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 (AEIS), 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 2009-10 CEIs.

2010-11 CEI Adjustment Process

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. (See 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.

(1) Course/Section Detail

Figure 8 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.

In the 2010-11 report, 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) was listed. 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 number of items that each student answered correctly and information about how each student performed in comparison to members of their comparison group was also provided. New for the 2010-11
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### Sample Teacher (99999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relative gain score</th>
<th>Items correct on this administration</th>
<th>Characteristics of student’s comparison group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | 2157094 STUDENT NAME | 0.00 | 33 peers taught in this group | Gender: Male, Hispanic; 2nd, SDS, high level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 2  | 2600587 STUDENT NAME | 0.43 | 38 peers taught in this group | Male, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 3  | 2170804 STUDENT NAME | 0.03 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 4  | 2170702 STUDENT NAME | 0.66 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 5  | 2600325 STUDENT NAME | 0.13 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 6  | 2600882 STUDENT NAME | 0.43 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 7  | 2170902 STUDENT NAME | 0.03 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 8  | 2600396 STUDENT NAME | 0.66 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 9  | 2172690 STUDENT NAME | 0.03 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 10 | 2066489 STUDENT NAME | 0.03 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 11 | 2066488 STUDENT NAME | 0.03 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:
| 12 | 2139899 STUDENT NAME | 0.03 | 38 peers taught in this group | Female, Hispanic, low SES, low level | Group's 2008-09 scores:

**NOTES:** The average relative gain score in any comparison group is 0 with a standard deviation (SD) of 10. Relative gain scores from 1 to 2.5 are above or below average and highlighted with the characters + or -. A student who scored higher than average in all comparison groups is shown in black. Students in red are those whose relative gain score is higher than 10. Relative gain scores between 4 and 5 (shaded gray) are considered average or “typical” students. All students in a comparison group have the characteristics listed in the student’s row. Students who are not educated in a racial/ethnic group marked by an asterisk (*) were not included in the data. Relative gain scores were calculated using the relative gain score method of the TAKS Reading and Language Arts (Spanish) tests.
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Figure 8. The third section of a Teacher’s CEI Report is the course/section detail report. Each section has a page per outcome test, such as “TAKS Reading.”
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 2010-11 CEI report built on changes implemented for the 2009-10 CEI report. It is recommended that DARRS works to include more student information, such as enrollment dates and additional reasons for exclusion.

2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 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 2010-11 longitudinal reports, which were produced in September 2011, included refinements to previous versions.

METHODOLOGY

To generate the 2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates, or “Longitudinal Report,” a database was compiled containing CEI statistics and TAKS data for teachers with 2011-12 teaching assignments.

Reports were uploaded on September 15, 2011 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 9. shows the title page which contained guidelines for interpreting the contents of the Longitudinal Report.
Teacher Summary

Figure 10 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.)

Division CEIs were represented graphically. 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. 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.

Appendix A for a breakdown of CEI-eligibility by school level.) 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. 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 2010-11 adjustment process covering CEIs from the 2009-10 school year.

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. 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.”

The deadline for adjustment requests related to 2009-10 CEIs was October 6, 2010. Some requests received after the deadline were investigated by request of Evaluation and 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 Evaluation and Accountability’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 Requests and Adjustments

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. In contrast, approximately 170 requests were submitted during the 2009-10 CEI adjustment period. The 32 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. In the past, confusion over student eligibility requirements or computation procedures often led to unsupported or unnecessary adjustment requests. Additions and changes to the teacher report for 2009-10 appeared to aid teachers in the interpretation of their results, which in turn limited the number of requests submitted.

The majority of teachers (88.9 percent) who submitted requests in 2010 had earlier in the year elected to participate in the district’s 2009-10 Performance Pay Program.\(^1\) 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 the 104 “Performance Pay” teachers who submitted adjustment requests, only 29 (27.9 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 teachers were due to an anomaly in the spring CEI Roster Verification process. Due to inconsistencies in district data for grades assigned to first-grade students, many preliminary 2009-10 CEI rosters created for first-grade teachers did not properly “link” their students.\(^2\) Some first-grade teachers submitted their preliminary CEI rosters without making corrections and, as a result, inadvertently confirmed that none or very few of their students were included for the fourth and fifth six-week grading periods to be “linked” for a year-long course.

---

1 As one of several eligibility requirements for the 2009-10 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 to be “linked” for a year-long course.
week grading periods. DARRS notified these teachers of the anomaly when CEI reports were published to MyData Portal on September 15 and instructed them to submit an adjustment request, if applicable.

Thirty-three first-grade teachers submitted adjustment requests related to this issue. An additional nine elementary school teachers who submitted their rosters without making the corrections necessary to link their students to them in the third six-week grading period contacted DARRS regarding their missing CEIs. These teachers were instructed to submit adjustment requests.

As shown in Figure 1, there were three main types of issues presented in the 2009-10 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 2009-10 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. These guidelines include not calculating CEIs for teachers who are on official leave for more than twenty working days during the school year. Additionally, CEIs are not calculated for teachers who have fewer than eight students who meet all CEI eligibility criteria. 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 2009-10 CEI adjustment requests.) Roster corrections were the most commonly cited issue among all adjustment requests.

Figure 2 presents the variability in the prevalence of each type of adjustment request among school types. The majority of elementary school teachers who submitted adjustment requests (56.3 percent) asked for roster corrections. The remaining requests submitted by elementary school teachers addressed CEI calculations and policy issues. Only five adjustment requests were submitted by middle school teachers. Three requested roster corrections, while the remaining two adjustment requests addressed policy issues and the calculation of CEIs. Of the 14 high school teachers who submitted adjustment requests, 10 questioned the way in which CEIs were calculated. The four remaining requests addressed policy issues and roster corrections.

<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>48</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers are not eligible to receive CEIs.

** Count includes complete and incomplete requests.
Adjustments

Fifty-seven CEIs were adjusted during the 2010-11 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 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. (See Appendix C for additional information on each type of adjustment.) As shown in Figure 3, the majority of adjustments performed involved linking students to a teacher.

Figure 4 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 first-grade teachers. The remaining adjustments for elementary school teachers involved removing students, adding students, and calculating CEIs for teachers who had not previously received them. Two middle school teachers received adjustments, both of which involved linking students to them. Of the three high school teachers who received adjustments, one had students removed from his course, another had her CEI removed, and the last had his CEI calculated.

Table 2. Adjustments Completed by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Adjustment Requests</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Adjustment requests were sorted by type of request within school type.
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. 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 was the exclusion of students who lacked prior-year or current-year 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 second 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.

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

Requests not Adjusted

Requests not Adjusted

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. 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 was the exclusion of students who lacked prior-year or current-year 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 second 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.

Figure 4. Adjustments were classified and counted by type of request within school type.
The third issue involved suggestions of alternative test combinations for students who did not have the required prior-year and current test combinations. Several teachers suggested that the grade four Spanish TAKS Mathematics test be used as a current assessment for fourth-graders and a prior-year assessment for fifth-graders. It was explained that it was not possible to use these combinations because although 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.

The fourth issue focused on understanding why certain students who were in a teacher’s course during the school year were excluded from the calculation of his or her CEIs. 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.

The fifth issue dealt with requests for the calculation of CEIs by teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2009-10 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.

### Non-traditional Adjustment Requests and Adjustments

In addition to the traditional requests already summarized, DARRS received 14 non-traditional adjustment requests concerning the CEIs of 20 teachers. Nine of the 14 were submitted by principals concerned that several of their teachers were eligible for Performance Pay awards because of CEIs that “should have been attributed to other teachers.” This was a direct result of teachers’ rosters not being properly corrected during the CRV process. Twelve teachers’ CEIs were adjusted as a result of the non-traditional requests. The adjustments involved linking students, adding students, or removing students from the teachers’ rosters.

As a result of an error in the CRV database, 25 English I teachers (course number 1201) did not receive CEIs in the original production run. CEIs were subsequently produced for these teachers during the adjustment period.
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 2010-11 CEI adjustment period, 117 traditional and 14 non-traditional adjustment requests were submitted. This was a 32 percent decrease from the 170 adjustment requests submitted during the 2009-10 CEI adjustment period. Additionally, the 94 adjustments completed during the 2010-11 CEI adjustment period was a 47.5 percent decrease from the 179 adjustments completed during the same period in 2009-10. 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 continues to refine the adjustment process to increase its overall efficiency by

1) Encouraging digital submission of adjustment requests to better track submissions
2) Sending reminders to reduce the number of late submissions
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.

2010-11 Teacher's CEI Report

CONTEXT

Changes were made to the Teacher’s CEI Report for 2010-11. 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 all features of the report.

METHODOLOGY

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 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.

(2) Glossary/Legend

Figure 6 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.
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Figure 6. The Teacher’s CEI Report begins with a one-page glossary/legend.

Longitudinal Report

Figure 7 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 each school year.
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.

(3) Course/Section Detail

Figure 8 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.

In the 2010-11 report, 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) was listed. Additionally, three neighborhood variables were listed for each student:

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

The number of items that each student answered correctly and information about how each student performed in comparison to members of their comparison group was also provided. New for the 2010-11
report was the listing of student grade level, and for courses in the bilingual reading/language arts sequence (0x27 – Reading/Language Arts (Spanish) and 0x28 – Reading/Language Arts (English)), the listing of the language of the current assessment. 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 with the reason for exclusion listed next to each student’s name.

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 2010-11 CEI report built on changes implemented for the 2009-10 CEI report. It is recommended that DARRS works to include more student information, such as enrollment dates and additional reasons for exclusion.

2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 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 2010-11 longitudinal reports, which were produced in September 2011, included refinements to previous versions.

METHODOLOGY

To generate the 2010-11 Longitudinal CEI Report (2011-12 School Assignments) with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates, or “Longitudinal Report,” a database was compiled containing CEI statistics and TAKS data for teachers with 2011-12 teaching assignments.

Reports were uploaded on September 15, 2011 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.

(2) Title Page

Figure 9. shows the title page which contained guidelines for interpreting the contents of the Longitudinal Report.
Texas S.B. 1 (1995) mandates that all teacher appraisal information be confidential and not subject to the Open Records Act of the State of Texas. All participants are cautioned to treat information in this Classroom Effectiveness Indices report as highly confidential.

This report is current as of November 8, 2010. Adjustments to student rosters may result in updated statistics. Adjustments completed after November 8, 2010 are not available in this report.

The 2010 AEIS standard for READING/ELA is 70% meeting standard.

The 2011 AEIS standard for READING/ELA is 70% meeting standard.

Notes: Division-level CEIs have an average of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. CEIs are converted to percentiles within each division. A percentile reports the percentage of other CEIs that are below the given value. In this report, CEIs up to one standard deviation are displayed graphically as a star (*) in relation to the average of 50, represented by a square (□). CEIs more than one standard deviation from average are graphed at one standard deviation. CEI percentiles are displayed graphically as bars and are coded by color and size. Division CEIs are reported for four years; TAKS passing rates are reported for three years. The school assignment is printed only if a CEI was received in the school year.

Figure 9. The first section of the Longitudinal CEI Report with Teacher-Level TAKS Passing Rates is the title page.

Teacher Summary

Figure 10 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.)

Division CEIs were represented graphically. 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. 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.

**Figure 10.** 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 3. 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>5,377</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>3,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,586</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 2009-10 school year.
- **CEI-eligible teachers** had students enrolled in the courses listed below. They verified students’ enrollment in courses during the spring 2010 CEI Roster Verification periods.

| Elementary       | Grades 1-5 mathematics
|                  | Grades 1-5 reading/language arts (reading, language arts, writing, etc.)
|                  | Grade 5 science
| Middle           | Grades 6-8 reading/language arts (reading, language arts, writing, etc.)
|                  | Grades 6-8 mathematics
|                  | Grade 8 science
|                  | Grade 8 social studies
|                  | Grades 7-8 courses with ACPs
| High             | Grades 9-11 TAKS subjects (language arts, math, science, social studies)
|                  | Grades 9-12 courses with ACPs

- **CEI Teachers** received at least one division-level CEI during the initial production of 2009-10 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 2009-10 school year submitted adjustment requests for roster corrections during the 2010-11 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 policy disputed 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 basing bilingual teachers’ CEIs on scores from tests that reflect the language in which students were assessed and not the language in which they were taught. Official leave documentation and CEI rosters that indicated courses taught during the 2009-10 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. Students added to a teacher’s section were removed from another teacher’s section. The teacher who received this adjustment was reminded that the spring CRV periods were the most appropriate times to make this type of correction.

- **Calculate CEI**: CEIs were computed for teachers who did not receive them during their initial production. This group of teachers was originally flagged as ineligible to receive a CEI because they had accumulated more than 20 working days of official leave during the 2009-10 school year. Only a select group of teachers whose leaves began after the 2009-10 TAKS testing period received this adjustment.

- **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 first-grade teachers who, as a result of not making corrections to their CEI rosters, did not have students linked to them during the fourth and fifth six-week grading periods of the 2009-10 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 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 (fewer than 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.

- **Alternative Test Combination:** Gave the reason why it was not possible to use suggested alternative test combinations to compute CEIs. The fourth-grade Spanish TAKS Mathematics was recommended for use as a current assessment for fourth-graders and a prior-year assessment for fifth-graders. It was reiterated to teachers that although 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.

- **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.

- **Bilingual Teachers:** Provided justification for the use of Spanish TAKS Reading and Spanish TAKS Writing scores in the computation of CEIs for teachers of the English portion of bilingual Reading/Language Arts. It was reiterated to teachers that students in their classes were only compared to other students across the district who took the same test in the same language in the same course.

- **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 who received mid-year reassignments during the 2009-10 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).

- **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.

- **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.

- **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 memos
  o Continuous Enrollment: Explained the criteria for a student to be considered continuously enrolled in a year-long course. For the 2009-10 CEIs, a student was required to be enrolled on or before April 26, 2010 and have at least 129 days of attendance with the teacher to be eligible for inclusion in the teacher’s CEI. The students who were excluded from the teacher’s CEI as a result of not being continuously enrolled were listed in this memorandum.
  o Exclusion of 2nd and 3rd TAKS administration: Provided an explanation for why TAKS scores from the second and third administrations are not used in the calculation of CEIs. Teachers were reminded that these tests are neither identical to the original nor to each other, so students’ scores on them cannot be used to make the comparisons that are necessary to compute the CEIs.
  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 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 for all six-week periods. Teachers were reminded that they are not held accountable for students they did not have in class all year.
  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 Raw Scores: Differentiated between the test scores listed in the CEI report and those posted on MyData Portal. Scores listed in the CEI report reflect students’ raw scores on the current and prior-year norm-referenced assessments, whereas scores on MyData Portal reflect the percentage of items each student answered correctly.
  o Special Education Students: Reminded teachers that the inclusion of special education students, flagged appropriately, in the computation of CEIs is a districtwide decision.
  o Unique Students: Described how to determine the number of unique students used in the calculation of a teacher’s division CEI.