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, limited English proficient (LEP) status, special education status, talented and gifted status, socioeconomic status, and three neighborhood characteristics) and the same level of achievement on the same p rior-year tests. An important feature of the CEIs is the use of a comparison group to measure relative progress. This measure of performance is in contrast to a system, such as the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), which evaluates students’ absolute progress against a pre-determined score criterion.

CEIs are computed at three levels. A teacher receives a CEI for each section, course, and division (or content area) he or she teaches. Reports containing all CEIs, as well as student-level information, are provided annually via MyData Portal to teachers, principals, and executive directors as a tool to guide instructional and professional development planning.

Background

During the 2012-13 school year, 5,661 teachers throughout the district taught CEI-eligible courses. Among those eligible, 5,128 teachers received CEIs during initial production. After the publication of CEI reports in September 2013, teachers had the opportunity to formally request investigations into their 2012-13 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 post-production corrections to student rosters, requests to include or exclude students were accepted if submitted with explanation and the principal’s approval.

2013-14 CEI Adjustment Process

Teachers used a standard form to request adjustments to their 2012-13 CEIs, which involved the verification of data used to compute individual CEIs, and where appropriate, the recalculation of CEIs. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) staff reviewed each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>CEI-eligible Teachers</th>
<th>CEI Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School*</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>100.0</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.

At-a-Glance

Table 1. CEI Teachers* and CEI Recipients by School Type

During the 2013-14 CEI adjustment period for 2012-13 CEIs, 18 traditional adjustment requests were submitted by teachers from 14 schools throughout the district.

There were three main types of issues presented in the 2013-14 CEI adjustment requests:

1) **Roster Corrections related to continuous enrollment**: Submitted by teachers who felt that their report did not accurately reflect the students they taught during the 2012-13 school year. This type of request generally came from teachers who did not correct or improperly corrected their rosters during the spring CRV process. Additionally, there was a discrepancy between continuous enrollment status for some students during the CRV process and the CEI reports. This discrepancy was due to the fact that rosters were created
before the end of the school year and did not use test-specific attendance requirements.

2) **Policy Issues:** Submitted by teachers who did not understand the policy-related requirements for CEI-eligibility such as the appropriate combination of tests, retained students, and/or special education students.

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

Eight CEIs were adjusted during the 2013-14 CEI adjustment process. All of the adjustments involved linking (or adding) students to the teacher’s course. In seven of the cases, the students appeared to be continuously enrolled during the CRV Verification Process in spring, but were not included in the CEI reports once the final continuous enrollment requirements were applied. In one of the cases, the teacher updated her rosters during the spring CRV period but did not submit them.

Of the 18 adjustment requests submitted, ten (55.5 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.

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

1. **Red Bar/Green Bar:** Provided guidance on the interpretation of students’ relative gain scores in relation to their 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.
2. **Attendance Requirements:** Addressed concerns regarding the inclusion of students with excessive absences in the computation of CEIs. Teachers were reminded of the maximum number of days a student can be absent from a teacher’s course and still be included in the computation of the teacher’s CEI. They were also reminded that the CEIs only take into account excused and unexcused absences. Students who were included in the teacher’s CEI were listed in this memorandum.
3. **Continuous Enrollment:** Explained the criteria for a student to be considered continuously enrolled in a year-long course. The students who were excluded from the teacher’s CEI as a result of not being continuously enrolled were listed in this memorandum.

**Recommendations**

**2013-14 CEI Adjustment Process**

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

- Working with appropriate district leaders and departments to streamline the dispute process related to the all of the metrics in the TEI, including CEIs.
- Implementing a CEI question/answer period before accepting formal adjustment requests. Many of the adjustment requests OIR receives are questions about the process or calculations and could be addressed without a formal adjustment request.
- Encouraging digital submission of questions and adjustment requests to better track submissions
- Sending districtwide reminders to reduce the number of late submissions
- Collaborating with appropriate district leaders and departments to determine the continued suitability and usefulness of certain CEI-related policies
- Refining the CEI rosters so that teachers are more easily able to view their student’s continuous enrollment status.