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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, special education status, talented and gifted 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 executive directors as a tool to guide instructional and professional development planning. This executive summary reviews the activities of Evaluation and Assessment’s Office of Institutional Research (OIR) that are related to the dissemination and use of CEIs, including adjustments for the 2011-12 CEIs.

2012-13 CEI Adjustment Process

BACKGROUND

During the 2011-12 school year, 6,455 teachers throughout the district taught CEI-eligible courses. Among those eligible, 5,508 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 2012, teachers had the opportunity to formally request investigations into their 2011-12 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 student rosters, 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 2012-13 adjustment process covering CEIs from the 2011-12 school year.

PROCESS

Teachers used a standard form to request adjustments to their 2011-12 CEIs, which involved the verification of data used to compute individual CEIs, and where appropriate, the recalculation of CEIs. OIR staff reviewed each request by examining appropriate information sources, such as the district’s student information system, preliminary CEI rosters maintained in OIR 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 2011-12 CEIs was October 26, 2012. No distinction is made between requests received before or after the deadline, and all are labeled traditional requests. Requests received through means other than submission of OIR’s adjustment request form with supporting documentation, such as from Evaluation and Assessment’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 2012-13 CEI adjustment period for 2011-12 CEIs, nine traditional adjustment requests were submitted by teachers from eight schools throughout the district. In contrast, approximately 51 requests were submitted during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period. The 82 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. Changes to the teacher report for 2011-12 appeared to aid teachers in the interpretation of their results, which in turn limited the number of requests submitted. Additionally, the 2011-12 school year was the first time since the 2007-08 school year that the district did not offer the Achievement Incentive Award. The Achievement Incentive Award was a performance pay award for which a teacher’s division CEI was one of several eligibility requirements. This award was not offered for the 2011-12 school year because the grant that funded the program was complete. It is suggested that because teachers were not eligible to receive performance pay awards for the 2011-12 school year, their interest in the 2011-12 CEIs may have waned.

Table 1 summarizes the number of adjustment requests submitted by school type. Similar to the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period, elementary school teachers submitted the majority of requests (66.7 percent) during the 2012-13 CEI adjustment period. As shown in Figure 1, there were three main types of issues presented in the 2011-12 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 2011-12 school year. This was generally due to the improper correction of their rosters during the spring CRV process. 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 20 working days during the school year. 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 2011-12 CEI adjustment requests.) Two adjustment requests were submitted for each issue.

Figure 2 presents the variability in the prevalence of each type of adjustment request among school types. More than half of elementary school teachers who submitted adjustment requests had corrections to their CEI rosters. The remaining requests submitted by elementary school teachers addressed policy issues and CEI calculations. One middle school teacher submitted an adjustment request. The adjustment request questioned the calculation of CEIs. Two high school teachers submitted adjustment requests. One adjustment request was related to policy issues, while the other adjustment request dealt with roster corrections.

Adjustments

Five teachers who submitted traditional adjustment requests during the 2012-13 CEI adjustment process received an adjustment. This is consistent with the number and types of adjustment requests submitted. Four adjustments involved removing students from the teacher’s course. The teacher did not properly update her rosters during the spring CRV period, and as a result, students that should have been removed from the rosters because they were not linked with her for the school year remained on the rosters. The other adjustment involved adding a course to a teacher’s rosters. The teacher provided both reading and language arts instruction to her students during the 2011-12 school year, but her rosters only showed students enrolled in language arts. One additional elementary school teacher had a potential adjustment, but the teacher did not provide the requested additional information necessary to process her request. (See Appendix C for additional information on each type of adjustment.)

![Figure 1](image-url)

**Figure 1.** Adjustment requests are differentiated by type based on the major issue described by the requester.

### 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>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers are not eligible to receive CEIs.
** Count includes complete and incomplete requests.
Requests not Adjusted

Of the nine adjustment requests submitted, four (44.4 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. (See Appendix D for a description of each memoranda topic.)

There were three predominant issues addressed in the memoranda sent to teachers. The first issue dealt with uncertainty regarding the calculation of CEIs for teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2011-12 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.

The second issue dealt with teachers’ understanding of the difference between students being enrolled in the teacher’s course versus students being CEI-eligible. Teachers were reminded that students must be enrolled in the course for the full term and meet all eligibility criteria in order to be included in the teacher’s CEI.

The third issue addressed in the memoranda sent to teachers was the request of information necessary to finish processing the adjustment request.

Non-traditional Adjustment Requests and Adjustments

In addition to the traditional requests already summarized, OIR received two non-traditional adjustment requests. The first non-traditional adjustment request was submitted by a principal who was concerned that nine of the teachers at his campus had CEIs based only on ACPs when they taught courses for which there were associated STAAR EOCs. He was alerted to this issue because his school’s component SEIs were not consistent with his teachers’ division CEIs. STAAR EOC results were not originally included in the computation of these teachers’ CEIs because they were the teachers of record for two semester-long courses (one course during semester 1 and one course during semester 2) that together covered a year’s worth of material (ex. 3151 Biology (1) and 3152 Biology (2)). Per the request of the Executive Director of Evaluation and Assessment, these nine teachers received adjustments that involved linking students to them for the full school year and recalculating their CEIs based on semester 1 and 2 ACPs and the course-relevant STAAR EOC. The second non-traditional adjustment request was submitted by the Director of the Office of Institutional Research. It was discovered while creating summary reports, that a teacher who changed campuses after the first six-week grading period had students at both campuses incorrectly linked to her for the entire school year. Per the request of the Director of the Office of Institutional Research, this teacher received an adjustment that involved removing the students from her initial 2011-12 campus and recalculating her CEIs based only on students from her final 2011-12 campus.

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 2012-13 CEI adjustment period, nine traditional and two non-traditional adjustment requests were submitted. This was an approximately 82 percent decrease from the 51 adjustment requests submitted during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period. The 15 adjustments completed during the 2011-12 CEI adjustment period was an approximately 96.8 percent decrease from the 464 adjustments completed during the same period in 2011-12. It should be noted that the majority of adjustments made during the 2011-12 adjustment period were due to an incongruence between CRV and CEI databases that was discovered after the initial production of CEIs (440 adjustments; 94.8 percent of adjustments made). This incongruence resulted in 1,201 middle school and high school teachers receiving CEIs in the original production run that included students with excessive absences. The lower numbers of adjustment requests during the 2012-13 adjustment period 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. It is also suggested that the absence of the Achievement Incentive Award may have affected teachers’ interest in their 2011-12 CEIs.

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 OIR 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 appropriate district leaders and departments to determine the continued suitability and usefulness of certain CEI-related policies
Appendix A:
Teachers, CEI Teachers, and CEI Recipients

Table 2. 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>5,023</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>3,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,455</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 2011-12 school year.

- **CEI-eligible teachers** had students enrolled in the courses listed below. They verified students' enrollment in courses during the spring 2012 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       | • Grade 9 STAAR EOC subjects (English I, Algebra I, Geometry, Biology, World Geography)  
|            | • Grades 10-11 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 school year submitted adjustment requests for roster corrections during the 2012-13 adjustment period. Teachers with this issue did not have students "linked to them" or enrolled in their course in one or more terms 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 term(s) 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 commonly disputed policy states that teachers who are on official leave for more than 20 days are not eligible to receive CEIs. Official leave documentation was 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. 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:

- **Link Students**: CEI rosters were corrected to indicate that a set of students were enrolled in a teacher’s course for the full school year. This type of adjustment was performed primarily for teachers who taught two consecutive semester-long courses that covered a year’s worth of material.

- **Remove Students**: One or more students were removed from teachers’ courses. The students were removed because they were not linked in Chancery, but linked in CEI rosters. The teachers did not properly update their rosters during the spring CRV period. The students removed from teachers’ courses had excessive absences and were incorrectly included in the original computation of these teachers’ CEIs.

- **Add Course**: CEI rosters were corrected to ensure that courses associated with teachers reflected the instructional environment during the 2011-12 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 policies regarding the way CEIs are assigned to teachers in the Language Arts division.
Appendix D: Memoranda Topics

Definitions:

- **Additional Information Required**: Requested additional information necessary to finish processing the adjustment request.

- **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.

- **On Leave**: Explained to teachers who were on leave for more than 20 working days during the 2011-12 school year that they were not eligible to receive a CEI.