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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

CESAR CHAVEZ PUBLIC CHARTER MIDDLE SCHOOL

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Cesar Chavez Public Charter Middle School
School Address	3701 Hayes Street, NE Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	███████████████████████████
Date Interviews Conducted	01/23/2014; 2/06/2014; 2/19/2014

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		WTR Erasure (2013)		WTR Erasure (2012)		Person Fit		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO

Based on 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by OSSE, Cesar Chavez Public Charter Middle School ("Chavez") had one ███████ testing group flagged for Extraordinary Growth and Wrong to Right erasures ("WTR erasures") in Math, as well as Person-Fit Analysis in Reading.

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)	3.17	0.77	3.50	1.61	0.15
	Math (STATE)	3.06	0.10	0.62	-0.01	0.17
	Reading (CLASS)	2.03	0.18	0.33	1.53	0.21
	Reading (STATE)	3.12	0.35	0.49	-0.02	0.24

The testing group for Test Administrator 1 was flagged for WTR erasures and Extraordinary Growth in Math, as well as Person-Fit in Reading. The testing group displayed an average of 3.50 WTR erasures per student on the Math section, which is higher than the State Average of 0.62 Math WTRs per student. High numbers of WTR erasures by themselves do not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation.

Test Administrator 1's testing group was also flagged for Person-Fit analysis. The testing group displayed a Person-Fit score of 1.53. A Person-Fit score over 1.00 indicates that the testing group did substantially better on the DC CAS than predicted.

---

[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
███	Admin 1	███	█	███	███
███	Student 1A	███	███	███	███
███	Student 1B	███	███	███	███
███	Test Administrator 2	███	███	███	███
███	Test Administrator 3	███	███	███	███
███	Test Administrator 1	███	███	███	███
███	Admin 2	███	███	█	█
███	Admin 3	███	███	█	█
███	Student 1C	███	███	███	███
███	Student 1D	███	███	███	███

IV.   SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the high levels of WTR erasures, Extraordinary Growth, and Person-Fit 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 8 individuals: 4 current and former staff and 4 current and former students. ███

███

During our interviews we noted two possible DC CAS test violations related to: 1) the failure to maintain the 2013 DC CAS Test Security File; and 2) Test Administrator 1 aiding students during the test by pointing to specific questions and telling the students to re-check their work.

Overall, based on the findings at Chavez, this school has been classified as critical (i.e., having definitive test security violations; 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:

> 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 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.*

B. Test Administrator 1 provided impermissible assistance on the DC CAS.

Student 1A and Student 1B from Test Administrator 1's testing group reported that they received help on the DC CAS from Test Administrator 1. Student 1A said that if ■ asked Test Administrator 1 a question about a problem, ■ would "say 'yes' or 'no' or tell me to try again." Student 1A also said that ■ thought ■ had done better on the test because of the help ■ received from Test Administrator 1.

Student 1B said that if ■ asked a question about a problem on the test, Test Administrator 1 would "remind me of the studying that we did, and then I would catch on and know the answer."

Additionally, Test Administrator 2 said that ■ had concerns about Test Administrator 1 that ■ brought to the attention of Admin 2 prior to testing. ■ said that, in ■ opinion, Test Administrator 1's students were scoring higher than they were capable of on their own. Test Administrator 2 said that ■ told Admin 2 that Test Administrator 1 should not be permitted to administer the DC CAS to ■ own students. Admin 2 was not interviewed because no longer works for the school, and contact information for ■ was unavailable.

Test Administrator 1 denied providing any assistance other than the accommodations provided for in the students' IEPs. ■ said that ■ students' score growth could be explained by their educational gains during the 2013 school year. ■ did not have an explanation for ■ testing group's abnormally high WTR erasures or Person-Fit score.

On February 19, 2014, the interviewers visited ■■■■■■■■■■ to interview two ■■■ Chavez students, Student 1C and Student 1D, who were in Test Administrator 1's testing group during the 2013 DC CAS. These students were interviewed to obtain further corroboration of the statements made by Student 1A and Student 1B. Both Student 1C and Student 1D corroborated the statements, and said that Test Administrator 1 would tell them to go back and check specific answers.

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;
>
> 5. Aiding or assisting an examinee with a response or answer to a secure test item or prompt.

While Test Administrator 1 denied assisting students during the DC CAS, all four students that were interviewed provided similar accounts of impermissible assistance provided by Test Administrator 1.

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
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.