

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

**CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

**CARDOZO EDUCATION CAMPUS**  
 Case Ref. 0001\_0454\_001\_2014

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>School Name</b>	Cardozo Education Campus
<b>School Address</b>	1200 Clifton Street Northwest Washington, DC 20009
<b>Field Team</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Date Interviews Conducted</b>	December 15 <sup>th</sup> , 18 <sup>th</sup> , 22 <sup>nd</sup> 2014, January 12 <sup>th</sup> , 15 <sup>th</sup> , 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2015

**II. TESTING GROUP FLAG INFORMATION**

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		Significant Score Drop		WTR Erasure (2014)		Person Fit (2014)		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
	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	YES	NO	NO	NO
Test Administrator 3	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Test Administrator 4	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on a 2014 DC CAS Test data analysis by OSSE, four testing groups at Cardozo Education Campus (“Cardozo”) were flagged. Test Administrator 1 and Test Administrator 2’s testing group were flagged for Person Fit in Math. Test Administrator 3 and Test Administrator 4’s testing groups were flagged for high Wrong-to-Right erasures in Math. There were no flags for Question Type Comparison or Extraordinary Growth.

The four flagged testing groups are:

- Test Administrator 1’s [REDACTED] grade Special Education testing group of 10 students
- Test Administrator 2’s [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] grades [REDACTED] testing group of 17 students
- Test Administrator 3’s [REDACTED] grade General Education testing group of 17 students

- Test Administrator 4's █ grade General Education testing group of 20 students

Cardozo was also flagged for fifteen missing testing materials: four █ Composition test booklets, one █ Reading and Math test booklet, two █ Reading and Math test booklets, one █ Composition test booklet and seven High School Biology test booklets.

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:<sup>1</sup>

- 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

- 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, including 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.<sup>2</sup>

Test Administrator 1's [redacted] grade testing group was flagged for Person Fit. The State average for Person Fit was 1.01 in Math. In contrast, Test Administrator 1's testing group had a 1.34 average for Math.

Test Administrator 2's [redacted] and [redacted] grade testing group also received a high Person Fit average of 1.35 compared to the State average of 1.01.

Test Administrator 3's [redacted] grade testing group was flagged for a large number of Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures when compared to the state average. The average WTR erasures for the testing group in Math was 2.00 versus the State average of 0.79 in Math.

Test Administrator 4's [redacted] grade testing group had average WTR erasures of 1.50 in Math compared to the state average of 0.79.

### 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	12/15/2014
[redacted]	Admin 2	[redacted]	[redacted]	School and Phone	12/15/2014 1/12/2015 1/15/2015 1/21/2015
[redacted]	Test Administrator 1	[redacted]	[redacted]	School	12/18/2014

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

<sup>3</sup> [redacted]

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2014 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Phone	12/22/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/18/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 2A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/18/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 3A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 3B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Not Interviewed	
[REDACTED]	Student 4A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 4B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/15/2014

**IV. OTHER INDIVIDUALS REFERENCED DURING INTERVIEWS**

Name of Individual	Name Reference	Position
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]

**V. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION**

Four testing groups at Cardozo were flagged. Two testing groups were flagged for high Wrong-to-Right (WTR) erasures in Math and the other two testing groups were flagged for Person Fit in Math.

Given the extent of the two Person Fit flags and the two WTR erasures in Math, our investigation focused on the possibilities that the flagged Test Administrators engaged in behavior during or

after the test administration that violated the security of the test. Given that Cardozo was missing materials, our investigation also focused on the protocols around maintaining the integrity of testing materials.

We interviewed 14 individuals: 6 current staff and 8 students. [REDACTED]

Upon arriving at the school, we were informed that Test Administrator 4 was [REDACTED] unavailable for an interview during our visit. Our team proceeded to interview the three available Test Administrators. Only Proctor 1 was available for an interview. All other Test Proctors were no longer working for DCPS and/or no longer living in the area. Our team interviewed at least one student from each flagged testing group. Students were selected based on availability and their individual test results. We made several attempts to speak with the [REDACTED] teacher, Test Administrator 4; however, [REDACTED] refused to participate in the interview unless it was recorded. We were, therefore, unable to conduct the interview.

Our investigation revealed two potential testing violations related to the provision of unapproved accommodations and the required maintenance of Test Security documentation. 1) The process for signing test materials in/out was inconsistent leading to a lack of a clear chain of custody for testing materials and 2) insufficient evidence was provided for the missing materials identified by the testing vendor. These potential violations are described in detail in the following section of this report.

We interviewed three [REDACTED] grade students from Test Administrator 1's testing group. Each student confirmed that there was no cheating or testing violations during the 2014 DC CAS Test. All three students were part of a Special Education testing group.

We interviewed one [REDACTED] grade student from Test Administrator 2's testing group. [REDACTED] At the beginning of our interview, [REDACTED] confused the DC CAS Test with another test [REDACTED] took earlier in the year. However, about halfway into the interview, the student recalled the 2014 DC CAS Test and verified that no testing violations took place.

We interviewed two [REDACTED] grade students from Test Administrator 3's testing group. Each student confirmed that there was no cheating or testing violations during the 2014 DC CAS Test. Student 3A recalled having to change several of [REDACTED] answers from wrong to right after misaligning [REDACTED] answers on the answer sheet. During our interview, Test Administrator 3 informed us that Student 3B had requested extended time during the 2014 DC CAS Test, suggesting [REDACTED] may have changed [REDACTED] answers from Wrong-to-Right after re-examining the questions and [REDACTED] answers.

We interviewed two [REDACTED] grade students from Test Administrator 4's testing group. Student 4A stated that [REDACTED] observed several students using calculators during some portions of the exam, but that not all students received calculators. Student 4B remembers seeing at least 4 or 5 students in

the testing group using calculators. DCPS provided an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for one of the students in the flagged testing group indicating that [REDACTED] was the only student permitted to use a calculator. Though there is some discrepancy between the statements of Students 4A and 4B indicating that several students were using calculators and DCPS's assertion that only one student was permissibly using a calculator, we find the IEP provided to be enough evidence to create reasonable doubt as to whether a violation occurred. Without any further evidence, in the form of an interview with the Test Administrator 4 who is [REDACTED] and was unavailable to be interviewed, we have determined that there is insufficient evidence of a violation.

With regard to fifteen missing test booklets, Admin 1 strongly believed that all testing materials were returned to the vendor right after testing. As support, we received copies of the following:

- 1) DC CAS 2013-2014 Test Materials Letter of Verification signed by Admin 2 on June 14, 2014
- 2) School Security Checklist for the four missing [REDACTED] Composition test booklets<sup>4</sup> indicating by Test Book Security Number that the four booklets were properly signed out and signed in on its testing day.
- 3) School Security Checklist for the missing [REDACTED] Reading and Math test booklet<sup>5</sup> indicating by Test Book Security Number that the booklet was properly signed out and signed in on its testing days.
- 4) School Security Checklist for the seven missing High School Biology test booklets<sup>6</sup> indicating by Test Book Security Number that the seven booklets were unused.
- 5) The School Security Checklist for the two missing [REDACTED] Reading and Math test booklets<sup>7</sup> identified by the Test Book Security Number. However; the Checklist indicated that the two booklets were not properly signed out and signed in on its testing days:
  - For one booklet, it appears that on April 3rd, 2014 the test booklet column in the School Security Checklist was not initialed when signed out; however it was initialed when signed in.

---

4 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

- Similarly for the other booklet, it appears that on April 1st and 4th, 2014, the test booklet column in the School Security Checklist was initialed when signed out; however it was not initialed when the test booklet was signed in.

Admin 2 claimed that these 2 missing 10th Grade Reading and Math booklets were returned by the assigned Test Administrator to Admin 2's assistant who helped with the sign in and sign out process and that all 15 missing booklets were returned to the vendor.

Admin 2 claimed that the missing 10th Grade Composition test booklet<sup>8</sup> was not used. We could not verify this claim as the School Security Checklist for the [REDACTED] Composition test was not included in the material provided to us by the LEA. Per our follow-up with Admin 2, [REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED] would email the team the related School Security Checklist, however it was not received as of the date of this report. The team also received no proof of shipment from the school.

Based on the limited supporting documentation received and the issues noted regarding the inconsistent sign in/out of certain missing materials, the missing test materials have been included as a possible test violation.

## **I. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS**

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

Upon review of the School Security Checklists used to sign test materials in and out to Test Administrators, we noted a number of instances where test materials had not been signed out but were signed in or test materials were signed out but not signed back in. This includes two missing [REDACTED] Reading and Math test booklets. When asked about these instances, Admin 2 and Admin 3 stated that the inconsistencies were primarily because:

- 6) Instead of signing for answer document and question booklet twice, teachers and assistants to the Test Coordinator signed only once since the answer document and question booklet were picked up and returned together.
- 7) Teachers and/or assistants to the Test Coordinator signed in the wrong column (for example: signed in the "in" column instead of the "out" column or vice versa; signed in the answer document column instead of the question booklet column or vice versa).

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 [REDACTED] 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 certain testing materials.

#### **B. Insufficient Evidence that Missing Materials Returned**

Upon review of the support provided by the LEA and the school regarding the fifteen missing test booklets, the team noted that the documents received were insufficient for the team to verify the school's claim that all missing materials were returned. The team received no support for the missing [REDACTED] Composition test booklet that it claims was unused and the checklists for 2 of the missing booklets were inconsistently signed in/out (as noted in the violation above). The team has also received no proof of shipment.

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 *2014 DC CAS Test Chairperson's/Test Monitor's Manual* (Page 27), provided to us by OSSE, indicates, in relevant part, that schools should:

Keep copies of the School Packing List and the School Security Checklist for [its] files... These materials should be kept for reference by the school in case security questions arise.

Due to the insufficient support provided by the LEA and the school, the team is unable to verify the chain of custody of the missing materials and that the materials were, in fact, returned to the testing vendors as represented by the school.

## VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Reviewed; no issues noted
Incident Reports	Reviewed.
DC CAS 2014 Training Sign-In Sheet	Reviewed. All interviewed adults signed sign-in sheet except for Proctor 1..
DC CAS 2014 Test Security Affidavit	Reviewed; signed by Admin 1.
DC CAS 2014 General Observation Report(s)	Reviewed. Issues Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student pulled out cell phone during test. Student was removed from testing.</li> <li>• Science models remained on walls of laboratory. Materials were not related to testing and were removed when identified.</li> </ul>
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements <sup>9</sup>	Reviewed; no issues noted.
School Security Checklist	Reviewed; noted several instances where materials had not been properly signed out or signed back in.
Other Documents Reviewed	DC CAS Test Materials Letter of Verification signed by Admin 2 on June 14, 2014; IEP for one student in the flagged testing group for whom use of a calculator was permitted; Proof of Shipment label; signed Test Materials Letter of Verification.

---

<sup>9</sup> Referred to in the Testing Integrity Act Sec. 103(a)(1)(B) as Testing Integrity and Security Agreements.