

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
 2014 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
 Test Security Investigation
 School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

CENTER CITY PCS – CAPITOL HILL CAMPUS
 Case Ref. 0156_1104_001_2014

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Center City PCS – Capitol Hill Campus
School Address	1503 East Capitol St. SE, Washington, DC 20003
Field Team	██
Date Interviews Conducted	December 8, 2014 & January 16, 2014

II. TESTING GROUP FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		Significant Score Drop		WTR Erasure (2014)		Person Fit		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on 2014 DC CAS data analysis, Center City PCS Capitol Hill Campus (“Capitol Hill”) had one █ grade testing group flagged for Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in both Math and Reading.

The testing group was comprised of █ students. According to OSSE-provided information, this testing group was a General Education group.

For the 2014 DC CAS, OSSE developed a flagging methodology consisting of five methods. Testing groups will be investigated if they trigger two or more test security flags or consecutive years of erasures in the same subject.

OSSE sets the policy and calculates Person Fit, Extraordinary Growth, Significant Score Drop and Question Type Comparison flags while the testing vendor computes the Wrong-to-Right flagging data based upon policy guidance from OSSE regarding standard deviations.

The methods consist of the following, as described in the 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology:¹

- 1) Wrong to Right (WTR) Erasures - Erasures occur for at least three reasons: rethinking, misalignment or irregularities. Therefore, high numbers of WTR erasures by themselves do not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation. Testing Groups are flagged when there is a large number of WTR erasures as compared to the state average.
- 2) Achievement Metrics – This method is divided into four sub-methods. Each sub-method is independent of the other; therefore it only takes one of the sub-methods to flag a testing group.
 - a. Test Score Growth - SGPs, or student growth percentiles, are produced by a model that measures academic growth by comparing groups of students with similar test score history. These are produced at the student-subject level. SGPs range from 0 to 11, and higher values indicate more growth relative to similarly performing students. Testing Groups with growth from 2013 to 2014 that is greater or equal to 4 standard deviations above the state growth from 2013 to 2014 are flagged.
 - b. Test Score Drop - Similar to test score growth described above, the test score drop looks at extraordinary declines in student scores from 2013 to 2014. Testing with a test score drop from 2013 to 2014 that is greater or equal to 4 standard deviations below the state mean drop are flagged.
 - c. Question Type Comparison (QTC) - QTC measures differences in performance between multiple choice questions and constructive response items. Significant differences in QTC performance will trigger a testing group flag.
 - d. Person-Fit Analysis - This model measures the likelihood of an examinee's response pattern given their estimated ability level. Testing Groups with unusual response patterns greater than or equal to 4 standard deviations above the state mean are flagged.

OSSE also selected certain schools for investigation if test materials, either question booklets, answer booklets, or instruction CDs, were identified to be missing. In addition, due to the requirements of the Testing Integrity Act of 2013, OSSE selected certain testing groups for investigation based on a random selection.²

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 1 displayed a significant number of WTR erasures in both Math and Reading. The average number of WTR erasures in the testing group

¹ 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

² Testing Integrity Act of 2013, Title II, Sec. 201(c).

was 23.05 for Math, while the State average for Math was 1.27. The average number of WTR erasures in the testing group was 24.80 for Reading, while the State average for Reading was 1.11. The presence of WTR erasures, by themselves, does not indicate testing irregularities, but WTR erasures to this significant degree warrant further investigation.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2014 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Center City Capitol Hill	12/08/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Center City Capitol Hill	12/08/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Center City Capitol Hill	12/08/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A – employed by another school in the District [REDACTED]	
[REDACTED]	Admin 5	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	01/16/2015
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	01/16/2015
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Center City Capitol Hill	12/08/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Center City Capitol Hill	12/08/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Center City Capitol Hill	12/08/2014

IV. OTHER INDIVIDUALS REFERENCED DURING INTERVIEWS

Name of Individual	Name Reference	Position
[REDACTED]	Admin 6	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 7	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]

V. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

Given the high levels of WTR erasures for Test Administrator 1’s testing group, our investigation focused on the possibility that Test Administrator 1 engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 8 individuals: 5 current and former staff and 3 students. Capitol Hill experienced significant personnel turnover at the end of the 2013-2014 school year and many of the individuals present during the administration of the 2014 DC CAS were no longer at the school; the [REDACTED] (Admin 5), [REDACTED] (Test Administrator 1), the [REDACTED] (Proctor 1), and [REDACTED] (Admin 4) during the 2014 DC CAS are no longer at Capitol Hill. We were subsequently able to schedule interviews with Admin 5 and Test Administrator 1 at their current schools. We attempted to schedule an interview with Admin 4 at [REDACTED] current school, but [REDACTED] we were unable to confirm an interview prior to the date of this report.

Our investigation revealed four potential testing violations: 1) Test Administrator 1 pointed out incorrect answers and made statements regarding the accuracy of student responses during the test, 2) Test Administrator 1 allowed students to view or practice secure test items before the scheduled testing time, 3) missing Test Security file, and 4) failure of Test Administrator 1 to follow Test Directions. These potential violations are described in detail in the following section of this report.

The three students with the highest number of WTR erasures were not available for interview;

[REDACTED]

We selected and were able to interview three other students from the testing group who also had a significant number of WTR erasures. Student 1A had 32 WTR erasures in both Math and Reading. Student 1B had 32 WTR erasures in Math and 38 in Reading. Student 1C had 35 WTR erasures in Math and 39 in Reading.

Of the [REDACTED] students in the flagged testing group, [REDACTED] students had WTR erasures of [REDACTED] or more in Math and [REDACTED] students had WTR erasures of [REDACTED] or more in Reading. Upon review of the answer booklets from the flagged testing group, it appears that the vast majority of the students made

marks as part of a process of elimination strategy. Test Administrator 1 stated that ■ taught them that strategy and they used it on the 2014 DC CAS, not knowing that there could not be any stray marks in the answer booklets. These stray marks likely inflated the WTR erasures for this testing group and triggered the flag, as there do not appear to be as many true erasures (i.e. answers bubbled in then erased) as the data would indicate. Admin 5 also stated that ■ was not aware that stray marks should not be made on the answer sheets so ■ would not have communicated this during school training.

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Pointed out incorrect answers and made statements regarding the accuracy of student responses during the test

We interviewed three students who were in Test Administrator 1's 2014 DC CAS testing group, and two confirmed that Test Administrator 1 walked around the classroom and asked students to re-check their answers, pointing to specific questions. Student 1B indicated that Test Administrator 1 would tell students "good job" or "fix that problem" during the DC CAS Test. Student 1C said that ■ heard Test Administrator 1 say "check number B," and that ■ was told to change and re-read questions during the test. Test Administrator 1 stated that ■ did look at students' answer sheets and would tell them to "check their work" or "go back and check" if ■ saw they had incorrect answers and time remaining.

Student 1A also indicated receiving assistance during the 2014 DC CAS, stating that a proctor present during the 2014 DC CAS Test would tell students to "look at that question again." We were unable to confirm the name of the Proctor with the student and were also unable to obtain corroboration from other students/ adults interviewed.

The *Testing Integrity Act of 2013*, Section 103 (a)(4) indicates, in relevant part, that authorized personnel shall...be prohibited from:

- (A) Reviewing, reading, or looking at test items or student responses before, during, or after administering the Districtwide assessment, unless specifically permitted in the test administrator's manual
- (B) Assisting students in any way with answers to test questions using verbal or nonverbal cues before, during, or after administering the assessment

The *2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Pages 13-14), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines...by school personnel shall constitute a test security violation and must be reported; such violations include...:

5. Engaging in the following prohibited behavior:
 - f. Aiding or assisting an examinee in any way with answers to test questions and prompts using verbal or nonverbal cues before, during, or after administering the assessment
 - s. Making statements regarding the accuracy of the student's responses on the state test

Advising students to re-check their answers to specific questions is a violation of the State Test Security Guidelines listed above. Based on the consistency of statements provided by two of the students interviewed, and by Test Administrator 1's own admission, we conclude that Test Administrator 1 provided unauthorized assistance to students in ■ testing group during the 2014 DC CAS Test.

B. Allowed students to view or practice secure test items before the scheduled testing time

All three of the students interviewed indicated that they had seen at least one of the stories on the reading section of the 2014 DC CAS Test prior to the testing date.

Student 1A said Test Administrator 1 had reviewed with the class, the "same stories and questions" as those on the DC CAS Test. Student 1B indicated that ■ had seen the story before, and stated that a passage was the "same exact story." Student 1B also said that the story (passage) was provided to the class by Test Administrator 1 prior to test day. Student 1C, after some confusion about which stories were being discussed, said that a "morning warm-up" class exercise conducted by Test Administrator 1 included the same story as was in the DC CAS testing booklet.

Test Administrator 1 asserted that ■ did not have any prior access to testing materials and did not provide ■ students with a passage from the test. ■ believes that a reading passage may have been a poem that they had reviewed before, but that the questions would have been different. The team noted that this was a General Education testing group so there would have been no reason for the Test Administrator to know what questions existed on the test unless ■ specifically reviewed the test questions.

When the team followed up with Admin 2 about this (who is familiar with the students in the classroom but was not present during the test), ■ said that ■ had no knowledge of this and that students might say that they had seen or heard stories before.

The *Testing Integrity Act of 2013*, Section 103 (a)(4) indicates, in relevant part, that authorized personnel shall...be prohibited from:

- (A) Photocopying, or in any way reproducing, or disclosing secure test items or other materials related to Districtwide assessments
- (B) Reviewing, reading, or looking at test items or student responses before, during, or after administering the Districtwide assessment, unless specifically permitted in the test administrator's manual;
- (C) Assisting students in any way with answers to test questions using verbal or nonverbal cues before, during, or after administering the assessment;
- (H) Allowing students to view or practice secure test items before or after the scheduled testing time;

The *January 2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Pages 13-14), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines...by school personnel shall constitute a test security violation and must be reported; such violations include:

- 5. Engaging in the following prohibited behavior:
 - a. Photocopying, or in any way reproducing, or disclosing secure test items...
 - c. Engaging in discussions, instruction, reviews, or looking at any portion of a state test...before, during, or after the Districtwide assessment administration,
 - m. Allowing students to view or practice secure test items before or after the scheduled testing time;

Giving students early access to part of the Reading section of the DC CAS is a violation of the State Test Security Guidelines listed above. Based on the consistency of statements provided by the three students interviewed, we conclude that Test Administrator 1 likely provided this assistance to students during the 2014 DC CAS. The team noted that the Reading test consisted of four sessions taken over multiple days. Test Administrator 1 would have had access the test materials from the first day of testing and therefore had the opportunity to look ahead at questions that would have been on the next days' tests.

C. Missing 2014 DC CAS Test Security File

Neither Admin 1 nor Admin 3 was able to locate the 2014 DC CAS Test Security file upon request. They explained that this was due to the significant turnover in school personnel after the prior school year, and that the file was likely lost during the transition. Admin 5 stated that [REDACTED] left the file at the school prior to [REDACTED] departure.

The *Testing Integrity Act of 2013*, Section 103(a)(1), indicates, in relevant part, that before the administration of a Districtwide assessment, Authorized personnel must:

(C) Complete testing integrity training, as developed by OSSE

(D) Sign a testing integrity and security agreement, as developed and distributed by OSSE

The *2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Pages 9-10), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that, before testing, the [REDACTED] must:

1. Attend state test administration training session(s);
2. Read, sign, and return to the principal the *State Test Security and NonDisclosure Agreement*;
6. Create a security file;
7. Account for the quantity of state test books distributed to each Test Administrator;
14. Outline instructions and conduct training sessions for Test Administrators and helpers.

The Test Security File is necessary to validate the school's compliance with the *Testing Integrity Act of 2013* and the *2014 DC CAS Test Security Guidelines*. It provides corroborating evidence that school personnel attended test security training, followed OSSE's test administration guidelines, and that each employee signed the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements*.

D. Failure to follow Test Directions

Both Test Administrator 1 and Admin 5 both stated that they were unaware that stray marks should not be made on student answer sheets. Test Administrator 1 stated that [REDACTED] taught [REDACTED] students an elimination strategy whereby students strike through answers in their efforts to identify the correct answer. Admin 5 also stated that [REDACTED] was not aware that stray marks should not be made on the answer sheets so she would not have communicated this during school training. Of the [REDACTED] students in the flagged testing group, [REDACTED] students had WTR erasures of [REDACTED] or more in Math and [REDACTED] students had WTR erasures of [REDACTED] or more in Reading. Upon review of the

answer booklets from the flagged testing group, it appears that the vast majority of the students made marks as part of a process-of-elimination strategy.

The *Testing Integrity Act of 2013*, Section 103 (a)(4) indicates, in relevant part, that authorized personnel shall...be prohibited from:

- (E) Altering the test procedures stated in the formal instructions accompanying the Districtwide assessments;

The *January 2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Pages 13-14), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines...by school personnel shall constitute a test security violation and must be reported; such violations include:

- 5. Engaging in the following prohibited behavior:
 - h. Altering the test procedures stated in the formal instructions accompanying the Districtwide assessments
 - Administering state tests in a manner that is inconsistent with the administrative procedures provided by the OSSE in the Test Chairperson's/Test Monitor's Manual
 - Failing to read test administration scripts verbatim as required by the Test Administrator's Manual;

The *2014 DC CAS Test Directions – Reading and Mathematics: Grade █* provided to us by OSSE, notes the directions to be read by Test Administrators at the beginning of each Reading and Math session. The language includes the following (see example on p. 14):

For each multiple-choice question, fill in only the circle that goes with the answer you choose. Fill in the circle completely and make your mark heavy and dark. If you want to change an answer, completely erase the mark you made and fill in a different circle. Do not make any other marks in your books.

The Test Administrators are required to be “thoroughly familiar” with this manual prior to the day of testing. The Test Chairperson is also required to have reviewed and followed the directions in all testing manuals.

The team also reviewed the OSSE DC CAS Test Chairperson Training 2014 PowerPoint presentation which, on slide 31, states that Test Chairpersons must “[c]heck answer booklets for stray marks and accurate demographic information.”

Both Test Administrator 1 and Admin 5 stated that they were not aware that students could not make additional markings on the answer sheets. This oversight resulted in this testing group being flagged for significant WTR erasures.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The school did not make any documents available to the team for review – the Test Security file was missing. Center City experienced significant turnover after the prior school year and there was no one from the prior administration available at the school when we conducted interviews. Admin 1 and Admin 3 speculated that during the transition they might have accidentally thrown the Test Security Binder out.

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Not available for review; Test Security file missing
Incident Reports	None noted.
DC CAS 2014 Training Sign-In Sheet	Not available for review; Test Security file missing
DC CAS 2014 Test Security Affidavit	Reviewed; signed by Admin 5 on 4/11/2014 (received from OSSE)
DC CAS 2014 General Observation Report(s)	None Noted
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements ⁴	Not available for review; Test Security file missing
School Security Checklist	Not available for review; Test Security file missing
Other Documents Reviewed	CTB Answer sheets for selected students in flagged testing group

⁴ Referred to in the Testing Integrity Act Sec. 103(a)(1)(B) as Testing Integrity and Security Agreements.