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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

CENTER CITY PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL – CONGRESS HEIGHTS Case Ref. 0156_1105_001_2014

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

| School Name | Center City PCS Congress Heights |
|---------------------------|---|
| School Address | 220 Highview Place SE, Washington, DC 20032 |
| Field Team | |
| Date Interviews Conducted | December 8 and 11, 2014 |

II. TESTING GROUP FLAG INFORMATION

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

Based on the 2014 DC CAS data analysis performed, Center City Public Charter School Congress Heights ("Center City Congress Heights") had one grade testing group flagged for Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in Math and Reading, as well as Extraordinary Growth in the same subjects.

The flagged 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

¹ 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

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

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 1 displayed a significant number of WTR erasures in Math and Reading. The average number of WTR erasures in the testing group was 4.94 for Math, while the State average for Math was 0.62; likewise, the testing group average for Reading was 4.71, while the State average was 0.57. The presence of WTR erasures, by themselves, does not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation.

| Name of Interviewee | Name Reference | Current Position | 2013 Testing Role/Position | Interview Location | Date Interview Conducted |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Admin 1 | | | School | 12/08/2014 |
| | Admin 2 | | | School | 12/08/2014 |
| | Test Administrator 1 | | | School | 12/08/2014 |
| | Student 1A | | | School | 12/11/2014 |
| | Student 1B | | | School | 12/11/2014 |
| | Student 1C | | | School | 12/11/2014 |

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

IV. 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 6 individuals: 3 current staff and 3 students.

Our investigation revealed one potential test security violation related to failure to maintain a documented chain of custody over testing materials.

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Inconsistent Sign-In/Sign-Out Sheet Process for Test Materials

During our interviews with Student 1A and Admin 1, we noted that there was a lack of control over certain test materials. Specifically, the School Security Checklist revealed that testing materials assigned to Student 1A were not signed in or out on day 1 (03/31/2014) or day 3 (04/02/2014) and no make-up testing date could be found in the school's records. The school attendance records indicate that Student 1A was present on day 1 (contrary to the Checklist) but absent on day 3. Student 1A received scores in both Reading and Math, indicating that makeup testing must have occurred for at least one day. As there is no make-up testing documented for Student 1A, the materials were in the hands of the student, but not signed out. Further, the school cannot be sure that Student 1A was prohibited from having access to testing materials on both the testing day and on the makeup day. Student 1A received being present on each day of the test.

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

- (G) Having in one's personal possession secure test materials except during the scheduled testing date.
- (H) Allowing students to view or practice secure test items before or after the scheduled testing time;
- (J) Leaving secure test materials in a non-secure location or unattended by authorized personnel; an

The 2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines (Page 10), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that as part of his/her roles and responsibilities, during testing the must:

- 2. Complete the School Security Checklist each day for each Test Administrator receiving materials; and
- 3. Ensure that all secured materials are signed in and signed out daily;

Because the school did not maintain accurate sign-in sheets for regular and make-up testing days, we could not verify that the chain-of-custody requirements for testing materials were observed.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

| Document | Notes |
|---|--|
| School Test Plan | Yes; generally disorganized binder |
| Incident Reports | Yes; none filed for 2014. |
| DC CAS 2014 Training Sign-In Sheet | Yes; no issues noted |
| DC CAS 2014 General Observation Report(s) | Yes; reviewed |
| DC CAS 2014 Test Security Affidavit | Yes; no issues noted |
| State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements ⁴ | Yes; the team found signed NDAs for all staff reviewed |
| School Security Checklist | Yes; no issues noted |
| Other Documents Reviewed | N/A |

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