

ALVAREZ & MARSAL  
2013 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)  
Test Security Investigation  
School Summary Report

**CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

**Paul Public Charter School**

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>School Name</b>	Paul Public Charter School
<b>School Address</b>	5800 8 <sup>th</sup> Street NW, Washington DC 20011
<b>Field Team</b>	██████████
<b>Date Interviews Conducted</b>	January 28, 2014; February 5, 2014

**II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION**

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		WTR Erasure (2013)		WTR Erasure (2012)		Person Fit		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by OSSE, one ██████████ classroom at Paul Public Charter School (“Paul PCS”) was flagged. Test Administrator 1’s classroom was flagged for Wrong-to-Right (“WTR”) erasures in Math and Extraordinary Growth in Math.

For the 2013 CAS, OSSE developed a flagging methodology consisting of three methods. Classrooms will be investigated if they trigger two or more test security flags in the same subject.

The methods consist of the following as described in the 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology:<sup>1</sup>

- 1) Wrong to Right Erasures (WTR) - 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. Classrooms

---

<sup>1</sup> 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

are flagged when there is a large number of wrong to right (WTR) erasures as compared to the state average.

- 2) Test Score Analysis – This method is divided into three sub-methods. Each sub-method is independent of each other; therefore it only takes one of the sub-methods to flag a classroom.
  - a. Test Score Growth - Student Growth is measured by taking the differences between the granular proficiency level scores for each student for 2012 and 2013. Classrooms with significant growth from 2012 to 2013 were flagged.
  - b. Test Score Drop - Similar to test score growth described above, the test score drop looks at extraordinary declines in student scores from 2012 to 2013.
  - c. Question Type Comparison (QTC) - QTC measures differences in performance between 1) frequently used test questions versus newer questions; and 2) multiple choice questions and constructive response items. Significant differences in QTC performance will trigger a classroom flag.
- 3) Person-Fit Analysis - The model measures the likelihood of an examinee’s response pattern given their estimated ability level. A Person-Fit over 1.0 indicates an unusual response pattern that may be the result of testing abnormalities.

In addition, due to the requirements of the Testing Integrity Act of 2013, OSSE selected certain classrooms for investigation based on a random selection.<sup>2</sup>

Testing group information is provided below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	3.19	1.21	2.60	0.03	-0.06
	Math (STATE)	3.06	0.10	0.62	-0.01	0.17
	Reading (CLASS)	2.53	0.48	0.40	0.19	0.13
	Reading (STATE)	3.12	0.35	0.49	-0.02	0.24

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 1 displayed a significant number of WTR erasures in Math. The average number of WTR erasures in the classroom was 2.60, while the State average was 0.62. The mere presence of WTR erasures does not necessarily indicate a testing irregularity, but may warrant further investigation. Additionally, the flagged testing group demonstrated score growth in Math well above the State average. The testing group, on average,

---

<sup>2</sup> Testing Integrity Act of 2013, Title II, Sec. 201(c).

improved their Math score by more than one proficiency level. The State average score growth in math was only 0.10, or one-tenth of one proficiency level.

**III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED**

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2013 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Given the high level of WTR erasures and extraordinary growth in Math, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator engaged in behavior during or after the test that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 7 individuals: 4 current and former staff, and 3 students.

During our interviews we noted three potential DC CAS test violations related to: 1) a lack of test security documentation; 2) the possibility that certain students received unapproved accommodations; and 3) a break in the chain of custody of test materials. These potential violations are described in detail below.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Paul PCS, this school has been classified as moderate (i.e., having defined violations; not test tampering or academic fraud).

## V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

### A. Poorly maintained 2013 DC CAS Test Security File

There were several discrepancies and omissions in the Paul PCS Test Security File. The Test Chairperson appears to have failed to follow a consistent process for signing test materials in and out. Our review disclosed that there were test booklets that were signed out on a test day, but never signed back in. Additionally, the sign-in sheets show Test Administrators signing out materials for students who were not in their assigned testing group. Admin 1 explained that the discrepancies were a result of “timing issues” and that no materials were missing. [REDACTED] further explained that if the sign-in sheet was not readily available, test materials would not be initialed as having been signed in or out.

The *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 7), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines...by school personnel shall constitute a test security violation...such violations include but are not limited to the following:

2. Administering state tests in a manner that is inconsistent with the administrative procedures provided by the DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education in the Test Chairperson’s Manual;

At page 8, the *Test Security Guidelines* provide that the:

Test Chairperson before Testing must...

9. Develop a distribution process for state test materials;
11. Account for the quantity of state test books distributed to each Test Administrator.

The Test Chairperson during Testing must...

3. Ensure that all secured materials are signed in and signed out daily.

By failing to accurately and consistently document the sign-in process at Paul PCS, the Test Chairperson has made it impossible to verify that the security of the test materials was maintained during testing.

**B. Providing unauthorized testing accommodations.**

Students 1A, 1B, and 1C said that Test Administrator 1 would give out stickers during testing to students that were doing well. The stickers were given out when students showed their work on the test booklets.

The *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 11), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines...by school personnel shall constitute a test security test violation...such violations include but are not limited to the following:

5. Aiding or assisting an examinee with a response or answer to a secure test item or prompt;
7. Providing unapproved test accommodations to a student.

Test Administrator 2 did not offer overt assistance, but offering stickers to students who were employing good test-taking strategies constitutes an unapproved testing accommodation.

**C. Failure to appropriately account for return of testing materials from each Test Administrator.**

Admin 3 and Test Administrator 2 reported that the school used “runners” to collect test materials upon completion of a testing session. Admin 3 explained that members of the “testing committee” would go to the individual testing group rooms and collect the test materials from the Test Administrators. At that point, the member of the testing committee would count and sign the materials in on the sign-in sheets. However, this record keeping was not done in a consistent manner.

The *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines...by school personnel shall constitute a test security test violation...such violations include but are not limited to the following:

13. Failure to return and account for all testing materials as soon as the testing session has terminated.

Although our investigation did not reveal evidence that test materials were left unattended at any time, this process for the collection of test materials raises significant concerns regarding the chain of custody of testing materials, particularly when coupled with the school’s failure to maintain the sign-in sheets in a consistent manner. It was not possible for the interviewers to verify that all test materials were accounted for immediately after testing on each testing day.

**VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Notes</b>
School Test Plan	The test plan was included in the Test Security File, however the file lacked proper documentation on sign-in sheets.
Irregularity Reports	None cited for 2013
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes, no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	No copies of signed individual training forms in the school's 2013 DC CAS folder.
Other Documents Reviewed.	