

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

HENDLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Case Ref. 0001_0249_001_2014

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Hendley Elementary School
School Address	425 Chesapeake St. SE Washington, DC 20032
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	December 9, 2014, December 18, 2014 and January 21, 2015

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	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Test Administrator 2	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO

Based on the 2014 DC CAS data analysis, two [REDACTED] grade testing groups at Hendley Elementary School (“Hendley”) were flagged for investigation. Test Administrator 1’s General Education testing group was flagged for Person Fit in Math. Test Administrator 2’s Special Education testing group was flagged for Person Fit in Reading. Hendley was also flagged for missing materials: one [REDACTED] grade Science test booklet and one [REDACTED] grade Health test booklet.

Test Administrator 1’s General Education testing group was comprised of [REDACTED] students and Test Administrator 2’s Special Education testing group was comprised of [REDACTED] students.

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 average PersonFit score of Test Administrator 1's testing group was 1.30, 4.75 standard deviations above the stae average of 1.0.

Similarly the average PersonFit score of Test Administrator 2's testing group was 1.43, 4.03 standard deviations above the stae average of 0.98.

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]	School	12/9/14
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/9/14
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/9/14
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/9/14
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/9/14
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Not Interviewed: 2013 – 2014 was the last year at school	
[REDACTED]	Proctor 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/18/14
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/18/14
[REDACTED]	Student 2A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/18/14
[REDACTED]	Student 2B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/18/14
[REDACTED]	Student 2C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/18/14

IV. OTHER INDIVIDUALS REFERENCED DURING INTERVIEWS

Name of Individual	Name Reference	Position
	Admin 3	
	Admin 4	
	Student 3	
	Student 4	
	Student 5	
	Teacher 1	
	Teacher 2	
	Teacher 3	
	Teacher 4	
	Teacher 5	
	Teacher 6	
	Teacher 7	
	Teacher 8	

V. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

Given the results of the Person Fit score analysis for the flagged testing groups, our investigation focused on the possibilities that the flagged Test Administrators and Proctors engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 10 individuals: 5 current staff and 5 former students. The students were in grade at Hendley during the 2013-2014 school year.

Our investigation revealed two potential testing violations: 1) Both Test Administrator 1 and Test Administrator 2 provided unapproved accommodations to students and 2) a deviation from

⁴ We were unable to identify Teacher 7 as a teacher at Hendley but have listed the name here as it was mentioned during our interview of Student 2C.

the school's Test Plan was not reported to OSSE. These potential violations are described in detail in the section below.

Our investigation also revealed a possible incident which we were unable to substantiate. Student 2C stated that, on the third day of testing, ■■■ answer sheet had marks on it that ■■■ did not write and further specified that it "looked like another kid wrote on it." Student 2C claims to have reported this to Test Administrator 2, and ■■■ was then moved to another SPED testing group. ■■■ also stated that marks were erased but did not provide details of when the marks were erased or by whom. These claims were not corroborated by any staff or other students and were not noted in an incident report. We asked Test Administrator 2 if ■■■ recalled this incident and ■■■ confirmed that ■■■ did not. ■■■ further stated that there would never be an instance where another student would have had access to Student 2C's answer sheets.

The team noted that students with varying accommodations were included in Test Administrator 2's Special Education group. Based on our review of the accommodations provided to the students in Test Administrator 2's testing group, the team noted that there were certain oral accommodations that were not approved for all students in the group. Although all students were allowed the reading of Math, Science and Composition test questions, only some were afforded the simplification of oral directions and the translation of words and phrases in Math, Science and Composition. Grouping these students together increases the likelihood that the Test Administrator would provide unapproved accommodations to students (e.g., if the accommodations are approved for some students, they may inadvertently be provided to all students). Students with approved accommodation should be grouped based on accommodation-type to ensure that all students are receiving only the accommodations for which they are authorized during testing.

With regard to the two missing test booklets: one ■■■ grade ■■■ test booklet⁵ and one ■■■ grade ■■■ test booklet,⁶ Admin 2 strongly believes that these booklets were returned the day after testing along with all other testing material. As support, we received copies of the following:

- 1) School Security Checklist for one missing ■■■ grade ■■■ test booklet indicating, by Test Book Security Number, that the booklet was properly signed out and signed in on the testing day by Test Administrator 3.
- 2) School Security Checklist for one missing ■■■ grade ■■■ test booklet indicating, by Test Book Security Number, that the booklet was properly signed out and signed in on the testing day by Test Administrator 3.

5 ■■■

6 ■■■

- 3) DC CAS 2013-2014 Test Materials Letter of Verification signed by Admin 2 on June 17, 2014.
- 4) Two Manna Freight Systems Delivery Manifests dated April 11, 2014, indicating that four and three packages, respectively, were picked up. Admin 2 claimed that both the missing test booklets were included in these packages.

The team also interviewed Test Administrator 3, as the missing Science and Health test booklets were assigned to ■ grade students in ■ testing group; however, ■ recalled returning all test materials to Admin 2 and this was confirmed by our review of the School Security Checklists. It should be noted that Test Administrator 3 is a ■ grade teacher for all subjects and that the ■ grade testing group to which ■ administered the test is not ■ homeroom class. We did not find any evidence contradicting the school's claim that the booklets were sent back to the vendor.

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Providing Unauthorized Test Accommodations

Students in Test Administrator 1's testing group received unauthorized accommodations from Test Administrator 1. Student 1A stated that Test Administrator 1 read instructions aloud, but not the questions, but, if a student asked, Test Administrator 1 would read Reading/Math questions to the student and the questions were not read verbatim (Math and Reading). Similarly, Student 1B also stated that, if asked, Test Administrator 1 would read questions for the student and would do so in ■ own words. Students 1A and 1B tested with a General Education testing group and neither student was authorized to receive any accommodations.

Students in Test Administrator 2's testing group were not approved to receive the accommodation for the translation of words and phrases; however both students recalled receiving this accommodation during the test. Student 2B stated that when asked by a student, Test Administrator 2 would read Math questions in ■ own words to that student. Student 2B did not indicate that this was an accommodation that ■ received first-hand, but assistance ■ heard being provided to other students. Student 2C stated that questions were read and interpreted for Math, but not for Reading (for other students).

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

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

The *2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 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...such violations include but are not limited to the following:

5.p. Providing unapproved test accommodations to a student

Because Test Administrator 1's testing group is a general education testing group without any approved accommodations, reading of questions by a Test Administrator is a clear testing violation.

Although Test Administrator 2's testing group is a Special Education group, the accommodations provided to each student vary. Although Students 2B and 2C did not indicate that they directly received the translation accommodation from Test Administrator 2, the fact that they witnessed and understood the accommodation being provided indicates that they at least indirectly benefitted from the accommodations provided to other students. Students with approved accommodation should be grouped based on accommodation-type to ensure that all students are receiving only the accommodations for which they are authorized during testing.

B. Unreported Deviation from Test Security Plan

School test plan not amended to reflect that the Test Chairperson also served as a Test Administrator. Admin 2 stated that, in addition to serving as the Test Chairperson, ■ also served as Test Administrator to a number of students. The most recent Test Plan obtained from DCPS was dated March 31, 2014 (also the first day of testing) and does not reflect Admin 2's role as a Test Administrator. A Test Chairperson also acting as a Test Administrator appears to be a clear conflict of roles and responsibilities. We would, therefore expect to see that a modified testing plan reflecting this change was revised and approved by LEA and OSSE.

The *Testing Integrity Act of 2013*, Section 102 (b) indicates, in relevant part, that the LEA shall:

- (3) Immediately report any breach of security, loss of materials, failure to account for materials, or any other deviation from the test security plan to OSSE.

The Test Chairperson also assuming the role of a Test Administrator is a deviation from the testing plan that was not approved by the LEA or OSSE.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; various versions of the document noted. Admin 2 showed us which one was the most up to date and correct version; however, the most up to date version did not reflect that Admin 2 was both a Test Chairperson and a Test Administrator.
DC CAS 2014 Incident Reports	Yes, reviewed.
DC CAS 2014 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted.
DC CAS 2014 Test Security Affidavit	Yes; no issues noted.
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements ⁷	Yes; no issues noted.
School Security Checklist	Yes; reviewed.
DC CAS 2014 General Observation Report(s)	Yes; reviewed.
Other Documents Reviewed	DC CAS 2013-2014 Test Materials Letter of Verification; Manna Freight Systems Delivery Manifests dated April 11, 2014

⁷ Referred to in Testing Integrity Act Sec. 103(a)(1)(B) as Testing Integrity and Security Agreements.