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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, limited English proficient 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 predetermined 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 reviews 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 2010-11 CEIs.

2011-12 CEI Adjustment Process

BACKGROUND

During the 2010-11 school year, 6,586 teachers throughout the district taught CEI-eligible courses. Among those eligible, 5,804 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 2011, teachers had the opportunity to formally request investigations into their 2010-11 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 (CRV)” 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 2011-12 adjustment process covering CEIs from the 2010-11 school year.

PROCESS

Teachers used a standard form to request adjustments to their 2010-11 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 2010-11 CEIs was September 29, 2011. Some requests received after the deadline were investigated by request of Evaluation and Accountability’s Executive Director or the district’s 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 2011-12 CEI adjustment period for 2010-11 CEIs, 51 traditional adjustment requests were submitted by teachers from 33 schools throughout the district. In contrast, approximately 117 requests were submitted during the 2010-11 CEI adjustment period. The 56 percent decrease in adjustment requests is thought to be a result of the refinements made to the 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 2010-11 appeared to aid teachers in the interpretation of their results, which in turn limited the number of requests submitted.

For the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period, DARRS did not receive information regarding which teachers had earlier in the 2010-11 school year elected to participate in the district’s 2010-11 Performance Pay Program.† Despite this, anecdotal evidence from current and prior years 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 51 teachers who submitted adjustment requests, only 5 (9.8 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. Similar to the 2010-11 CEI adjustment period, elementary school teachers submitted the majority of requests (82.4 percent) during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period. As shown in Figure 1, there were three main types of issues presented in the 2010-11 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 2010-11 school year. This was generally due to the improper correction of their rosters during the spring CRV process. Teachers with students who were continuously enrolled in the course but not listed on the final CEI report also requested roster corrections. Policy issues requests were submitted by teachers who wanted to refute the guidelines used to determine teachers’

---

†As one of several eligibility requirements for the 2010-11 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
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 2010-11 CEI adjustment requests.) CEI calculations 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. Half of elementary school teachers who submitted adjustment requests had concerns regarding the calculation of their CEIs. The remaining requests submitted by elementary school teachers addressed roster corrections and policy issues. Only six adjustment requests were submitted by middle school teachers. Three adjustment requests questioned the calculation of CEIs, while the remaining three adjustment requests addressed roster corrections and policy issues. Of the three high school teachers who submitted adjustment requests, two questioned the way in which CEIs were calculated. The remaining request addressed policy issues.

Adjustments

Thirteen CEIs were adjusted during the 2011-12 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.

Six general types of adjustments were performed. The first type of adjustment added one or more students to a teacher’s course. The second 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. The third type of adjustment linked students to a teacher in one or more six-week

Table 1. Adjustment Requests by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Adjustment Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers are not eligible to receive CEIs.
** Count includes complete and incomplete requests.
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grading periods. The fourth type of adjustment removed CEIs for teachers who received them in error. The fifth type of adjustment removed select students from a teacher's course. The sixth type of adjustment updated the courses that were assigned to the teacher for the purposes of CEIs. (See Appendix C for additional information on each type of adjustment.) As shown in Figure 3, the majority of adjustments performed involved adding students, linking students, and updating courses.

Figure 4 illustrates how the type of adjustment performed varied by school type. The prominent adjustments made for elementary school teachers involved adding students, linking students to a teacher, and updating courses. Of particular interest are the three adjustments for elementary school teachers that involved updating the courses for which teachers were denoted as the teachers of record. Beginning with the 2010-11 CEIs, changes were made to the way CEIs were assigned to teachers in the Language Arts division. These changes were based on recommendations from the district's English Language Arts (ELAR) department, the Multi-language Enrichment Program (M-LEP), and the Effectiveness Indices Advisory Council (EIAC). CEIs for Language Arts course 0400 were based only on grade four TAKS Writing, while CEIs for Reading course 0403 were based only on grade four TAKS Reading. Additionally, only student scores from tests of the same language as the course were used in computing CEIs for bilingual reading/language arts courses. CEIs for course 0X27 were based on scores from Spanish Language tests (i.e. Logramos and Spanish TAKS), and CEIs for course 0X28 were based on scores from English language tests (i.e. ITBS and English TAKS). The small number of teachers who required this adjustment suggests that these changes were effectively communicated to district stakeholders, and as such, most teachers affected by these policy changes were able to make the necessary corrections prior to the initial production of CEIs.

The two middle school teachers who received adjustments taught at the same campus during the 2010-11 school year. Adjustments for both teachers involved removing students with excessive absences who were incorrectly included in the original computation of these teachers’ CEIs. This occurred due to an error in DARRS databases used to determine students’ absences, which did not flag the campus as following a block schedule during the 2010-11 school year. No high school teacher received a traditional adjustment during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period for 2010-11 CEIs.

Table 2. Adjustments Completed by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requests not Adjusted

Of the 51 adjustment requests submitted, 38 (74.5 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 memorandum topic.)

There were five predominant issues addressed in the memoranda sent to teachers. The first 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 CEIs.

The second issue, red bar/green bar, dealt with teachers’ interpretations of their CEI results in relation to their students’ 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 a high relative gain score, he must outperform the average score of his comparison group, whether that score is a “passing” value or a “failing” value.

The third issue was the exclusion of students who lacked 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 fourth issue focused on teachers’ perceived discrepancies between course CEIs and division CEIs as well as relative gain scores and TAKS Growth profiles. It was emphasized that a course CEI is the average fairness adjusted relative gain score standardized within grade and test for a course.

Figure 3. Adjustments were classified and counted by type of request.
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Figure 4. Adjustments were classified and counted by type of request within school type.
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division CEI is the average fairness adjusted relative gain score standardized within division. It was also explained that even though TAKS Growth Profiles and CEIs address students’ performance in comparison to members of their peer group, different types of data and formulas are used to calculate these values, and as a result, they do not provide the same measure of student performance.

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 2010-11 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 9 non-traditional adjustment requests concerning the CEIs of 12 teachers. One of the nine was submitted by a principal who was concerned that four of the teachers at her campus did not receive CEIs and as such, were not eligible for Performance Pay awards. The teachers did not receive CEIs because they did not update their rosters during the CRV process to indicate that their students were linked with them all six-week grading periods of the school year. Per the request of the Executive Director of Evaluation and Accountability, the original investigation results were overturned and these four teachers received adjustments that involved linking students to them for the first six-week grading period and calculating their CEIs. Three other teachers received adjustments as a result of a decision made by the performance pay committee. These three teachers did not receive CEIs during their original production because they were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2010-11 school year. Leave status was removed and CEIs were computed for these teachers. In total, 11 teachers’ CEIs were adjusted as a result of the non-traditional adjustment requests. The adjustments involved linking students, calculating CEIs, and removing students from the teachers’ rosters.

As a result of an incongruence between CRV and CEI databases, 1,201 middle school and high school teachers received CEIs in the original production run that included students with excessive absences. A student was considered to have excessive absences if they had 18 or more excused absences (EA) and unexcused absences (UA) in a full year course or 11 or more EA and UA in a semester-long course. Analysts investigated the effects of removing students with excessive absences on teachers’ division CEI percentiles. There were three possible outcomes: 1) division CEI percentile decreased (272 teachers), 2) division CEI percentile increased (440 teachers), and 3) division CEI percentile stayed the same (489 teachers). It was determined that it was most appropriate to adjust CEIs for teachers whose division CEI percentiles would increase if students with excessive absences were removed. CEIs were subsequently
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**Figure 5.** Memoranda to teachers were classified by major topic.
adjusted for these teachers during the adjustment period. Of the 440 teachers who received this adjustment 7 (1.6 percent) had increases in their division CEI percentiles high enough to qualify for Performance Pay awards.

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 2011-12 CEI adjustment period, 51 traditional and 9 non-traditional adjustment requests were submitted. This was an approximately 49 percent decrease from the 117 adjustment requests submitted during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period. Although the 464 adjustments completed during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period was an approximately 494 percent increase from the 94 adjustments completed during the same period in 2010-11, it should be noted that this increase was primarily due to the adjustments made for excessive absences (440 adjustments; 94.8 percent of adjustments made). The lower numbers of adjustment requests are thought to be due to changes in the CRV 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 districtwide 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.

2011-12 Teachers’ CEI Report

CONTEXT

Changes were made to the Teacher’s CEI Report for 2011-12. 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 2011-12 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 a sufficient number of days during 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 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.

2011-12 Classroom Effectiveness Index Report for SAMPLE TEACHER (99999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSSARY/LEGEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINUITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENROLLED (EO)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVISION CEL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELIGIBILITY (&quot;CEI-ELIGIBLE&quot;)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAIRNESS-ADJUSTED RELATIVE GAIN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD VARIABLES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORMAL-REFERENCED ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENTAGE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREVIOUS-YEAR SCORE ABBREVIATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION CEI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIMILAR STUDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(2) Longitudinal Report

Error! Reference source not found. 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.
Figure 7. 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.

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. 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 2011-12 report, detailed information about each student's group of similar students, including gender, ethnicity, level of English proficiency, special student population status (i.e. talented and gifted (TAG) or special education (SPED)), 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
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 "STAAR Reading."

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 senior executive directors. Presenting CEI-related information transparently in a user-friendly format should remain the main purpose of the CEI report. The 2011-12 CEI report built on changes implemented for the 2010-11 CEI report. It is recommended that DARRS works to include more student information, such as enrollment dates and additional reasons for exclusion.
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>5,075</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>3,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,276</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 2010-11 school year.
- **CEI-eligible teachers** had students enrolled in the courses listed below. They verified students' enrollment in courses during the spring 2011 CEI Roster Verification periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-5 mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-5 reading/language arts (reading, language arts, writing, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-8 reading/language arts (reading, language arts, writing, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-8 mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 social studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-8 courses with ACPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-11 TAKS subjects (language arts, math, science, social studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12 courses with ACPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CEI Teachers** received at least one division-level CEI during the initial production of 2010-11 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 2010-11 school year submitted adjustment requests for roster corrections during the 2011-12 adjustment period. Teachers with this issue did not have students “linked to them” or enrolled in their course in one or more six-week grading 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 not calculating CEIs for teachers who have fewer than eight students who meet all CEI-eligibility criteria and using either TAKS Reading or TAKS Writing scores to calculate CEIs for grade four teachers in the language arts division. Official leave documentation and CEI rosters that indicated courses taught during the 2010-11 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. Some 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. Conversely, other teachers believed that their CEIs excluded students who met all eligibility criteria, including having the correct combinations of prior-year and current tests. Several other teachers believed that their students’ relative gain scores did not provide an accurate portrayal of the growth they made during the 2010-11 school year. 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 the teacher’s section were *removed* from another teacher’s section. This teacher was reminded that the spring CRV periods were the most appropriate times to make this type of correction. Two other teachers had students added to their courses who were incorrectly excluded during the initial production of CEIs due to a DARRS database error. As a result of this error, grade five students at one campus were accidentally excluded in the current-year Spanish Reading, Spanish Science, English Mathematics, and English Science fairness regression runs.

- **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 2010-11 school year. Only a select group of teachers whose leaves dates were incorrectly entered into Human Resources databases or whose initial investigation decisions were overturned by the Executive Director of Evaluation and Accountability 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 grading periods. This type of adjustment was performed primarily for teachers who, as a result of not making corrections to theirk CEI rosters, did not have students linked to them during the first six-week grading period of the 2010-11 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. According to information extracted from the district’s student information system, this teacher was the teacher of record for CEI-eligible courses, and thus, received CEIs during their initial production. The teacher’s principal informed DARRS that this was an error in Chancery, and that the teacher did not actually instruct CEI-eligible courses during the 2010-11 school year. Because it was not appropriate for this teacher to receive CEIs, his CEIs were removed.

- **Remove Students**: One or more students were removed from teachers’ courses. The students removed from teachers’ courses had excessive absences and were incorrectly included in the original computation of these teachers’ CEIs.

- **Update Course Number**: CEI rosters were corrected to ensure that courses associated with teachers reflected the instructional environment during the 2010-11 school year. This type of adjustment was performed primarily for reading/language arts teachers who did not correct their rosters so that students’ enrollment was consistent with the new policies regarding the way CEIs are assigned to teachers in the Language Arts division.
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.

- **Continuous Enrollment**: Explained the criteria for a student to be considered continuously enrolled in a year-long course. For the 2010-11 CEIs, a student was required to be enrolled on or before April 25, 2011 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.

- **Discrepancies in CEIs**: Clarified the distinctions between different measures of student growth (ex. course CEI vs. division CEI; CEIs vs. TAKS Growth Profiles). It was emphasized that a course CEI is the average fairness adjusted relative gain score standardized within grade and test for a course, whereas the division CEI is the average fairness adjusted relative gain score standardized within division. It was also reiterated that although TAKS Growth Profiles and CEIs address students’ performance in comparison to members of their peer group, different types of data and formulas are used to calculate these values. As a result, these measures do not provide the same evaluation of student performance.

- **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**: Described 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.

- **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.

- **On Leave**: Explained to teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2010-11 school year that they were not eligible to receive a CEI.

- **Reading and Writing CEIs**: Addressed concerns over the use of either TAKS Reading or TAKS Writing in the computation of CEIs for teachers in the Language Arts division. It was explained that beginning with the 2010-11 CEIs, based on recommendations from the district’s English Language Arts (ELAR) department, the Multi-language Enrichment Program (M-LEP), and the Effectiveness Indices Advisory Council (EIAC), changes were made to the way CEIs were assigned to grade four teachers in the Language Arts division. More specifically, CEIs for Language Arts course 0400 were based only on TAKS Writing, while CEIs for Reading course 0403 were based only on grade four TAKS Reading.

- **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.

- **Testing Irregularities**: Addressed teachers’ concerns about testing irregularities that were perceived to have occurred during the main TAKS testing period of the 2010-11 school year. Teachers were informed that State/National Assessments was the appropriate department to contact regarding these concerns.