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Teacher attrition and retention

— Teacher shortage (Ingersoll, 2001; Billingsley 2007).
  • Chronic, pervasive, & growing
  • Costly affecting school structure and student achievement...costing over $7 billion annually (NCTAF)
— Nearly a third of new teachers leave the teaching field within the first five years (Darling-Hammond, 2001).
— Teachers of students with disabilities and those in high poverty schools are most at-risk for teacher attrition (Billingsley, 2005).
— Teachers in juvenile justice teach some of the most complex students (Houchins, Guin, & Schroeder, 2001).
Literature review

• Federal government appropriates $90 million annually for recruitment (Brownell, Hirsh, & Seo, 2004)

• Projected need to fill vacant positions by the end of 2008 is 135,000 (COPSSE, 2005)

• More than 60,000 special educators left or transferred from 1999-2001
  – (National Center for Education for Statistics)

• Retaining qualified teachers for students with disabilities is a critical part of the solution
  – (Billingsley, 2003)
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Literature review

• Typical factors that may contribute to teacher attrition in special education
  – Unalterable reasons
    • Personal reasons, age, movement (retirement, move to another school, etc.), life events
  – Alterable reasons
    • Teacher qualifications (Carlson & Billingsley, 2001)
      – Higher scores & less certification
    • Work environment (Gersten, Keating, Yovanoff, & Harniss, 2001)
      – Salary, school climate, overall dissatisfaction, work design
    • Stress (Cooley & Yovanoff, 1996; Billingsley, 2002, 2004)
    • Paperwork
    • Lack of support... particularly for new teachers
    • School leadership
    • Resources
    • National legislation...NCLB and IDEA demands?
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- Houchins, Puckett-Patterson, Crosby, Shippen, & Jolivette (2009).
  - Establishing a juvenile justice system of education
    - (a) personnel concerns,
    - (b) academics,
    - (c) student concerns,
    - (d) discipline,
    - (e) materials and supplies,
    - (f) parental involvement,
    - (g) funding,
    - (h) communication, and
    - (i) facility issues.

Recent Statewide findings
Context

• National reforms in juvenile justice
  – Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (CRIPA)
  – Georgia and Louisiana
  – Not in Ohio
  – Increase emphasis on
    • Education
    • Mental health
    • Transition

Research questions

• 1. Is there an interaction between facility type and teachers’ (a) job satisfaction, (b) role perception, and (c) quality of experiences in the juvenile justice system?

• 2. Is there an interaction between gender and teachers’ (a) job satisfaction, (b) role perception, and (c) quality of experiences in the juvenile justice system?

• 3. Is there an interaction between teacher type (general v. special education) and teachers’ (a) job satisfaction, (b) role perception, and (c) quality of experiences in the juvenile justice system?

• 4. Is there an interaction between state and (a) job satisfaction, (b) role perception, and (c) quality of experiences in the juvenile justice system?
Data analysis

• Separate MANOVA’s
  – Independent variables
    • Facility type (short v. long term)
    • Gender (male v. female)
    • Teacher type (general v. special education)
    • State (Georgia, Louisiana, Ohio)
  – Dependent variables
    • Job satisfaction
      – (a) Overall satisfaction (b) Job satisfaction, (c) Impact satisfaction, and (d) Site satisfaction.
    • Role perception
      – (a) Role support (b) Role understanding, (c) Role efficacy, (d) Role advocacy, (e) Role communication.
    • Quality of experiences in juvenile justice
      – (a) Stress (b) Experience with students, (c) Experience with others, and (d) Experience with JJ system.

Methodology

• Instrumentation
  – Adapted edition of the Morvant, Gersten, Gillman, Blake, and Howard (1992) Working in Special Education survey
    – Included questions on satisfaction, role, teaching experience, demographics, and career plans
  – Reliability .92.
  – Five point scale with approximately 150 questions
    – Lower scores better
      – 1=very satisfied, 2=satisfied, 3=neutral, 4=dissatisfied, 5=very dissatisfied
      – 1=strongly agree, 2=somewhat agree, 3=neutral, 4=somewhat disagree, 5=strongly disagree
  – Piloted with principals
  – Completed
    – GA….during a state conference
    – LA and OH….at each facility
### Participant Characteristics
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-34</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and up</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Educator</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Educator</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facility Type**

- Long Term: 51% (n = 169) 85% (n = 66) 100% (n = 132) 67% (n = 530)
- Short Term: 49% (n = 165) 15% (n = 66) 0% (n = 132) 67% (n = 544)

**Satisfaction**

- Overall: 2.56 (0.66)
- Job: 2.56 (0.66)
- Impact: 2.54 (0.66)
- Site: 3.06 (1.01)

**Role**

- Support: 2.21 (0.82)
- Understand: 3.16 (0.76)
- Efficacy: 2.05 (0.52)
- Advocacy: 2.78 (0.76)
- Communication: 2.84 (0.70)

**Experience**

- Stress: 3.22 (0.57)
- Students: 2.07 (0.56)
- Others: 2.33 (0.80)
- System: 2.31 (1.10)

**Total significant**

0 9 1 2
Discussion/Potential Implications

– 1. Long term facilities may be more likely to have retention issues as compared to short term facilities.
   • More students with complex needs
   • Size of facilities
   • Level of student academic accountability

– 2. Males and females may view their jobs slightly different
   • Structure of environment?

– 3. General educators may be slightly more likely to have retention issues as compared to special educators.
   • Approximately 45% of incarcerated students have disabilities

– 4. States that have gone through federal reform efforts may have less retention issues.
   • Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (CRIPA)
   • Different approaches to reform
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– 5. Areas with relatively high means (needs)
  • Site satisfaction (3.00)
  • Role understanding (3.42)
  • Stress (3.35)

– 6. Areas with relatively low means
  • Efficacy (2.20)...how meaningful is this?
  • Interaction with students (2.20)
  • Role support (2.36)
  • Interaction with others (2.44)

– 7. Impact on pre-service and in-service teachers?

General tips

• 1. Support new teachers
  – mentoring, initial assignments
• 2. Provide quality leadership
• 3. Better define teacher roles
• 4. Hire well-trained teachers and keep training them.
• 5. Address behavior management concerns
  – Consider effective strategies for all personnel
  – Academics affects behavior
    • Task avoidance and attention
    • Punishment should be used sparingly
• 6. Identify and address causes of stress
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