

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

CESAR CHAVEZ PUBLIC CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Cesar Chavez Public Charter High School
School Address	3701 Hayes Street, NE Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	02/03/2014

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
Subject										
Test Administrator 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), Cesar Chavez Public Charter High School (“Chavez”) was randomly selected.

For the 2013 CAS, OSSE developed a flagging methodology consisting of three methods. Testing groups 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:¹

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

¹ 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

- 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 testing group.
 - 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. Testing groups 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 testing group 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 testing groups for investigation based on a random selection.²

Testing group information is provided below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.01	0.26	0.80	0.35	0.25
	Math (STATE)	2.76	-0.01	0.61	0.03	0.27
	Reading (CLASS)	1.92	-0.45	0.60	0.00	0.09
	Reading (STATE)	2.85	-0.13	0.74	0.01	0.21

Because Chavez was a randomly selected school, there were no classrooms with data flags on which to conduct our investigation. Test Administrator 1’s classroom was selected at random.

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

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]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Because Chavez was a randomly selected school, our investigation was general in nature. Test Administrator 1’s classroom was also selected randomly, and one student was selected based on [REDACTED] individual test results.

We interviewed 4 individuals: 3 current staff, and 1 student. [REDACTED]

Our investigation revealed one testing violation related to the maintenance of the 2013 Test Security File. This potential violation is described in detail below.

Overall, based on the findings at Chavez, 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. Missing 2013 DC CAS Test Security File.

Admin 1 was unable to locate the 2013 DC CAS Test Security File. Admin 1 said that there had been a lot of school administrator turnover after the 2013 school year, and explained that the file

must have been lost during the transition. The school tried to locate the file. But as of the date of this report, efforts have been unsuccessful.

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 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 7, the *2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines*, further provide that the:

Test Chairperson, before Testing, [must]...

6. Attend and/or host a test administration training session;
10. Create a test security file (please refer to *Definitions* in the appendix);
11. Account for the quantity of state test books distributed to each Test Administrator;
18. 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 *Test Security Guidelines*. It provides corroborating evidence that the 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*.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; plan was found in Admin 1's email; No issues noted.
Irregularity Reports	No; file missing.
State Test Security & Non-Disclosure Agreements	No; file missing.

Document	Notes
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	No; file missing.
Verification of DC CAS training form	No; file missing.
Test Sign-in / Sign-Out Records	No; file missing.
Other Documents Reviewed.	Seating charts and Test Administrator room assignments also found in Admin 1's email.