

Mastery Learning in Practice: A (Mostly) Descriptive Analysis of Log Data from the Cognitive Tutor Algebra I Effectiveness Trial

Anita Israni

Adam C Sales

John F Pane

December 7, 2017

1 Introduction

Mastery learning sits at the foundation of intelligent tutoring systems [e.g. Corbett, 2001, Wenger, 2014]. The philosophy of mastery learning assumes a well-structured curriculum, and posits that students progress within the curriculum as they master its skills [Bloom, 1968, Kulik et al., 1990]. The Cognitive Tutor Algebra I (CTAI) system, developed by Carnegie Learning, Inc., is one of the best studied and best regarded examples of modern educational software. It is a blended learning system for teaching algebraic concepts and principles, to middle and high school students, including both textbook materials and software. The software component of the curriculum allows students to progress at their own pace and receive individualized feedback on their performance. A large-scale randomized effectiveness trial conducted by the RAND corporation showed that, in some circumstances, CTAI boosts students' scores on an Algebra-I posttest by about one fifth of a standard deviation [Pane et al., 2014]. CTAI's success in this experiment would seem to validate its pedagogy: mastery learning, and the algebra I curriculum on which it is based.

However, the theory underlying CTAI does not always determine its use. To be sure, the software has a standard set of algebra topics, divided into units and further into sections; and a standard sequence for presenting them. But this precise curriculum is not mandatory. At the request of educators, it can be customized by altering what units or sections are included (including, possibly, material from a different standard curriculum such as geometry), as well as their sequence, to conform to local or state standards or scope and sequence guides. Further, teachers have the option of moving students within the curriculum, regardless of the software's estimate of their skill mastery.

This article examines teachers' and schools' adherence and non-adherence to the standard, mastery-based CTAI curriculum, using data from the RAND study, a seven-state randomized controlled trial of CTAI in high schools and middle schools. The study found a significant positive effect of CTAI in high schools, during their second year of implementation but not the first. Students in the treatment group of the study were enrolled in one or more of the

standard or customized curricula during their participation in the study, and the software logged aspects of their usage, including time spent, sections encountered, and whether the software judged the students to have mastered the sections. Adopting standard procedures of an effectiveness trial, both Carnegie Learning and the researchers running the study restricted their support and oversight to what is typically provided outside of an experimental context. Thus, the software data from the study reflect typical usage. Secondary data analyses used principal stratification to show that students who attempted more sections experienced larger treatment effects, and students who had high or low assistance levels, as opposed to an average level, experienced smaller treatment effects [Sales and Pane, 2015, Sales et al., 2016]. Sales and Pane [2017] found that students more likely to master worked sections of the CTAI software may experience *smaller* effects than those less likely to achieve mastery, casting doubt on the role of mastery learning as a mechanism for the treatment effect.

Here we contextualize the previous findings to describe, in detail, the ways in which schools, teachers, and students violate mastery learning. We will begin with short discussions of the RAND effectiveness trial and the usage data it produced. Sections 3—5 will describe overall patterns of usage. First, we will discuss standard and customized CTAI curricula used in the study (Section 3). Next, in Section 4, we will describe patterns in the amount CTAI usage, showing that it varied widely between states, between years, and between students. In particular, the amount of usage decreased from years 1 to 2—though more in some states than others. Then in section 5 we will describe how the amount of usage changed—which units of the CTAI curriculum were worked more and less from years 1 to 2—and find that order in which students worked CTAI’s units varied across years. We show that this change is due mostly, but not completely, to the presence of customized curricula in year 2.

In Section 6 we will describe patterns of mastery in general, and in Section 7 we will delve deeply into “reassignment”: the process in which a teacher moves a student out of a section he or she has not (yet) mastered into a new section. In particular, we will attempt to elucidate teachers’ goals in reassigning students. One hypothesis is the need for teachers to push ahead students who were falling behind, i.e. to reassign them from sections on which they were struggling, to allow them catch up with the rest of the class. Another hypothesis is that teachers sought to push students past easier sections to begin working on more relevant or challenging topics for them. A third hypothesis is that teachers needed to cover certain topics in preparation for an upcoming state exam, and might have reassigned groups of students all at the same time to cover topics that might otherwise not have been covered. This hypothesis may lead to an increase in reassignments as the exam approaches. We find evidence of all three motivations for reassignment, varying across classrooms, schools, states, and study years.

Finally, in Section 8 will give quasi-experimental estimates of the effects of reassignment on students’ posttest scores. We find that reassignment probably decreases student learning, though the effects vary widely across classrooms. Section 9 will conclude the article with a summary of findings and discussion.

2 The RAND Effectiveness Trial

The study to measure the effectiveness of CTAI included 7 states, 73 high schools, and 74 middle schools with nearly 18,700 high school students and 6,800 middle school students participating. Schools were enrolled in a total of 52 school districts that were distributed among urban, suburban, and rural areas. Schools were matched on a set of covariates, and then randomly assigned to the treatment or control group. Schools in the control group continued with their current algebra curriculum, and schools in the treatment group used Carnegie Learning’s curriculum which includes CTAI textbook materials and software. Each school participated for two years, with a different cohort of students participating the second year (with a small fraction of students present in the study both years because they repeated algebra). It should be noted that this study did not include statewide implementations; the study results cannot be generalized to all schools within the state. In some states, one large school district participated, while in other states, a set of smaller school districts participated. The states included Alabama (AL), Connecticut (CT), Kentucky (KY), Louisiana (LA), Michigan (MI), New Jersey (NJ), and Texas (TX). Each state participated in both the middle school and high school arms of the study, except AL, which participated only in the middle school arm. The current study focuses on high school students only.

There are some limitations to the available data for this study. Log data from some schools, and some students within schools, were missing either because the log files were not retrievable, or because of an imperfect ability to link log data to other study data files. For this reason, this study uses only data from the 18 treatment schools for which at least 80% of students in both study years appear in the log data file. This sample includes 4460 students, around 75% of the treated high-school sample. Table 1 gives the number of students in the sample by state and year. The states in the table are ordered by the total number of students they represent in the sample; they will appear in this order in all of the forthcoming tables and figures. Some figures will only show data from a subset of states; since so few students were in New Jersey, it will be excluded from almost all state-by-state comparisons (but included analyses that pool across states).

	TX	KY	MI	LA	CT	NJ
Year 1	947	890	325	164	112	17
Year 2	719	646	285	180	139	36

Table 1: Numbers of students in the sample by state and study year

In this sample from 18 schools, 164 students who participated in the RAND study do not appear in the log data; they may have not used the CTAI software at all, or may have been excluded from the log data for other reasons. Since we don’t know which is true, we exclude these students from most analyses.

It is likely that some usage data were missing, even for students who appear in the usage dataset. However, it is impossible to know in which cases these data were missing or why; for the most part, we ignore this problem, but it should be kept in mind nonetheless.




Figure 1: Percentage of worked problems coming from various courses (denoted by color, with Algebra II and Geometry bundled as “>Algebra I”), from standard and customized variants, denoted by shading.

3 Standard and Customized Curricula

Students’ automatic progress through the Cognitive Tutor (CT) software is normally governed by the sequences of sections and units embedded in the software. Without external meddling, the curriculum a student works on determines the sequence, and thus what section he or she will be directed towards next after mastering (or exhausting the problems) from a previous section. In the CTAI effectiveness trial, the most common curriculum was, naturally, Algebra I. This came with three closely related variants, due to new software releases. Students requiring more remediation were able to work on a less advanced curriculum, called “Bridge to Algebra,” and more advanced students could work on Algebra II or Geometry.

In the second year of the study, some high schools, primarily in Texas, Michigan, and Kentucky, requested customized variants of the curricula. This was typically due to state standards, testing schedules, or local scope and sequence guidelines. These “customized curricula” altered the order of some sections and units, and were usually particular to schools.

Figure 1 shows the percentage of worked problems from each curriculum, from standard and customized varieties, by state and year. First, note that the vast majority of worked problems were from the Algebra I sequence. A small but notable number of more advanced problems were worked in Kentucky in Year 2, and some less advanced problems were worked in Michigan and Louisiana. Secondly, note the rise in “customized curricula” in year 2 in Texas, Kentucky, and Michigan, the three states with the most students in our dataset. In particular, Texas shifted almost entirely to customized curricula from years 1 to 2.

Throughout the school year, teachers could have a class of students working on multiple curricula either sequentially, where the students changed curricula in lock step, or simulta-

neously, where students worked on different curricula at the same time. As an example, two teachers located in Kentucky had their students working on Algebra I throughout most of the year and then reassigned them to Algebra II in the last month of school. In contrast, a different teacher in Kentucky had students variously enrolled in three different curricula throughout the entire year (Bridge-to-Algebra, Algebra I, and a specialized Geometry curriculum), while a year 2 teacher in Michigan enrolled students in three curricula sequentially throughout the year: Algebra I until November, followed by a customized curriculum until February, and ending with a different customized curriculum until June. While there are numerous instances of these uses of multiple curricula in Year 2, there are also many occurrences of teachers who had their students enrolled in the standard Algebra I throughout the entire year. In TX mostly, with some instances in Michigan, there were teachers who exclusively used customized curricula the whole second year.

4 Student Usage Across States and Years

	Hours	Problems	Sections	Units
Year 1	33.47	309	43.0	9
Year 2	23.83	228	36.5	10

Table 2: Median numbers of hours, problems, sections, and units worked by each student in the dataset in the two years of the study. Students with no usage data were excluded.

Table 2 shows the median numbers of hours, problems, sections, and units worked on by each student in the dataset in the two years of the study. Apparently, usage decreased markedly in the second year: the median of hours worked decreased by 10, the median number of problems decreased by 81, and the median number of sections decreased by 6.5 from years 1 to 2. Yet, as discussed below, the median number of units worked increased by 1.

Figure 2 shows that the number of hours students spent working on the CT software in some more detail, via state-by-year boxplots. Analogous figures for the numbers of problems and sections students worked, available in an online supplement, showed similar patterns for the numbers of sections and problems students worked. Usage time varied substantially between students and across states and years. Students in Texas, Connecticut, and New Jersey worked far fewer hours than students in Kentucky, Louisiana, and Michigan. Not every state reduced its usage from years 1 to 2—while students in Texas, Kentucky and New Jersey used the software less in the second year than in the first, students in Michigan, Louisiana, and Connecticut increased their usage.

Overall, usage varied a bit more in year 2 than in year 1—the median absolute deviation of time spent was 15.9 hours in the first year, compared to 16.9 in the second year. The increase in variation seems to be driven both by increasing between-state variation, and a between-student increase in Louisiana. One intriguing possibility is that CT usage may have been better tailored to teachers and students in the second year than in the first—perhaps




Figure 2: Boxplots of hours each student spent on Cognitive Tutor software over by year and state. Students with no timestamp data ($n=193$), with anomalous negative time ($n=3$) or with more than 110 hours ($n=91$) were excluded.

students who stood to gain more from the software increased their usage, and the rest of the students used it less.

In contrast to the decreasing numbers of hours, problems, and sections students worked in year 2, Table 2 shows that the median number of units students worked increased by 1 in year 2. This suggests students in year 2 were exposed, on average, to a slightly wider range of topics. Figure 3 shows boxplots of the numbers of units worked by state and year. The geographic variation in units worked mirrors the pattern in Figure 2, with more usage in Kentucky, Michigan, and Louisiana but less in Texas, Connecticut, and New Jersey. However, in every state the median Year 2 student worked at least as many different units as the median Year 1 student. Variation in the number of units worked also increased slightly from years 1 to 2—the interquartile range (IQR) increased in every state except for Kentucky, where a decrease in IQR was accompanied by an increase in the number of outliers.

All in all, students used CT software less in year 2 than in year 1. On the other hand, students in the second year tended to see a slightly wider range of topics, and varied somewhat more in their usage.

5 Working Units in Order—Or Not

Overall, students used CT less in the second year than in the first. How was this difference distributed across CTAI units?

Figure 4 shows the units of algebra along the horizontal axis, according to their order in the standard CTAI curriculum. The vertical axis shows the percentage of students with




Figure 3: Boxplots of the number of units of Cognitive Tutor software each student worked, by year and state. Students working more than 55 units (7 of 4460) and students with no usage data (189) were excluded.

usage data who worked each unit.

In year 1, the curve is almost monotonically decreasing, as one would expect if students adhered to the curriculum. Students varied in how many units they worked—with the variation due to both student ability and the amount of time allocated to CTAI within a classroom—but they mostly followed the standard curriculum. Students who worked fewer units stopped earlier in the sequence, and those who worked more units progressed farther. Hence, earlier sections were worked by higher proportions of students than later units.

In contrast, in year 2 students were much more likely to depart from the standard unit order. For instance, Figure 4 suggests that some students skipped “Unit Conversions” to work on “1st Quadrant Linear Graphs” or skipped “1 step Linear Equations” to work on “Independent Variables in Linear Models” In both these cases, the subsequent unit was worked on by a greater proportion of students than the immediately prior unit.

Most strikingly, “Linear Equations with Variables on Both Sides” was worked by a greater proportion of students in Year 2 than in Year 1, and by a greater proportion of students than any of the previous six sections. Presumably teachers and administrators wanted students to focus on that unit, perhaps because they found it to be particularly effective, because students tend to struggle with its main topic, or because its topic may figure prominently in an upcoming standardized test.

Most of the variation in unit order was driven by the rise, in year 2, of customized curricula. Figure 5 divides year-2 students into those attending schools using primarily a customized curriculum, and those attending schools using primarily a standardized curricu-




Figure 4: The percentages of students with usage data who worked at least one problem from each unit in the Algebra I curriculum. The units are arranged in order for the standard curriculum. In the 2008 version of the software, the “Unit Conversions” unit was broken up into two smaller units; for the sake of between-year comparisons, we re-combined them.




Figure 5: The percentages of year-2 students with usage data who worked at least one problem from each unit in the Algebra I curriculum. The units are arranged in order for the standard curriculum. Students are divided between those attending schools using primarily a customized curriculum and those using primarily the standard Algebra I curriculum.

lum.¹ Students using a standardized curriculum followed the standard sequence—more or less—while students using customized curricula did not. That said, there were some order violations in the standard group: specifically, more students worked problems from units “2-step Linear Equations” and “Exponents” than worked the preceding sections; this suggests that some teachers used the reassignment tool to prioritize particular topics. Of course, teacher reassignment may have occurred in schools with customized curricula as well—a possibility we will discuss in the next section.

Figure 6 further decomposes the year-2 results by school and state, showing a large amount of variation between states, as well as variation between schools within states. In Texas, every school used customized curricula, most of which seem to prioritize some of the same units, for instance, “Linear Patterns,” “Independent Variables in Linear Models,” and “Linear Equations with Variables on Both Sides” On the other hand, there was also variance between schools. For instance, one school prioritized units “2 Step Linear Equations” and “4-Quadrant Linear Graphs” while nearly eliminating “Linear Patterns.”

Between-school variation is evident in the other states, as well. In four of the five Kentucky schools, nearly every student worked on the first nine units; in the one Kentucky school that used a customized curriculum, nearly every student worked on the first 13 units, omitted the 15th (“Lin. Mod. in General Form”), and worked on the 16th and 17th (“Literal Equations” and “Linear Equations with Variables on Both Sides”). In the remaining school, nearly every student worked on the first section, but usage decreased rapidly from there. In one Michigan school which used the standard curriculum, no students seem to have worked on the “Linear Models & Ratios” section.

If unit order and topic scaffolding are important to CT’s mastery learning mechanism, the wide variation in students’ realized curricula would seem to pose a problem. The fact that the prescribed order was followed less in the second year of the study, when CTAI was effective, than in the first year, when it wasn’t, suggests that the standard curriculum may play a smaller role than one might otherwise imagine.

6 Mastering the Material—Or Not

The central idea behind mastery learning is that students progress through the curriculum as they master skills. In the context of CT, skills are clustered within sections, which are in turn clustered within units. Students progress from the current section to the next section after mastering all of the current section’s skills. Ideally, students would master all of the skills in all of the sections they work.

By default, the software operates by automatically moving students from section to section based on the sequence of topics defined by the curriculum they were currently enrolled in. In this software-controlled sequencing, students ideally spend the time necessary to learn the material of a section, are judged by the software to have mastered the material, and then “graduate” to the next section. However, the software will also “promote” a student

¹At least 90% of problems worked by students at “Customized” schools were from a customized curriculum, and at most 1% of problems at “Standard” schools were from a customized curriculum.




Figure 6: The percentages of year-2 students with usage data in each school who worked at least one problem from each unit in the Algebra I curriculum. The units are arranged in order for the standard curriculum. Schools are classified as either using primarily customized curricula (solid line) or using primarily the standard Algebra I curriculum (dotted).




Figure 7: The distributions of outcomes of worked sections, by state and across the entire sample, in the two study years.

to the next section if the student exhausts a section’s material without mastering its skills. Additionally, teachers are able to modify a student’s path within the curriculum. They can “reassign” students from their current sections to other sections earlier or later in the intended sequence, including sections they worked on previously. Finally, if the semester ends, or a student stops using CT for some other reason, while in the middle of working through a section, the section is designated “final.” All in all, each CT section a student encounters ends in one of four possible ways: mastery, promotion, reassignment, or as the student’s final section.

Figure 7 and Table 3 show the proportions of worked sections in each state and study year that ended with mastery, promotion, or reassignment, or as the student’s final section. In the first year, about 85% of worked sections are mastered, except in Connecticut. Other than in Texas, about 13–15% of sections end in promotion. About 3% of sections in Texas and 5% in Connecticut end in reassignment, which is even rarer in the other states.

With the exception of Texas, sections tended to be completed similarly in both years. In Texas, however, the percentage of sections ending in reassignment increased by a factor of about 5, to about 14%. The proportion of Texas sections labeled “Final” increased as well, most likely due to the decrease in usage, and thus the total number of sections.

Across states, sections ended in reassignment at a rate of about 1% in year 1 and 2% in year 2.

6.1 Section Mastery and Curriculum

A well-designed curriculum, can, in theory, play an important role in students’ attainment of mastery. Students who work on appropriate problems that build on their current set of skills

	Year 1					
	TX	KY	MI	LA	CT	Overall
Final	699	625	242	129	91	1796
Reassigned	600	140	220	5	92	1082
Promoted	1619	9628	4582	1459	261	17561
Mastered	15815	56199	31200	8648	1303	113374
Total	18733	66592	36244	10241	1747	133813
	Year 2					
Final	1252	660	236	137	114	2412
Reassigned	1215	253	275	9	144	2042
Promoted	1000	6296	4717	1998	450	14477
Mastered	4929	36676	26509	10108	1513	79874
Total	8396	43885	31737	12252	2221	98805

Table 3: Numbers of worked sections that ended in each of the four possible outcomes, across states and study years.




Figure 8: The distributions of outcomes of worked sections, by curriculum, in the two study years. (There were no Bridge-to-Algebra sections in customized curricula in our dataset.)

should be more likely to master new skills than students working on problems above their level. What role did variations in the CT curriculum play in mastery during the effectiveness trial?

Figure 8 shows the proportions of worked sections that were mastered or ended in promotion, reassignment, or finality, in standard and customized versions of each CT curriculum. Mastery proportions do, indeed, depend on curriculum. Specifically, students mastered sections from more advanced curricula less frequently. Sections from the most basic curriculum, Bridge to Algebra, were mastered 92% of the time; those from Algebra I were mastered 83% of the time, and those from more advanced curricula were mastered at a rate of 75%. This is unsurprising, since more advanced curricula may be expected to be more challenging. However, it may suggest that some students studying advanced topics would fare better in more standard curricula.

Algebra I sections from customized curricula tended to end in reassignment more often than sections from the standard Algebra I curriculum (3% vs. 1.4%, in year 2). This may indicate an overall skepticism towards the Carnegie Learning standards among certain schools and teachers, manifested in both adoption of alternative curricula and reassignment.

7 Digging Deeper into Section Reassignment

The proportion of worked sections in our dataset ending in reassignment was small. Nevertheless, since reassignment represents the only mechanism by which individual teachers can affect their students' progress through the Cognitive Tutor, exploring patterns of reassignment can provide insight into how CT was used.

7.1 How Do Reassignment Patterns Vary?

Teachers alone control reassignment. Nevertheless, the factors influencing student reassignment vary at a number of levels. For instance, state and district standards may prod teachers into reassigning students to particular units. Some principals may encourage teachers to adhere to the official curriculum and avoid reassignment. Some students may be more prone to reassignment than others. Certain units in the CTAI curriculum may be harder than others, causing students to tarry and teachers to reassign. Finally, a host of other factors, at these levels and others, may spur reassignment.

To better understand the source of the variation in reassignment—what drives some, but not other, sections worked by students to end in reassignment—we fit a set of multilevel models. We fit separate models to data from each the three states with the highest numbers of reassignments, Texas, Kentucky, and Michigan, and in the sample as a whole, in each of the two study years, yielding a total of eight models. Each model was a logistic regression: a binary indicator for section reassignment was regressed on a random intercept for unit, as well as nested random intercepts for student, classroom, and school. Models fit to data from all six states included an additional random intercept for state.




Figure 9: Results from a set of eight multilevel logistic regressions predicting section reassignment. For each year, in the entire sample (“Overall”) and in the three states with the largest numbers of reassignments (Texas, Kentucky, and Michigan), we regressed a binary variable indicating whether a section ended in reassignment on random intercepts for school, class, student, and unit, and in the overall case, for state as well, and recorded their variance. The residual variance was set as the variance of the standard logistic distribution, $\pi/3$. These bar charts give the proportion of the total variance attributable to each random effect.

Logistic regression can be represented in terms of an underlying latent variable Z^* : student i working section sec is reassigned when $Z_{sec,i}^* > 0$. The model for Z^* is:

$$Z_{sec,i}^* = \alpha_0 + \beta_{u[sec]} + \gamma_i + \delta_{c[i]} + \epsilon_{s[i]} + e_{sec,i}$$

Where α_0 is an overall intercept, and $\beta_{u[sec]}$, γ_i , $\delta_{c[i]}$, and $\epsilon_{s[i]}$ are random intercepts for the unit in which sec appears, for student i , for i 's classroom, and for i 's school, respectively. Again, the model fit to all six states includes an additional random intercept for state. The random intercepts are modeled as independent and normally distributed, each with its own variance. The regression error $e_{sec,i}$ is given the standard logistic distribution, with “residual” variance $\pi/3$. It is convenient to represent variance in reassignment probabilities in terms of the variance of Z^* .

Figure 9 gives the variance components estimated from these logistic regressions: variances of the random intercept terms, as a percentage of the total variance of Z^* . Overall, in both years of the study, the largest determinant of reassignment was school, accounting for 30% of the variation in year 1, and 43% in year 2. After school, state was the most important, accounting for 20 and 21% in the two years, and unit, accounting for 16 and 14%. Surprisingly, classroom and student-level factors only accounted for 7% and 3% in year 1, respectively, and 6% and 1% in year 2. The pattern was similar in Texas—where school accounted for over half the variation in reassignment in both years—and in Michigan to a lesser extent.² In Kentucky, unit played the largest role (52%) in year 1, and classroom played the largest role in year 2 (50%). Across states and years, student level factors never accounted for more than 5% of the variation in reassignment. Other than in Kentucky in year 2, classroom never accounted for more than 12% of the variation.

Summary. Although teachers control reassignment, their decisions appear to be largely determined by broader policies, occurring at the state or school level.

7.2 When are Students Reassigned?

The timing of reassignments can also provide a window into what drives teachers’ decisions to reassign students. Figure 10 shows the proportion of worked sections in each month that end in reassignment. In both years, reassignments were much more common in the second half of the school year than in the first. This may be the result of teachers learning how to use the software as the year progresses, or responding the pressure of upcoming standardized tests by accelerating students’ progress and reassigning students to relevant sections.

As we’ve seen, reassignment was more common in year 2 than in year 1. In fact, reassignment increases fairly steadily over the entire length of the study. Through December of the first year, reassignment was rare. From January through May of year 1, between one and two percent of sections ended in reassignment. Year 2 begin where year 1 left off, with one to two percent of sections reassigned. Finally, from February through May of the second year, the rate of reassignment increased again.

²Percentages in state specific models, in which there is no between-state variance, cannot be directly compared to those from the overall model.




Figure 10: The proportion of worked sections ending in reassignment, by month and year.

	Year 1		Year 2	
	Aug-Dec	Jan-Jun	Aug-Dec	Jan-Jun
TX	18	582	281	932
KY	9	131	52	201
MI	47	173	245	30
LA	0	5	9	0
CT	14	78	84	60
NJ	3	22	17	129
Overall	91	991	688	1352

Table 4: The number of reassignments in each state and overall in the first and second halves of the year




Figure 11: The proportion of a state’s reassignments that occurred in each month of the year.

Figure 11 and Table 4 decompose these trends by state, Figure 11 includes just the three states with the highest number of reassignments, Texas, Kentucky, and Michigan. Table 4 shows data for each of the six states and overall. For the two study years, Figure 11 shows the proportion of all of each state’s reassignments that occurred in each month of the school year. (Note that while both Figure 10 and 11 show proportions for each month, the denominators are not the same: Figure 10 gives the proportion of each month’s worked sections that ended in reassignment, and Figure 11 gives the proportion of all of the state’s reassignments over the course of the year, that occurred in each month.)

Figure 11 reveals patterns that are not apparent in Figure 10. For example, the bulk of Kentucky’s reassignments took place in May. A fifth of Michigan’s reassignments in year 1 occurred in October; for the rest of the year, Michigan roughly followed the same pattern as Texas. In year 2, the vast majority of Michigan’s reassignments also occurred near the beginning of the year, in September and October.

Summary. In Texas and overall, reassignments were more common in the second half of the school year than in the first half. In Kentucky and Michigan, they were clustered in a few specific months.

7.3 Does Reassignment Depend on Classmates?

Student individuality and independence might be the most important motivating factors behind mastery learning—each student learns at his or her own pace, and struggles on a unique set of skills. Students are supposed to move through the CT curriculum independently of each other. However, reassignments give teachers the ability to override this feature, and coordinate students’ progress. Teachers might identify students who are behind their

classmates and reassign them to later sections. They may also move an entire class together to a particular section or unit of interest. To what extent did these and similar considerations drive reassignment in the CTAI study?

Figure 12 addresses this question by plotting a students' classmates' statuses at the time he or she is reassigned. For each reassignment in Texas, Kentucky, and Michigan, Figure 12 plots a vertical bar colored to show the proportions of the reassigned students' classmates (represented in the usage data) who had exited the section on the same day or earlier via promotion or mastery, who had been reassigned from that section on an earlier date, on the same date, or on a later date, who mastered the section or were promoted on a later date, or who never worked the section at all. The bars are rank ordered according to those same proportions: first by the proportion of classmates who were promoted or mastered the section on the same day as the reassignment in question, or earlier, next by the proportion who were reassigned from the same section on an earlier date, next by the proportion who were reassigned from the same section on the same date, and finally by the proportion who were reassigned from the same section on a later date.

Do teachers reassign students in order to help them catch up with classmates? According to Figure 12, that might be part of the story, but isn't all of it. Across years and states, in about 40% of reassignments, at least 75% of the rest of the class had exited the section through graduation or promotion on the same date or earlier. The figure also reveals that the proportions of students who had graduated or been promoted from the same section on the same day or earlier was smaller in year 2 than in year 1, especially in Texas and Michigan.

In Texas, year 2 saw a dramatic increase in the proportions of students reassigned from the same section on the same day, suggesting that some teachers may have been moving the class together through the curriculum. In Michigan in year 2, teachers reassigned almost all students who worked certain sections. That is, in 65% of the instances in which year-two Michigan students were reassigned from a section, at least 75% of their classmates were, at some point, reassigned from the same section, or never worked it. Across all three states and both years, it is exceedingly rare for students to master or be promoted from a section after someone in their class has been reassigned from the same section.

Summary. Three different patterns emerge from Figure 12: teachers reassigning students who have fallen behind their classmates, teachers reassigning an entire class from the same section on the same day, and teachers reassigning almost all students who begin to work on particular sections. Each of these patterns mostly takes place in different states and years.

7.4 Where To?

Teachers who reassign students may simply move them to the next section within the same unit. Say that a teacher believes that a particular student had already mastered the skills in one of the CTAI sections or is wheel-spinning—working problems without learning—or a teacher dislikes one of the sections in a CT unit. Still, the teacher wants the student to learn as much as possible from the current unit. Then moving the student to the next section within the same unit might make sense. Alternatively, teachers who believe that some of




Figure 12: Distributions of classmates' statuses at each reassignment in Texas, Kentucky, and Michigan. Each reassignment that took place in these three states is represented by a bar showing the proportions of the reassigned student's classmates who had exited the section on the same day or earlier via promotion or mastery, who had been reassigned from that section on an earlier date, on the same date, or on a later date, who mastered the section or were promoted on a later date, or who never worked the section at all. The bars are rank ordered according to those proportions, in the order listed.




Figure 13: Reassignment transition plot for study year 1. The units on the left of the plot are the Algebra I units that ended in reassignment at least 30 times in year 1. The units on the right are those that were the destination of at least 30 reassignments. Also included on the left are the top two sending units for each of the units on the right, and also included on the right are all the units on the left, along with those units' top two receiving units. The units are numbered according to their order in the standard Algebra I curriculum. There is an arrow from a unit on the left to a unit on the right if a student was assigned from the unit on the left to the one on the right. The thickness of the arrows is proportional to the percentage of all reassignments from the sending unit that ended in that receiving unit. The darkness of the arrows is proportional to the number of reassignments from the sending unit to the receiving unit.

their students are not progressing quickly enough may reassign them out of their current units entirely, and into the next unit in the sequence—whatever that may be. Finally, a teacher who wanted his or her students to focus on a particular topic might reassign them all to the appropriate unit when the time is appropriate.

Which of these patterns is most prevalent? More generally, when teachers reassign their students, where in the curriculum do they send them?

To address these questions, we focus on the units in the standard Algebra I sequence. Figures 13 and 14 give transition plots for reassignment in the two study years. On the left of each figure, marked “From,” are the top “sending” units: the units that students were reassigned *from* at least 30 times. They are numbered according to the order they appear in the standard Algebra I curriculum. On the right, under “To,” are the top “receiving” units: the units that students were reassigned *to* at least 30 times. For completeness, each of the top two receivers for each sending unit, and each of the top two senders for each receiving unit were also included. Finally, all of the sending units listed on the left were also




Figure 14: Reassignment transition plot for study year 2. See caption of Figure 13 for details.

included in the receiving column. All in all, 75% of the first-year reassignments and 75% of the second-year reassignments are captured in the figures.

The arrows in the plot represent reassignments. An arrow from a sending unit to a receiving unit indicates reassignment from the former to the latter. The thickness of the arrows represents the proportion of reassignments originating in the sending unit whose destination was the receiving unit. The darkness of the arrows represents the number of such reassignments. For instance, in Figure 13, the arrow from “4-Quadrant Linear Graphs” on the left to “4-Quadrant Linear Graphs” on the right is fairly thick, since 44% of the reassignments from “4-Quadrant Linear Graphs” end in the same unit. Yet it is also fairly faint, since it only represents 12 reassignments.

Inspecting the figures shows that the most common pattern is for students to be reassigned to the next unit in the curriculum—this pattern comprises 52% of the reassignments in year 1 and 24% of those in year 2. On the other hand, it is relatively rare for students to be reassigned within the same unit (these reassignments account for 15% and 18% in the two years). It is also rare for students to be reassigned to units earlier in the curriculum (comprising 2% and 8%).

The transition plots also reveal some interesting cases worth highlighting. In year 1 (Figure 13), students reassigned from the first unit, “Linear Patterns”, were primarily placed two units ahead, in “1st Quadrant Linear Graphs,” skipping “Unit Conversions,” perhaps suggesting a disinterest in “Unit Conversions” on the part of the reassigning teachers. Similarly, 9 of the students (27%) reassigned from the section “Independent Variables in Linear Models” were placed 13 units later in “Systems of Linear Equations” and all 62 of the students reassigned from “Quadratic Models & Area” were placed in “Exponents.” This suggests that some teachers may have considered the units “Systems of Linear Equations” and “Exponents” to contain particularly important material.

Since the total number of reassignments was higher in year 2, the corresponding plot (Figure 14) is larger and more complex. It is also more common in year 2 for students to be reassigned to units other than the next unit in the sequences. This may be partly due to the proliferation of customized curricula. Two units, “4-Quadrant Linear Graphs” and “Lin. Equations with Variables on Both Sides,” were common destinations from a wide variety of earlier units, suggesting strong teacher interest in those units. The majority (76%) of the students reassigned from “Probability” were placed in another section of the same unit, perhaps suggesting problems with some of that unit’s sections; in fact, all of the students reassigned within the “Probability” unit were reassigned from one its first three sections (of seven). Finally, 44 (81%) of the reassignments from “Pythagorean Theorem” ended in the earlier “Product Rule for Exponents” unit.

Summary. The most prevalent pattern was for students to be reassigned to the following unit, suggesting that teachers may be mostly interested in advancing students who are behind. On the other hand, a number of examples of other patterns—students moving within the same unit, or to units out of sequence—appear as well, suggesting that some teachers may be finely manipulating their students’ curricula.

8 Effects of Reassignment

The goal of CTAI is to help students learn Algebra, so the most important questions about reassignment are about its effect on learning. Although the data from this study came from a randomized trial, it was CTAI as a whole that was randomized, not individual behaviors within CTAI. Specifically, student reassignment was not randomized. Therefore, precise estimates of causal effects of reassignment on learning require strong untestable assumptions that are unlikely to be true. As in all observational studies, this includes the assumption that all confounding variables—variables that predict both reassignment and learning—have been measured well and modeled correctly. Further complicating matters, although reassignment itself is a well-defined process, in practice it can take many forms, as we have endeavored to show. There is no reason to expect the effects of reassignment to be the same regardless of whether the teacher used it to help lagging students catch up, to allocate time to important topics, or for some other reason.

All that said, observational estimates of reassignment’s average causal effects can be valuable, if interpreted cautiously, for instance by assessing their sensitivity to unmeasured confounding, as we do below. In the absence of evidence from randomized trials, observational studies can help guide intuition, future research, and even—when combined with other relevant information and theory—practice.

Figure 15 shows students’ gain scores—the difference between their posttest and pretest scores—as a function of the number of times they were reassigned. (The number of reassignments was jittered—random noise was added on the horizontal dimension—to avoid overplotting.) Overall, the relationship between the two variables is positive. Nevertheless, some non-linearity seems to be present, especially in year 2. Further, the distribution of the number of reassignments is right-skewed—again, especially in year 2. Care in modeling the number of reassignments, then, is especially important—observations from students reassigned an unusually large number of times can exert undue influence on a regression model and generate misleading results, particularly in the presence of non-monotonic relationships. We settled on three different strategies: first, the variable R^{bin} dichotomizes reassignment— $R^{bin} = 0$ for students who were never reassigned, and $R^{bin} = 1$ for students who were. Next, R^{cat} defines a categorical variable taking the values $R^{cat} = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4+$ for students who were reassigned 0, 1, 2, 3 or four or more times, respectively. Finally, R^{num} is the raw number of reassignments, which we include for completeness.

We used linear models to estimate the effect of reassignment, regressing posttest scores on R^{bin} , R^{cat} , or R^{num} along with fixed effects for classroom, essentially modeling reassignment as randomly assigned within classroom. Since this is unlikely to be the case (even approximately), we ran a second set of models including student level covariates as well: pretest scores,³ race, sex, grade, special education and gifted status, English as a second language (ESL), and free and reduced-price lunch eligibility.

The results are reported in Table 5. All the effect estimates are negative, indicating

³These are measured with error, and missing at a relatively high rate (15%). To account for this, we used regression calibration based on the 20 “multiple imputations” used in the original CTAI study, Pane et al. [2014].




Figure 15: Students' Gain scores (posttest minus pre-test) versus the number of times the were reassigned over the course of the year (jittered), with a Loess smoother added.

	R^{bin} Effect of ≥ 1 Reassignment	Parametrization R^{cat} Effect of # Reassignments:	R^{num} Effect per Reassignment:
No Covariates	-0.14 ± 0.06	1 : -0.15 ± 0.07 2 : -0.15 ± 0.1 3 : -0.07 ± 0.15 4 + : -0.12 ± 0.17	-0.04 ± 0.03
Covariate Adjusted	-0.15 ± 0.06	1 : -0.15 ± 0.07 2 : -0.16 ± 0.1 3 : -0.08 ± 0.15 4 + : -0.14 ± 0.17	-0.04 ± 0.03

Table 5: Estimates of effects of reassignment on posttests, with 95% margins of error.

that reassigning students may hurt their algebra learning. The estimated effects decrease in magnitude for three or four reassignments, but these estimates are very noisy—very few students were reassigned more than two times. The magnitudes of the effects are rather large: Pane et al. [2014] reported an effect, in year 2, of about 0.2; the estimated effect of at least one reassignment is 73% of that.

But what of unmeasured confounding? For instance, the negative effect may be due to baseline differences in ability, beyond what is captured in pretest scores. Hosman et al. [2010] suggest a method of estimating the sensitivity of a regression to an omitted confounder based on bench-marking from observed confounders. In order to confound the causal relationship between reassignment and posttests, a confounder would have to predict both. Roughly speaking, the idea is to widen the confidence interval from an ostensibly causal linear model to account for the possibility of a hypothetical unmeasured confounder that predicts reassignment and posttests to the same extent as one of the observed covariates. These “sensitivity intervals” account for uncertainty from two sources: random error, and systematic error due to the omission of a confounder. As is typical, the pretest is our most important measured covariate, both in terms of its prediction of reassignment and of posttest scores. The sensitivity interval for the effect of being reassigned at least once on posttest scores, allowing for the possible omission of a hypothetical confounder at most as important as pretest, is -0.15 ± 0.14 . This interval is quite wide, implying that such a covariate could explain much of the observed relationship between reassignment and posttest scores (or that the relationship may be much stronger). On the other hand, the sensitivity interval allowing for the possible omission of a less important hypothetical confounder—one that predicts posttests as well as ESL status and reassignment as well as Hispanic ethnicity, the next best observed predictors—is -0.15 ± 0.07 . This interval is substantially tighter. All in all, unmeasured confounding may play an important role here, but there is good reason to believe that it does not explain all of the observed relationship.

The wide variety in the use of reassignment that we have documented here might suggest that reassignment’s treatment effect varies as well. Figure 16 shows estimated classroom-specific treatment effects of R^{bin} , being reassigned at least once. The estimates came from a multilevel model in which posttest scores were regressed on R^{bin} and student-level covariates, along with random effects for classroom and random slopes for R^{bin} varying by classroom. Unlike fixed effects models, multilevel models “partially pool” data across classrooms to estimate classroom specific effects more precisely [Gelman and Hill, 2006]. This is especially important given the small sample sizes within classrooms. Figure 16 shows a wide variation in the effect of reassignment across classrooms—the estimated standard deviation of these effects was 0.18, larger than the average effect itself. While the effect was negative in most classrooms, it was positive in some. This variation could be due to a number of factors, including differences in the composition of classrooms, but supports the hypothesis that differences in when and how reassignment is used lead to differences in its effect.




Figure 16: The effect of being reassigned at least once, in each classroom, as estimated by a multilevel model. The classrooms are sorted by these estimated effects. The dotted line indicated an effect of zero.

9 Summary and Discussion

The effectiveness of the Cognitive Tutor software presumably depends on how much, and how, it is used. This paper exploited available log data from the high-school arm of the CTAI effectiveness trial—which yielded an impressive result for the software in year 2—to describe variation and patterns in the software’s usage, paying particular attention to issues of mastery learning. We found that:

- The amount the software was used varied widely between states and decreased, overall, from years 1 to 2.
- Year 2 saw the proliferation of “customized” curricula in three states, altering which units students worked, and in what order.
- Year 2 saw frequent departures from the standard CTAI unit sequence, driven mainly, but not entirely, by customized curricula.
- Examination of section mastery found that:
 - About 85% of worked sections in year 1 and 81% in year 2 ended with the student having mastered all of the included skills.
 - There were three ways students worked a section with mastering its contents: exhausting its problems and being promoted, being reassigned to a new section by the teacher, and ending CT use altogether.

- Reassignment was rare, though it was more prevalent in Texas and Connecticut than in other states, and more common in year 2 than 1.
- Mastery rates were lower for more advanced curricula.
- Examination of reassignment patterns found that:
 - Reassignment rates were determined more by factors varying by state and school than by classroom.
 - Reassignment was more common in the second half of the year than in the first—particularly in Texas.
 - Depending on state and year, reassignment typically takes place in one of three scenarios: teachers reassigning students who have fallen behind, teachers reassigning (almost) the entire class together, and teachers assigning (almost) all students *out* of a particular section.
 - Students are most commonly reassigned to the next unit in the curriculum—suggesting that teachers may be advancing lagging students—but in some cases they might be finely manipulating their students’ curricula.
- Reassignment appears to lower students’ performance on the post-test relative to that of their peers; however, the effect appears to vary widely between classrooms (and, presumably, how reassignment is used).

In practice, mastery learning and topic scaffolding often unfolded quite differently from the vision of CT’s designers. In some cases, the departures were apparently a matter of a student’s inability to achieve mastery quickly enough, and in other cases of educators’ preferences that ran counter to CTAI’s design.

Notably, both the amount of usage and fidelity to CTAI’s design decreased from years 1 to 2—just as the estimated *effect* of CTAI increased. In year 2, when the effect was substantial, students spent less time, and followed the CTAI curriculum and guidelines less closely than in year 1, when the estimated effect was negative but statistically insignificant. This raises questions as to the roles of structure and mastery in CTAI’s effectiveness. Does flexibility lead to higher effects? Is mastery learning an important mechanism for CTAI? Answers to these questions could prove crucial for optimizing the realized effectiveness of CTAI and other intelligent tutors.

On the other hand, reassignment appears to hurt students’ performance on the posttest, relative to their classmates (though based on data from a randomized experiment, this analysis was observational, so confounding can’t be ruled out). Does this, in contrast, suggest that achieving mastery is an important component of effective intelligent tutoring?

As educational technology spreads, attention to the details of implementation may yield important insights—or important questions—about effectiveness, and the science of when intelligent tutors work, and when they don’t.

References

- Benjamin S Bloom. Learning for mastery. instruction and curriculum. regional education laboratory for the carolinas and virginia, topical papers and reprints, number 1. *Evaluation comment*, 1(2):n2, 1968.
- Albert Corbett. Cognitive computer tutors: Solving the two-sigma problem. *User Modeling 2001*, pages 137–147, 2001.
- Andrew Gelman and Jennifer Hill. *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*. Cambridge university press, 2006.
- Carrie A Hosman, Ben B Hansen, and Paul W Holland. The sensitivity of linear regression coefficients’ confidence limits to the omission of a confounder. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 849–870, 2010.
- Chen-Lin C Kulik, James A Kulik, and Robert L Bangert-Drowns. Effectiveness of mastery learning programs: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research*, 60(2):265–299, 1990.
- John F Pane, Beth Ann Griffin, Daniel F McCaffrey, and Rita Karam. Effectiveness of cognitive tutor algebra i at scale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(2): 127–144, 2014.
- Adam Sales, Asa Wilks, and John Pane. Student usage predicts treatment effect heterogeneity in the cognitive tutor algebra i program. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Educational Data Mining. International Educational Data Mining Society*, pages 207–214, 2016.
- Adam C Sales and John F Pane. Exploring causal mechanisms in a randomized effectiveness trial of the cognitive tutor. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Educational Data Mining. International Educational Data Mining Society*, 2015.
- Adam C Sales and John F Pane. The role of mastery learning in intelligent tutoring systems: Principal stratification on a latent variable. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09308*, 2017.
- Etienne Wenger. *Artificial intelligence and tutoring systems: computational and cognitive approaches to the communication of knowledge*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2014.