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 measure of performance is in contrast to a system, such as the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), which evaluates 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) he or 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.

### Background

During the 2009-10 school year, 6,586 teachers throughout the district taught CEI-eligible courses. Among those eligible, 5,627 teachers received CEIs during initial production. After the publication of CEI reports in September 2010, teachers had the opportunity to formally request investigations into their 2009-10 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. Even though there is a transition away from post-production corrections to the rosters of students, requests to include or exclude students were accepted if submitted with explanation and the principal’s approval.

### 2010-11 CEI Adjustment Process

Teachers used a standard form to request adjustments to their 2009-10 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. CEIs were recalculated when data and roster discrepancies were confirmed. Additionally, 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. Principals were notified when teachers from their schools received any correspondence regarding their adjustment requests.

During the 2010-11 CEI adjustment period for 2009-10 CEIs, 117 traditional adjustment requests were submitted by teachers from 63 schools throughout the district.

There were three main types of issues presented in the 2009-10 CEI adjustment requests:

1) **Roster Corrections**: Submitted by teachers who felt that their report did not accurately reflect the students they taught during the 2009-10 school year. The improper correction of their rosters during the spring roster verification process was a common cause for this request. Teachers with students who were continuously enrolled in the course but not listed on the final CEI report also requested roster corrections.

2) **Policy Issues**: Submitted by teachers who wanted to refute the guidelines used to determine teachers’ eligibility for CEIs. Not calculating CEIs for teachers who are on Table 1. CEI Teachers* and CEI Recipients by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>CEI-eligible Teachers</th>
<th>CEI Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School**</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>100%</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.
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During the 2010-11 CEI adjustment period for 2009-10 CEIs, 117 traditional adjustment requests were submitted by teachers from 63 schools throughout the district.

There were three main types of issues presented in the 2009-10 CEI adjustment requests:

1) **Roster Corrections**: Submitted by teachers who felt that their report did not accurately reflect the students they taught during the 2009-10 school year. The improper correction of their rosters during the spring roster verification process was a common cause for this request. Teachers with students who were continuously enrolled in the course but not listed on the final CEI report also requested roster corrections.

2) **Policy Issues**: Submitted by teachers who wanted to refute the guidelines used to determine teachers’ eligibility for CEIs. Not calculating CEIs for teachers who are on
official leave for more than twenty working days during the school year or for teachers who have fewer than eight students who meet all CEI eligibility criteria were contested guidelines.

3) **Calculation of CEIs:** Submitted by teachers who questioned the validity of the methods and data used to compute CEIs.

![Figure 1. Adjustment requests are differentiated by type based on the major issue described by the requester.](image)

Fifty-seven CEIs were adjusted during the 2010-11 CEI adjustment process. 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 calculated CEIs for teachers who did not receive them during their initial production because they were marked as not meeting one or more of the eligibility criteria.

![Figure 2. Adjustments were classified and counted by type of request.](image)

Of the 117 adjustment requests submitted, 53 (45.3 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.

There were five predominant issues addressed in the memoranda sent to teachers:

1) **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 of each student in question was confirmed and listed in this memorandum.

2) **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. The number of absences for each student in question was confirmed and listed in the memorandum.

3) **Alternative Test Combination:** Gave the reason why it was not possible to use suggested alternative test combinations to compute CEIs. It was reiterated to teachers that despite the fact that their students had these test combinations, there were not enough students throughout the district with these test combinations necessary to make valid comparisons among all of their scores.

4) **Less Students on Report than Roster:** Described the difference between being enrolled in a teacher’s course and being CEI-eligible. Teachers were reminded that students had to be enrolled in their course for all six-week grading periods of the term (either semester or year) as well as meet all other eligibility criteria in order to be included in their CEI.

5) **On Leave:** Explained to teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2009-10 school year that they were not eligible to receive a CEI. This decision was made based on teacher input, which determined that it makes the indices fairer to teachers by only holding them accountable for students they were in contact with throughout the school year. As a result, teachers who are on leave for more than 20 days are ineligible to receive CEIs.

**2010-11 Teachers’ CEI Report**

To generate the 2010-11 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 produced 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. Changes were made to the Teacher’s CEI Report for 2010-11, including the addition of information about students’ grade-levels and the language of the current assessment for courses in the bilingual
reading/language arts sequence. 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. The sample teacher report was updated to include the new features of the report.

**2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates**

The 2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates, or “Longitudinal Report,” is a four-year longitudinal report that combines 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. A database containing CEI statistics and TAKS data for teachers with 2011-12 teaching assignments was compiled in order to generate the Longitudinal Report.

Reports were uploaded on October 10, 2011. Senior executive directors received an e-mail message notifying them that the Longitudinal Report was available on MyData Portal for downloading and printing.

**Recommendations**

**2010-11 CEI Adjustment Process**

The CEI adjustment process should continue to provide an easily accessible and fair platform for teachers to dispute their CEIs. To accomplish this goal, it is recommended that DARRS continues to refine the adjustment process to increase its overall efficiency by

- Encouraging digital submission of adjustment requests to better track submissions
- Sending reminders to reduce the number of late submissions
- Collaborating with the Effectiveness Indices Advisory Council and other departments to determine the continued appropriateness and usefulness of certain CEI-related policies
- Working in partnership with Pay for Performance to communicate to teachers, principals, and stakeholders that CEIs and Performance Pay Programs are distinct entities

**2010-11 Teachers’ CEI Reports**

The CEI report is a tool designed to provide clear and complete information about CEIs to teachers, principals, and senior executive directors. Presenting CEI-related information transparently in a user-friendly format should remain the main purpose of the CEI report. To aid in this, DARRS should aim to include more student information in the report, such as enrollment dates and additional reasons for exclusion.

**2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates**

The 2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates is a tool created to provide prior-year CEI- and TAKS-related information for reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies teachers currently at campuses. Senior executive directors and principals 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. To increase the report’s usefulness for elementary school stakeholders, testing data summaries for first- and second-grade reading and mathematics norm-referenced results should be included in the report, where possible.