DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE

A Classroom Effectiveness Index, or CEI, is a value-added measure of the amount of academic progress that a teacher afforded his or her students after a year of instruction. CEIs evaluate a student’s performance on select summative, standardized tests by comparing his or her performance to that of similar students in the district. “Similar students” have the same demographic characteristics (i.e. gender, ethnicity, LEP status, socioeconomic status, and three neighborhood characteristics) and the same level of achievement on the same prior-year tests. An important feature of the CEIs is the use of a comparison group to measure relative progress. This is in contrast to a system such as the Academic Excellence Indicator System, which measures students’ absolute progress against a pre-determined score criterion.

CEIs are computed at three levels. A teacher receives a CEI for each section, course, and division (or content area) she teaches. Reports containing all CEIs, as well as student-level information, are provided annually via MyData Portal to teachers, principals, and senior executive directors as a tool to guide instructional and professional development planning. This executive summary summarizes the activities of Evaluation and Accountability’s Data Analysis, Reporting, and Research Services (DARRS) that are related to the dissemination and use of CEIs, including adjustments for the 2008-09 CEIs.

2008-09 CEI Adjustment Process

BACKGROUND

During the 2008-09 school year, 6,504 teachers throughout the district taught CEI-eligible courses. Among those eligible, 5,204 teachers received CEIs during initial production. (See Appendix A for a breakdown of CEI-eligibility by school level.) After the publication of CEI reports in September 2009, teachers had the opportunity to formally request investigations into their 2008-09 CEIs. Investigations were based on data quality issues including demographic, attendance, and assessment results. The adjustment request process was available for specific, documented adjustment requests. While the adjustment request process is transitioning away from corrections to the rosters of students, requests to include or exclude students were accepted if submitted with explanation and the principal’s approval. (A “CEI Roster Verification” process was implemented in 2007-08 and provides opportunities to review and correct CEI rosters before CEIs are computed.) The following provides a synthesis of the 2009-10 adjustment process covering CEIs from the 2008-09 school year.

PROCESS

Teachers used a standard form to request adjustments to their 2008-09 CEIs, which involved the verification of data used to compute individual CEIs, and where appropriate, the recalculation of CEIs. DARRS staff reviewed each request by examining appropriate information sources, such as the district’s student information system, preliminary CEI rosters maintained in DARRS databases, CEI training documents, and databases used in the calculation of CEIs and School Effectiveness Indices, or SEIs. When sufficient documentation was presented to confirm data or roster discrepancies, CEIs were recalculated, and an updated report containing the new or “adjusted” CEI was posted on MyData Portal. Teachers who submitted adjustment requests received memoranda explaining the outcome of the
investigations. Additionally, principals were notified when teachers from their schools received any correspondence regarding their adjustment requests.

Requests for copies of CEI reports and questions about CEIs were handled as they were submitted, and such inquiries were not considered to be "adjustments."

Teachers who elected to participate in the district's 2008-09 Performance Pay Programs were required to submit their adjustment request forms by September 21, 2009. Teachers who did not opt-in to the program were required to submit their adjustment request forms by September 30, 2009. The deadline for "Performance Pay" teachers was earlier so that investigations could be completed in time to meet performance pay award distribution deadlines. Some requests received after the deadline were investigated by request of Evaluation & Accountability’s Executive Director or the Chief of Staff. No distinction is made between requests received before or after the deadline in these cases, and all are labeled traditional requests. Requests received through means other than submission of DARRS' adjustment request form with supporting documentation, such as from E&A's Executive Director, are labeled non-traditional requests.

RESULTS

The results of the adjustment period are described through a series of tables and figures that summarize all adjustment activities. The CEI adjustment period results included in this summary are:

- Adjustment Requests
- Adjustments
- Requests not Adjusted
- Non-traditional Adjustment Requests and Adjustments

Adjustment Requests

During the 2009-10 CEI adjustment period for 2008-09 CEIs, 182 traditional adjustment requests were submitted by teachers from 74 schools throughout the district. In contrast, approximately 284 requests were submitted during the 2008-09 CEI adjustment period. The 36 percent decrease in adjustment requests is thought to be a result of the refinements made to the CEI Roster Verification (CRV) process, which provided teachers and principals two opportunities to address roster-related issues prior to the production of CEIs. Additions and changes to the teacher report for 2008-09 appeared to aid teachers in the interpretation of their results, which in turn decreased the number of requests submitted.

The majority of teachers (92 percent) who submitted requests in 2009 had earlier in the year elected to participate in the district’s 2008-09 Performance Pay Programs.1 Anecdotal evidence suggests the teachers in this subset were more likely to submit adjustment requests because they believed the request would result in an increase to their CEIs, which would make them eligible for a payment or eligible for a higher award amount. Consistent with this suggestion are the findings that of 169 “Performance Pay” teachers who submitted adjustment requests, only 41 (24.3 percent) had a division CEI percentile that qualified them to receive the award.

Table 1 summarizes the number of adjustment requests submitted by school type. A large number of requests from elementary school teachers were due to an anomaly in the spring CEI Roster Verification process. Due to inconsistencies in district data for grades assigned to elementary students, many preliminary 2008-09 CEI rosters created for elementary school teachers did not properly "link" their students.2 One set of elementary school teachers submitted their preliminary rosters without making

---

1 As one of several eligibility requirements for the 2008-09 Achievement Incentive Award, teachers were required to have a minimum division CEI percentile of 70. More information about performance pay programs at the Dallas Independent School District can be found at [http://www.dallasisd.org/performancepay](http://www.dallasisd.org/performancepay).

2 A "linked" student was in a teacher's course for a complete term (semester or year). The linkage is determined by snapshots of enrollment at the end of each six-week grading period: a student must be in the teacher's course at the end of each of the first five six-week grading periods and receive a grade in the course for each of the first five six-week grading periods to be "linked" for a year-long course.
corrections, while another set of elementary school teachers neither corrected nor submitted their preliminary rosters. As a result, both sets of teachers inadvertently confirmed that none or very few of their students were included for the second six-week grading period. Twenty-eight elementary school teachers submitted adjustment requests related to this issue.

As shown in Figure 1, there were three main types of issues presented in the 2008-09 CEI adjustment requests: roster corrections, policy issues, and the calculation of CEIs. Roster corrections were submitted by teachers who felt that their report did not accurately reflect the students they taught during the 2008-09 school year. This was generally due to the improper correction of their rosters during the spring CRV process. Additionally, teachers with students who were continuously enrolled in the course but not listed on the final CEI report requested roster corrections. Policy issues requests were submitted by teachers who wanted to refute the guidelines used to determine teachers’ eligibility for CEIs. One such guideline is not calculating CEIs for teachers who are on official leave for more than twenty working days during the school year. Another commonly questioned guideline is not calculating CEIs for full-year teachers who were not the teacher of record the entire school year due to a mid-year change in assignment. The validity of the methods and data used to compute CEIs was questioned by those who submitted requests related to the calculation of CEIs. (See Appendix B for additional information on the three main issues presented in 2008-09 CEI adjustment requests.) The calculation of CEIs was the most commonly cited issue among all adjustment requests.

**Error! Reference source not found.** presents the variability in the prevalence of each type of adjustment request among school types. Elementary school teachers primarily submitted adjustment requests that asked for roster corrections (38.9 percent). The remaining requests submitted by elementary school teachers addressed

---

**Table 1. Adjustment Requests by School Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number**</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers are not eligible to receive CEIs.
** Count includes complete and incomplete requests.
CEI calculations and policy issues. The majority of adjustment requests submitted by middle school teachers (81 percent) questioned the way in which CEIs were calculated. The remaining adjustment requests addressed roster corrections and policy issues. Of the 18 high school teachers who submitted adjustment requests, 16 questioned the way in which CEIs were calculated. The two remaining requests addressed policy issues and roster corrections.

Adjustments

Fifty 2008-09 CEIs were adjusted during the 2009-10 CEI adjustment process. Table 2 shows the number of adjustments performed by school type. Elementary school teachers comprised the majority of adjusted CEIs. This is consistent with the number and types of adjustment requests submitted.

Five general types of adjustments were performed. The first type of adjustment removed select students from a teacher's course. The second type of adjustment added one or more students to a teacher's course. The third type of adjustment linked students to a teacher in one or more six-week periods. The fourth type of adjustment removed CEIs for teachers who received them in error. The fifth type of adjustment removed select courses or sections from teachers' rosters. (See Appendix C for additional information on each type of adjustment.) As shown in Error! Reference source not found., the majority of adjustments performed involved linking students to a teacher.

Error! Reference source not found. illustrates how the type of adjustment performed varied by school type. The prominent adjustment made for elementary school teachers involved linking students to a teacher. This is consistent with the CEI roster anomaly prevalent amongst elementary school teachers. The remaining adjustments for elementary school teachers involved removing CEIs, removing students, and removing courses or sections. One middle school teacher received an adjustment, which involved linking students to him. Of.

Table 2. Adjustments Completed by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Completed Adjustments</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the two high school teachers who received adjustments, one had students added to his course and the other had students linked to her.

Requests not Adjusted

Of the 182 adjustment requests submitted, 118 (64.8 percent) were not adjusted. Teachers who did not receive an adjustment were provided memoranda explaining why an adjustment was not necessary or appropriate. Principals received copies of the memoranda sent to teachers currently employed at their campuses. Figure 5 shows the distribution of issues addressed in memoranda to teachers who did not receive adjustments. (See Appendix D for a description of each memoranda topic.)

There were five predominant issues addressed in the memoranda sent to teachers. The first issue dealt with requests for the calculation of CEIs for teachers who, due to Dallas ISD’s 2008-09 Reduction in Force, received new teaching assignments during the middle of the 2008-09 school year. These teachers were reminded that CEIs are computed for a full-year teacher only if the teacher had students all year, through the main TAKS testing period. This designation is determined if the teacher assigned all the students’ course grades from the first six-week period through the fifth six-week grading period. It was stressed that this standard is in place to ensure the CEIs are fair to teachers, consistent for all teachers, and reliably track the same effects each year.

Figure 3. Adjustments were classified and counted by type of request.

Figure 4. Adjustments were classified and counted by type of request within school type.
The second issue was the exclusion of students who lacked either prior-year or current test scores from the calculation of CEIs. Testing history was verified for each student in question, and it was confirmed that they did not have the required test combination. It was reiterated that students had to have the listed test combination in order to be included in the computation of the teacher's CEIs.

The third issue focused on understanding why certain students whose scale scores were either higher in 2009 than 2008 or labeled “not passing” in 2008 then “passing” in 2009 had low relative gain scores. Teachers were reminded that the CEI is a measure of students’ relative gain, not passing rate. Only students who outperform the average score of their comparison group, whether that score is a “passing” value or a “failing” value, will have high relative gain scores.

The fourth issue dealt with requests for the calculation of CEIs by teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2008-09 school year. Based on teacher input, teachers who are on leave for more than 20 days are ineligible to receive CEIs because it makes the indices fairer to teachers by only holding them accountable for students they were in contact with throughout the school year. This point was reiterated to teachers.

Table 3. Number of Teachers with “Perfect Score” Students by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Completed Adjustments</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Memoranda to teachers were classified by major topic.
The fifth issue, attendance requirements, refers to the maximum number of days a student may be absent from a teacher’s course and still be included in the computation of a CEI. There were concerns that students with excessive absences were still included in the calculation of CEIs. The number of absences for each student in question was confirmed. It was communicated that the students in question met all attendance requirements, and therefore, it was appropriate to include them in the calculation of CEIs.

**Non-traditional Adjustment Requests and Adjustments**

In addition to the traditional requests already summarized, DARRS investigated an internal non-traditional adjustment request concerning the CEIs of 174 teachers. During the 2009-10 adjustment period for the 2008-09 CEIs, DARRS began research into an artifact of the production of CEIs. This artifact exists because in full-year courses, relative gain scores for students in grades 3 through 11 are presently based solely on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), which is not always suited for differentiating among high-performing students. In prior years, the district also administered the Iowa Test...
of Basic Skills (ITBS), which better discriminates among high performers because of its design. However, this capability is no longer available in the process because the district no longer administers the ITBS in all grades. During the 2009-10 adjustment period, DARRS determined that the model may create artificially low gain scores for some high-performing students. High-performing students are defined as those who demonstrated high scores on the prior year’s tests. When these students take a TAKS test and answer all questions correctly, they may not be showing the true extent of their knowledge as they would if they had more difficult questions to challenge them.

That is, if the test given to district students was more challenging for high-performing students, such as the ITBS, the variation among high scores would allow students to truly demonstrate whether they scored below average, at the average, or above average among their comparison group of other high-performing students.

To address this issue for the 2008-09 CEIs, DARRS adjusted indices for all teachers who had at least one student who earned a perfect score on the 2009 TAKS and had a negative relative gain score, as indexed by a red bar next to their name on the CEI report. Table 3 shows the number of teachers with “perfect score” students by school type. The adjustments involved removing each student’s relative gain score from the computation of teachers’ CEIs.

Teachers with these students fell into one of three categories:

1) Suppressing students’ relative gain scores increased the teacher’s division CEI. The student’s gain score was removed. The adjustment was recorded in appropriate databases. The report was reprinted with the gain scores removed and the student’s name printed in bold red. The report was made available via the teacher’s MyData Portal account and was stamped “ADJUSTED.”

2) Suppressing students’ relative gain scores had no impact on the teacher’s division CEI. The student’s gain score was removed. The adjustment was recorded in appropriate databases. The report was reprinted with the gain scores removed and the student’s name printed in bold red. The report was made available via the teacher’s MyData Portal account and stamped “ADJUSTED,” but there was no net change to his or her division CEI.

3) Suppressing students’ relative gain scores would have lowered the division CEI. No change was made to the teacher’s CEIs or CEI report.

Only if removing the relative gain score improved or did not change teachers’ CEIs did an adjustment take place. As a result of this artifact and subsequent actions to address it, 116 teachers received adjustments which suppressed the negative relative gain scores of students who earned perfect scores on a 2009-10 TAKS subject test. Each adjustment corrected at least one student. A teacher may have received a perfect score adjustment in more than one subject, and they are counted for each subject. As shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7, most perfect scores were earned in and adjusted for third-grade TAKS Mathematics.

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The goal of each year’s adjustment period is to provide a formal, organized process for the request of investigations into the prior school year’s CEIs. Investigations are conducted to examine data quality issues including demographic, attendance, and assessment results. During the 2009-10 CEI adjustment period, 182 traditional adjustment requests were submitted. This was a 36 percent decrease from the 284 adjustment requests submitted during the 2008-09 CEI adjustment period. Additionally, the 166 adjustments completed during the 2009-10 CEI adjustment period was a 5.7 percent decrease from the 176 adjustments completed during the same period in 2008-09. The lower numbers of adjustment requests and adjustments are thought to be due to changes in the CEI Roster Verification process, refinements to the methods and procedures for computing the Indices, and updates to the teacher CEI report.

Providing an easily accessible and fair platform for teachers to dispute their CEIs should remain the primary focus of the CEI adjustment process. It is recommended that DARRS continue to refine the adjustment process to increase its overall efficiency by
1) Streamlining the adjustment request submission process
2) Addressing the perfect score artifact during the initial computation of CEIs
3) Working with the Effectiveness Indices Advisory Council and other departments to determine the continued appropriateness and usefulness of certain CEI-related policies.

Additionally, both DARRS and Pay for Performance should continue to communicate to teachers, principals, and stakeholders that CEIs and Performance Pay Programs are distinct entities.

2009-10 Teachers’ CEI Report

CONTEXT

Extensive changes were made to the Teacher’s CEI Report for 2009-10. The goal in making all changes was to increase teachers’ and principals’ understanding of CEIs and increase the overall usefulness of CEIs in instructional professional development planning. A sample teacher report was created to highlight and explain the new features of the report.

METHODOLOGY

To generate the 2009-10 Teacher’s CEI Report, two databases containing relevant teacher- and student-level data were created. Based on the information available in these databases, reports were created for all teachers who taught at least one CEI-eligible course in which at least one student was linked to the teacher for all six-week periods of the term.

RESULTS

The updates to the CEI report are described through a series of figures that summarize all changes. Report sections included in this summary of updates are (1) glossary/legend, (2) longitudinal report, and (3) course/section detail.

(1) Glossary/Legend

Figure 8 shows the glossary/legend, which lists terms to aid teachers and principals in their understanding of the contents of the CEI report. This section also contains instructions for submitting an adjustment request. In contrast to the 2008-09 report, the glossary/legend of the 2009-10 report provides more detailed descriptions of important CEI terms.
Longitudinal Report

Figure 9 depicts the Longitudinal CEI report, the second section of the Teacher’s CEI Report. The longitudinal CEI section reports division-level CEI information for the most recent year and the four prior years (where available). A division CEI is the average fairness-adjusted relative gain score standardized within division or content area. The six CEI divisions are reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, computer science, and foreign language. This section reports division CEI, division CEI percentile, number of students with one or more relative gain score contributing to the division CEI, and the school where the teacher received the CEI. The division CEI percentile is represented graphically for

Figure 9. The second section of the Teacher’s CEI Report is a longitudinal report beginning with the latest year and extending back four years. The report shows the teacher's division-level CEIs.
each school year. The height of the boxes indicates the magnitude of the CEI percentile from shortest to tallest for low and high CEI percentiles. For the 2009-10 report, the graph was redesigned to provide clear demarcations for division percentiles.

(3) Course/Section Detail

Figure 10 shows the third section of the Teacher's CEI Report, the course/section detail. The course/section detail provides student-level background and performance measures for each relevant assessment. Each page provides a roster for a unique course, section, and assessment.

New for the 2009-10 report was the listing of detailed information about each student’s group of similar students, including gender, ethnicity, level of English proficiency, and socioeconomic status (determined by receipt of free or reduced-price lunches). Additionally, three neighborhood variables were listed for each student:

1) Median household income among households headed by a person of the same ethnicity as the student
2) Percentage of adults over the age of 25 of the same ethnicity as the student with a college degree
3) Percentage of persons of the same ethnicity as the student living below the federal poverty level.

The inclusion of the number of items that each student answered correctly and information about how each student performed in comparison to members of their comparison group were other new features of
the 2009-10 report. Students who were enrolled in a teacher’s class for the full term (year or semester), but did not meet all of the criteria necessary for inclusion in the calculation of a teacher’s CEI were listed in red bold italics. In contrast to the 2008-09 report, the reason for exclusion was listed next to each student’s name in the 2009-10 report.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEI report is a tool designed to provide clear and complete information about CEIs to teachers, principals, and executive directors. Presenting CEI-related information transparently in a user-friendly format should remain the main purpose of the CEI report. The 2009-10 CEI report made great strides in providing users with more information about the characteristics used to determine students’ comparison groups. It is recommended that DARRS build on these changes by including more student information, such as enrollment dates and grade level. Additionally, printing issues, such as blank pages and missing text, need to be addressed.

2009-10 Longitudinal CEI Report (2010-11 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates

CONTEXT

Since 2005-06, DARRS has produced four-year longitudinal reports that combine division-level CEI histories with three-year teacher “TAKS passing rate” summaries. A division CEI is the average fairness-adjusted relative gain score standardized within division: language arts/reading, mathematics, social studies, science, computer science, and foreign language. Teachers’ “TAKS passing rates” are the percentage of the teacher’s students who met standard on the year’s TAKS reading (or English language arts), mathematics, science, or social studies tests, where the teacher’s students are considered to be those who were used in the computation of the teacher’s CEIs for the year. The 2009-10 longitudinal reports, which were produced in November 2010, included refinements to previous versions.

METHODOLOGY

To generate the 2009-10 Longitudinal CEI Report (2010-11 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates, or “Longitudinal Report”, a database was compiled containing CEI statistics and TAKS data for teachers with 2010-11 teaching assignments.

Reports were uploaded on November 4 and 8, 2010. Principals received an e-mail message notifying them that the Longitudinal Report was available on MyData Portal for downloading and printing.

RESULTS

The updates to the longitudinal report are described through a series of figures that summarize all changes. Report sections included in this summary of updates are (1) title page and (2) teacher summary.

(1) Title Page

Figure 11 shows the title page which contained guidelines for interpreting the contents of the Longitudinal Report. Changes made to the 2009-10 title page include descriptions of changes made to aid in the interpretation of the Longitudinal Report.
(2) **Teacher Summary**

Figure 12 shows a sample of the teacher summary portion of the Longitudinal Report. The summary contains up to four years of information about teachers’ school assignments, division CEIs, division CEI percentiles, and the number of unique students used to calculate each teacher’s division CEI. Additionally, the summary contains three years of information about the percentage of students in each teacher’s class that met standard on the **TAKS** test corresponding to the division. (All **TAKS** data are from students’ first administration of the test.)

New for the 2009-10 Longitudinal Report was a graphical representation of the division CEIs. CEIs up to one standard deviation were displayed graphically as a star (*) in relation to the average of 50, represented by a square (□). CEIs more than one standard deviation from average were graphed at one standard deviation. Teachers’ CEI percentiles were also presented graphically. In addition to color coding, the width of each bar symbolized the magnitude of the CEI percentile from shortest to longest for low and high CEI percentiles.

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Longitudinal Report is a tool designed to provide prior-year CEI- and **TAKS**-related information for reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies teachers currently at campuses. Principals and senior executive directors are able to use the Longitudinal Report to identify trends among their teachers.
The Longitudinal Report should continue to serve as a tool that synthesizes CEI and TAKS data for district decision-makers. The 2009-10 Longitudinal Report continued to build on previous years’ improvements. It is recommended that DARRS investigate methods for summarizing norm-referenced results for first- and second-grade reading and mathematics teachers in reports for elementary schools.

### Table: 2009-10 Longitudinal CEI Report (2010-11 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample School (999)</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009-07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAMPLE TEACHER (1)</strong></td>
<td>S. SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI/NCP (%)</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Students</td>
<td>N = 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKS Grade/Year</strong></td>
<td>% Pass # Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ELA</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ELA</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12.** The second section of the Longitudinal CEI Report with Teacher TAKS Passing Rates is the teacher summary, with a four-year CEI history combined with three-years of division-related TAKS passing rates.
### Appendix A:

**Teachers, CEI Teachers, and CEI Recipients**

#### Table 4. Teachers*, CEI Teachers, and CEI Recipients by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>District Teachers</th>
<th>CEI-eligible Teachers</th>
<th>CEI Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School**</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>3,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>1,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from the student information system describing teacher course assignments were used to compute teacher counts.

**Prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers do not receive CEIs.

#### Definitions:

- **District teachers** had at least one student enrolled in at least one course during the 2008-09 school year.

- **CEI-eligible teachers** had students enrolled in the courses listed below. They verified students’ enrollment in courses during the spring 2009 CEI Roster Verification periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Eligible Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>- Grades 1-5 mathematics&lt;br&gt;- Grades 1-5 reading/language arts (reading, language arts, writing, etc.)&lt;br&gt;- Grade 5 science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>- Grades 6-8 reading/language arts (reading, language arts, writing, etc.)&lt;br&gt;- Grades 6-8 mathematics&lt;br&gt;- Grade 8 science&lt;br&gt;- Grade 8 social studies&lt;br&gt;- Grades 7-8 courses with ACPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Grades 9-11 TAKS subjects (language arts, math, science, social studies)&lt;br&gt;- Grades 9-12 courses with ACPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CEI Teachers** received at least one division-level CEI during the initial production of 2008-09 CEIs. Teachers who had more than 20 working days of leave or did not meet employment date requirements did not receive CEIs. Data from Dallas ISD’s Human Resources was used to determine leave and employment status.
Appendix B: Adjustment Request Issues

Definitions:

- **Roster Corrections**: Teachers who felt that their report did not accurately reflect the students they taught during the 2008-09 school year submitted adjustment requests for roster corrections during the 2009-10 adjustment period. Teachers with this issue did not have students “linked to them” or enrolled in their course in one or more six-week periods because they did not correct their rosters during the spring CRV process. Teachers submitted CEI rosters that included handwritten corrections and statements indicating that all students on the rosters were enrolled in their course the entire school year to support assertions that adjustments were necessary.

- **Policy Issues**: This type of adjustment request was submitted by teachers who wanted to refute the guidelines used to determine their eligibility for CEIs. One disputed policy states that teachers who are on official leave for more than 20 days are not eligible to receive CEIs. Other policies were called into question, such as using both TAKS Reading and TAKS Writing scores to calculate CEIs for teachers in the language arts division, where available, and not calculating CEIs for teachers who receive a change in assignment mid-school year. Official leave documentation and CEI rosters that indicated courses taught during the 2008-09 school year were submitted as evidence to support requests for adjustments based on policy issues.

- **CEI Calculations**: Teachers who questioned the validity of the methods and data used to compute CEIs submitted this type of adjustment request. These teachers felt that their CEIs were based on data from students who did not meet the eligibility criteria due to excessive absences, non-continuous enrollment, and incorrect combinations of prior-year and current tests. Teachers submitted attendance records from the student information system and information about testing history from MyData Portal student profiles as supporting documentation.
Appendix C:
Adjustment Types

Definitions:

- **Add Students:** Several students were added to a teacher’s course. The teacher who received this adjustment was reminded that the spring CRV periods were the most appropriate times to make this type of correction.

- **Link Students:** CEI rosters were corrected to indicate that a set of students were enrolled in a teacher’s course during one or more six-week periods. This type of adjustment was performed primarily for elementary teachers who, as a result of not making corrections to their CEI rosters, did not have students linked to them during the second six-week grading period of the 2008-09 school year. DARRS reminded teachers who received this adjustment that this type of correction should be made during the spring CRV periods.

- **Remove CEI:** CEIs were removed for one teacher who received them in error. Although this teacher taught a course that was not eligible for CEIs, he received CEIs during their initial production. Because it was not appropriate for this teacher to receive CEIs, his CEIs were removed.

- **Remove Course/Section:** One or more courses or sections were removed from teachers’ rosters. The courses and sections removed were ones that were listed on the CEI rosters during the CEI roster verification period, but were not removed during that time period. The teacher who received this adjustment was reminded that the spring CRV periods were the most appropriate times to make this correction.

- **Remove Students:** One or more students from teachers’ courses were removed. The students removed from one teacher’s sections were designated to be added to another teacher’s roster. Teachers who received this adjustment were reminded that this type of correction should be made during the spring CRV periods.
Appendix D: Memoranda Topics

Definitions:

- **Attendance Requirements:** Addressed concerns regarding the inclusion of students with excessive absences in the computation of CEIs. Teachers were reminded of the maximum number of days a student can be absent from a teacher’s course and still be included in the computation of the teacher’s CEI (18 excused absences (EA) or unexcused absences (UA) for a year-long course or fewer than 11 EA or UA for a semester-long course). The number of absences for each student in question was confirmed and listed in the memorandum.

- **Inclusion of Retained Students:** Explained guidelines regarding the inclusion of retained students in the calculation of CEIs. Teachers were informed that students who were retained within the prior two years are not included in the computation of TAKS and middle-school ACP CEIs.

- **Less Students on Report than Roster:** Explained the difference between being enrolled in a teacher’s course and being CEI-eligible. Teachers were reminded that in order for a student to be included in the teacher’s CEI, they must be enrolled in the course for the full term and meet all eligibility requirements including, being continuously enrolled, not being retained within the prior two years, having the appropriate test combination, and lacking excessive absences. Because fewer students are eligible for inclusion in the CEI than are usually enrolled in a teacher’s class, fewer students are listed in the CEI report than on the CEI roster.

- **Mid-year Reassignment:** Discussed the impact of mid-year reassignment on the computation of CEIs. Teachers whose assignments changed during the 2008-09 school year were reminded that a CEI could not be computed for them because their students were not linked to them for the full term (either semester or year).

- **Missing Names on Roster:** Informed teachers that only student identification numbers, not student names, are used in the processing of CEIs. It was verified that the listed identification numbers for students whose names were missing from the CEI rosters matched the identification numbers for the students listed on the CEI report.

- **On Leave:** Explained to teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2008-09 school year that they were not eligible to receive a CEI.

- **No Students Linked for SW1-SW5:** Explained that a student is linked to a teacher for the computation of CEIs only if the teacher had the student all year, which is determined if the student was enrolled in the teacher’s course and received grades for all six-week periods. Teachers were reminded that they are not held accountable for students they did not have in class all year.

- **Reading and Writing CEIs:** Addressed concerns over the use of both TAKS Reading and TAKS Writing in the computation of CEIs for teachers in the language arts division, where available. It was explained that this was a districtwide decision established by a committee of teachers, administrators, and community members with the inception of the Effectiveness Indices in the early 1990s. Additionally, it was communicated that the combined use of reading and writing test scores mirrors Dallas ISD’s English and Spanish language arts curricula.

- **Red Bar/Green Bar:** Provided guidance on the interpretation of students’ relative gain scores in relation to their TAKS passing rates. It was reiterated that the CEI is a measure of students’ relative gain, not passing rate. In order for a student to have high relative gain scores, he must outperform the average score of his comparison group, whether that score is a “passing” value or a “failing” value.

- **Students’ CEI-eligibility:** Directed teachers to documents on the MyData Portal website that provide information about the criteria used to determine whether a student was eligible for inclusion in the calculation of a teacher’s CEI.
• **Test Combination:** Reiterated the appropriateness of excluding students who lacked prior-year or current test scores from the calculation of teachers’ CEIs. The missing test combination for each student in question was confirmed and listed in this memorandum.

• **Other:** This category is comprised of the following memorandums
  
  o Calculating CEIs: Referred teachers to documents on the MyData Portal website that provide detailed descriptions of how CEIs are calculated.
  
  o CEI-eligible Course: Explained to teachers that the course they taught during the 2008-09 school year was, in fact, a CEI-eligible course. As a result, it was correct that they received a CEI.
  
  o Continuous Enrollment: Described the criteria for a student to be considered continuously enrolled in a year-long course. For the 2008-09 CEIs, a student was required to be enrolled on or before April 27, 2009 and have at least 128 days of attendance with the teacher to be eligible for inclusion in the teacher’s CEI. Students who were excluded from the teacher’s CEI as a result of not being continuously enrolled were listed in this memorandum.
  
  o Less than 8 Eligible Students: Reiterated that a CEI at any level (section, course, and division) is only generated if there are at least 8 students who meet all eligibility requirements.
  
  o Missing Additional Information: Reminded teachers that without the requested additional information, DARRS was unable to continue their investigation into the adjustment of their CEIs.
  
  o Not the Teacher of Record: Provided explanation for how CEI rosters were used to designate which students were linked to a teacher for the computation of CEIs. DARRS required teachers who believed that they were held accountable for classes that were not theirs to provide documentation from their principal confirming that they were not the teacher of record and listing which teacher was.
  
  o Students Included in CEI but for Wrong Section: Attended to concerns that some students used in the calculation of CEIs were listed in the correct course, but under the wrong section. Teachers were informed that the sections under which students were listed on the CEI report reflected the sections they were listed under on the CEI rosters. They were reminded that the computation of the division CEI includes all students regardless of which section they are listed under, such that any rearrangement of students would not change a teacher’s division CEI.
  
  o Testing Irregularities: Addressed concerns regarding the lack of test scores used for CEIs for a particular semester- or year-long course. Teachers were informed that based on information from the State and Local Assessment department within Dallas ISD, their students did not take the norm-referenced test that corresponded with that particular course.