</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness/Death</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other known reasons for leaving</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know why administrator left</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Survey Instrument

Section 1: Teacher Hiring

1. How many new teachers did your district/charter school hire for the 2006-2007 school year? (This number should include teachers moving from temporary to regular contracts.)

2. How many contracts were offered, with intent to hire, in:

   - April 2006
   - May 2006
   - June 2006
   - July 2006
   - August 2006
   - September
   - October

3. Of all your 2006-2007 hires, how many teachers did you hire on TEMPORARY contracts?

4. Of all of your 2006-2007, how many teachers did you hire who were on TEMPORARY contracts in 2005-2006?

5. What were the reasons for hiring teachers on TEMPORARY contracts this year?
   a. Uncertainty of September 30 count
   b. Teacher not yet highly qualified or certified
   c. Other teacher credential issues
   d. Temporary needs due to pregnancy, illness, sabbaticals, etc.
   e. Other

   If “Other”, please specify
6. How many Alternative Routes teachers did you hire?

7. Are you using letters of intent before issuing contracts to all or some new teachers?
   - No (If No, skip to question #9)
   - Some
   - All

8. How many letters of intent were written in:
   - [ ] April 2006
   - [ ] May 2006
   - [ ] June 2006
   - [ ] July 2006
   - [ ] August 2006
   - [ ] September 2006
   - [ ] October 2006 or later

9. Do you tend to hire teachers in critical needs areas early or late in the hiring process?
   - Early
   - Neither early nor late
   - Late
   - Not sure

10. Were there contractual barriers or hindrances, such as transfer clauses, that delayed your offering a contract for Fall 2006?
    - Yes
    - No

    If yes, what were they?

    - [ ]

11. Did your district try to renegotiate these contractual barriers or hindrances in your last collective bargaining negotiations?
    - Yes
    - No
12. How many teacher vacancies (including those resulting from temporary contracts) did you learn about in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 or earlier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 or later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How many teachers left your district for the following?

- Took a position in another DE school district
- Took a position in another district outside of DE
- Took a position at a Charter School
- Relocated with family
- Were dismissed
- Illness/death
- Retired due to additional requirements for "highly qualified" teachers per No Child

- Left Behind
- Retired for other reasons
- Other known reasons for leaving
- Do not know why teacher left

14. Did some teacher candidates commit to work in your district and later change their minds during the period of July-September?

- Yes
- No

15. Of the teacher candidates who committed to work in your district/charter school and later changed their minds, approximately how many did the following:

- Took a position in another DE school district
- Took a position in another district outside of DE
- Decided not to teach
- Other
If other, please specify:


16. Does your district/charter school continue to offer any incentives for early notification of plans to retire?

☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Incentives added this year

17. Are any teaching positions open in your district/charter school at this time?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how many?


If yes, in what areas? e.g. Math(4);English(12);etc.


Section 2: Teacher Qualifications/Recruitment, Selection, and Hiring

18. To what extent does your district/charter school consider each of the following characteristics in hiring new teachers?

a. Years of teacher experience

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

b. Type of teacher classroom experience (e.g. similar district)

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

c. Teacher’s preparation program and degree (selectivity/prestige of the institution)

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

d. Teacher certification status

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

e. Teacher coursework in the subject area

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

f. Classroom observation

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

g. National board certification

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

h. Teacher’s test scores

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

i. Student teaching record in district’s schools (where applicable)

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

j. Graduate of local high school

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

k. Graduate of Wilmington College

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent

l. Graduate of University of Delaware

☐ Great Extent ☐ Moderate Extent ☐ No Extent
m. Graduate of Delaware State University
n. Other
If "Other", please specify

19. Overall, how would you rate the preparation of the teachers you hired for 2006-2007?

○ All highly prepared
○ Almost all highly prepared
○ More than half highly prepared
○ Half highly prepared
○ Less than half highly prepared
○ Few highly prepared

20. Were the teachers you hired for 2006-2007:

○ More prepared than prior years
○ About the same as prior years
○ Less prepared than prior years

Please explain your response:

21. How difficult was it to fill TEACHING POSITIONS in each of the following areas?

a. Art
b. Bilingual/ESOL
c. English
d. Elementary
e. Foreign Languages
f. Elementary School Math
g. Middle School Math
h. High School Math
i. Music
j. Physical Education
k. Reading
l. Elementary School Science
m. Middle School Science
22. Which of the areas listed in QUESTION #21 was the MOST difficult for teacher hiring in your district/charter school for Fall 2006?

- Art
- English
- Foreign Languages
- Middle School Math
- Music
- Reading
- Middle School Science
- Social Science
- Technology

23. To what extent was each of the following a problem related to teacher shortages in your district for Fall 2006?

- Lack of qualified teacher candidates in particular areas
- Lack of number of teacher candidates in particular areas
- Teachers moving from your district to another district in Delaware
- Teachers moving from your district to a district outside Delaware
- Low starting salaries for teachers in your district
- Low salaries for experienced teachers in your district
- Good teaching candidates failing PRAXIS I
- Good teaching candidates failing PRAXIS II
- Other

If "Other", please specify
24. To what extent have the following been effects in your district/charter school of the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) provision of NCLB?

- a. Improved quality of teachers hired
- b. Improved quality of teachers already in the district
- c. Harder to find/recruit elementary school teachers
- d. Harder to find/recruit middle school teachers
- e. Harder to find/recruit high school teachers
- f. Harder to find/recruit special education teachers
- g. Harder to find/recruit ESL teachers
- h. Added more "red tape" to hiring process
- i. Reduced pool of possible hires
- j. Other

If "Other", please specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Moderate Extent</th>
<th>No Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. To what extent did your district use each of the following recruitment tools in teacher recruitment for Fall 2006?

- a. Recruitment trips/fairs in neighboring states (NJ, MD, PA)
- b. Recruitment trips/fairs in other states
- c. Teach Delaware website
- d. Teach for America program
- e. Delaware State University Recruitment Fair
- f. University of Delaware Project Search
- g. Print Advertisements
- h. Recruiting your district's student teachers
- i. Delaware Alternative Routes Office
- j. Your district's website for advertising positions
- k. Your district's website for online applications
- l. “Grow your own” teachers from paraprofessionals and subs
- m. Visitation by recruits
- n. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Great Use</th>
<th>Some Use</th>
<th>No Use</th>
<th># of trips</th>
<th># of hires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option:

- Recruitment trips/fairs in neighboring states (NJ, MD, PA)
- Recruitment trips/fairs in other states
- Teach Delaware website
- Delaware State University
- Print Advertisements
- Delaware Alternative Routes Office
- Your district’s website for online applications
- Visitation by recruits
- Teach for America program
- University of Delaware Project Search
- Recruiting your district’s student teachers
- Your district’s website for advertising positions
- "Grow your own" teachers from paraprofessionals and subs
- Other

If your district has new or other ways to recruit teachers, please specify:

26. What steps are you taking in your recruitment and selection of teachers to address HQT requirements?

Section 3: Administrator Hiring

27. How many new school administrators did your district/charter school hire for the 2006-2007 school year?

From inside your district/charter school
From Delaware but outside your district/charter school
From out-of-state
Don't Know or Other

28. How many administrative positions that were filled were new positions?

29. How many administrative positions that were filled replaced an incumbent or sitting administrator?

30. Of the administrators you hired, how many had completed a university internship program in which they had worked in a school district with a mentoring principal?
31. Of the administrators you hired, how many were aspiring school leaders participating in either your or another district’s succession planning or program to prepare/develop administrators?

32. Does your district/charter school have its own program to prepare/develop administrators?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

33. Does your district have a program to support new principals during their induction stage (years 1-3)?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

34. How many administrators left your district/charter school for the following?

   - Took a position in another DE school district
   - Took a position in another district outside of DE
   - Took a position at a Charter School
   - Relocated with family
   - Were dismissed
   - Illness/death
   - Retired
   - Other known reasons for leaving
   - Do not know why teacher left

35. How many total applicants did you receive for administrative positions for the 2006-2007 school year?

36. How many qualified applicants did you receive for administrative positions for the 2006-2007 school year?
37. Would your district/charter school consider a non-traditional candidate for an administrative position, i.e. an individual who had not been a teacher and had not received a traditional educational leadership/administration degree?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Maybe

Please explain

Section 4: Non-Teacher Hiring

38. To what extent did your district experience difficulties in filling each of the following NON-TEACHING POSITIONS for the 2006-2007 school year?

a. Librarian
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

b. Psychologist
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

c. Guidance Counselor
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

d. Nurse
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

e. Speech Therapist
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

f. Elementary School Principal
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

g. Elementary School Assistant Principal
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

h. Secondary School Principal
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

i. Secondary School Assistant Principal
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

j. Central Office Administrator
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

k. Other
   - Very Difficult
   - Moderately Difficult
   - Not Difficult
   - Not Applicable

If Other, please specify:

   

   

   

   

   


Delaware Teacher and Administrator Supply Survey Analysis
39. Which of the areas listed in QUESTION #38 was the MOST difficult for non-teacher hiring in your district/charter school for Fall 2006?

- Librarian
- Guidance Counselor
- Speech Therapist
- Elementary School Assistant Principal
- Secondary School Assistant Principal
- Other
- Psychologist
- Nurse
- Elementary School Principal
- Secondary School Principal
- Central Office Administrator

40. What changes in difficulty in NON-TEACHER HIRING do you anticipate in the next year?

Section 5: Priorities and Projections

41A. Overall, how much of a priority is administrator recruitment and retention in your district/charter school at this time?

- Highest priority
- High priority
- Moderate priority
- Low priority
- Not a priority

41B. Overall, how much of a priority is teacher recruitment and retention in your district/charter school at this time?

- Highest priority
- High priority
- Moderate priority
- Low priority
- Not a priority
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