

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

RICHARD WRIGHT PCS FOR JOURNALISM AND MEDIA ARTS
Case Ref. 0167_3067_001_2014

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Richard Wright PCS for Journalism and Media Arts
School Address	770 M Street Southeast, Washington, DC 20003
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	December 5, 2014

II. TESTING GROUP FLAG INFORMATION

Based on a random selection by OSSE, one ■ grade testing group at Richard Wright PCS for Journalism and Media Arts (“Richard Wright”) was flagged for investigation. Richard Wright was also flagged for missing test booklets: one ■ grade Reading test booklet, one ■ grade Composition test booklet and one High School Health test booklet.

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

¹ 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

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

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

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	12/05/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/05/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Phone Interview	12/19/2014
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/05/2014
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/05/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/05/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/05/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/05/2014

IV. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

Given that this [REDACTED] grade⁴ testing group was flagged based on a random selection, our investigation focused on the general test security policies and procedures in place at Richard Wright in regards to the 2014 DC CAS Test administration. Given that Richard Wright was missing materials, our investigation also focused on the protocols around maintaining the integrity of testing materials

³ [REDACTED]

⁴ <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/2014-dc-cas-frequently-asked-questions>. See “Federal Requirements” and “Subjects Covered” topics. State testing is required by federal laws and fulfills the requirements of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). ESEA requires annual assessments in reading and mathematics for students in grades 3-8 and high school. [REDACTED]

We interviewed 8 individuals: 5 current staff and 3 students. However, none of the students recalled details about the DC CAS nor did they recognize Test Administrator 1 as their Test Administrator.

Our investigation revealed two possible testing violations related to the administration of the 2014 DC CAS. The process for signing test materials in/out was inconsistent leading to a lack of a clear chain of custody for testing materials and *State Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements* (NDAs) were missing for Admin 1 and Admin 2.

With regards to the missing ■ Grade Reading⁵, ■ Grade Composition⁶, and High School Health booklets⁷, Admin 2 and Admin 3 strongly believed that the materials were picked up by the vendor right after testing. Both Admin 2 and Admin 3 were surprised that the school was being investigated for missing materials, stating that they were never notified of any missing materials by OSSE. As support, we received copies of the following from the school:

- 1) School Security Checklist for ■ Grade Reading indicating, by Test Book Security Number, that the missing booklet was properly signed out/in by the assigned Test Administrator.
- 2) School Security Checklist for ■ Grade Composition indicating that the missing test booklet was not listed on the checklist and was deemed to have not been used.
- 3) School Security Checklist for ■ Grade High School Health indicating, by Test Book Security Number, that the missing booklet was properly signed out/in by the assigned Test Administrator.
- 4) Richard Wright DC CAS Sign Out Sheet for Testing Materials with Admin 2 and delivery vendor signatures
- 5) CTB DC CAS 2014 School Group Lists for ■ grade Reading scoreable answer documents, ■ grade Composition scoreable answer documents and ungraded Health documents.

The team also reviewed an email provided by OSSE dated June 18, 2014 in which OSSE notified Admin 1 of the missing materials and included guidance on how the school should respond. Admin 1 and ■ team checked their emails but were unable to locate the notification email sent by OSSE. Admin 1 stated that if the school received the email, it would have responded to OSSE. Further, the team did not observe a signed DC CAS 2013-2014 Test Materials Letter of Verification form (i.e., a form that would have been included in OSSE's notification email) the Test Security file and Admin 2 does not recall signing one. Based on the documentation reviewed, the team has found no indication that the missing materials were not returned to the testing vendor.

⁵ ■

⁶ ■

⁷ ■

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

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

Test Administrator 1 did not initial the sign-in sheet to indicate that ■ received returned test booklets. On April 3, 2014, the sign-in sheet was not initialed upon the return of 14 ■ Grade Reading test booklets to the Test Chairperson. The related answer booklets were signed-in with initials. Admin 2 & 3 assured us that, in their opinions, all test booklets and answer sheets were gathered from Test Administrators and were returned to the testing company.

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.

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, we could not verify the chain-of-custody of the testing materials.

B. Missing State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements

Upon review of the Test Security file, the Team could not locate the signed *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements* (NDAs) for Admin 2 and Admin 3. During the interview, Admin 2 stated that both ■ and Admin 3 attended 2014 DC CAS training provided by OSSE. Admin 2 claimed that ■ signed the NDA at OSSE training and, as such, it is not included in the Test Security file.

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:

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

The *2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (page 8) provide that, before testing, the ■ must:

3. Ensure that all individuals involved in the state testing system in any way; read, sign, and return to the LEA Assessment Coordinator/Test Integrity Coordinator the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement

At page 9, the *2014 DC State Test Security Guidelines* provide that, before testing, the [REDACTED] must:

2. Read, sign, and return to the principal the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement

The signed NDAs should be maintained by the school in its Test Security file as they are necessary to validate the school's compliance with the *Testing Integrity Act of 2013* and the *2014 DC CAS Test Security Guidelines*. Though Admin 2 indicated that [REDACTED] signed the 2014 NDA at OSSE Training, we are unable to corroborate [REDACTED] statement based on a review of the school's Test Security file.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Incident Reports	None noted
DC CAS 2014 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
DC CAS 2014 Test Security Affidavit	Yes; no issues noted
DC CAS 2014 General Observation Report(s)	Yes; Issues noted – Testing sessions timing issues; Students resting their heads
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements ⁸	None noted for Admin 2 and Admin 3 though Admin 2 claims to have signed at OSSE training
School Security Checklist	Reviewed; noted that Test Administrator 1 did not initial to indicate that the return of 14 [REDACTED] grade Reading booklets

⁸ Referred to in Testing Integrity Act Sec. 103(a)(1)(B) as Testing Integrity and Security Agreements.