

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

PAUL LAURENCE DUNBAR HIGH SCHOOL
Case Ref. 0001_0467_001_2014

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Dunbar High School
School Address	101 N St. NW Washington, DC 20001
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	December 11, 2014

II. TESTING GROUP FLAG INFORMATION

Based on a random selection by OSSE, one [REDACTED] Grade testing group at Paul Laurence Dunbar High School (“Dunbar”) was flagged for investigation. Dunbar was also flagged for missing materials: two High School Biology test booklets.

The testing group was comprised of [REDACTED] students. According to OSSE-provided information, and supported by DCPS documentation, this testing group was a [REDACTED] 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

¹ 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

Groups are flagged when there are 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

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2014 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
██████████	Admin 1	██████████	██████████	School	12/11/14

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

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2014 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/11/14
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Not Interviewed - [REDACTED]	
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Phone	2/2/2015
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/11/14
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/11/14
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/11/14

IV. OTHER INDIVIDUALS REFERENCED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2
[REDACTED]	Teacher 3
[REDACTED]	Teacher 4
[REDACTED]	Teacher 5
[REDACTED]	Teacher 6
[REDACTED]	Teacher 7

V. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

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

3 [REDACTED]

We interviewed 5 individuals: 2 current and former staff members and 3 students. The team was unable to interview Admin 3, [REDACTED]

Our investigation revealed two potential testing violations: 1) Test Administrator 1 provided unauthorized accommodations to students in [REDACTED] testing group and 2) The process for signing test materials in/out was inconsistent leading to a lack of a clear chain of custody for testing materials. These violations are described in detail in the following section of this report.

With regards to the two missing High School Biology booklets⁴, Admin 1 stated that [REDACTED] was not aware of any missing materials and Admin 2 recalled that everything was returned. As support, we received the following:

- 1) School Security Checklist for the High School Spring 2014 Biology Test indicating by Test Book Security Number that both missing test booklets were used. They were signed out by Teacher 7 along with 12 other booklets. The booklets were also signed back in by Admin 2.
- 2) DC CAS 2014 Observer Form (After Testing) dated April 10, 2014. The DCPS observer noted no issues with the packing of scoreable and non-scoreable test materials. Question no. 11 of the Observer Form asks “Were the scoreable materials stacked with the “Group Information Sheets” in the scoreable box?” and Question no. 12 asks “Were the non-scoreable materials stacked in the non-scoreable box, including all booklets listed in the “School Security Checklist” and scratch papers?” The Observers responded “Y[es] to both questions.
- 3) Signed Test Materials Letter of Verification.

Although Admin 1 and Admin 2 have indicated that they were not made aware of any missing materials, DCPS provided the team with the email communications to Dunbar confirming that it did communicate to the school regarding the missing materials and was awaiting a response. The team reviewed an email from DCPS sent to Admin 1 and Admin 2 dated June 13, 2014 in which the school was notified of the specific materials missing and the response required by “no later than June 19, 2014.” The team also reviewed follow up emails sent from DCPS to Admin 1 on September 30, 2014 and again on October 7, 2014. DCPS stated that follow-up was attempted via phone on a few occasions but with no success. In addition, the team sent two emails to the school – on January 13, 2015 to Admin 1 and Admin 2 and on January 15, 2015 to Admin 1 - requesting evidence of shipment; however, neither Admin 1 nor Admin 2 has provided a response as of the date of this report.

Although we were unable to obtain proof of shipment from the school, we were able to confirm that the missing test materials were signed back in to the Test Chairperson per the School Security Checklist. DCPS subsequently provided a signed Test Materials Letter of Verification confirming that all materials were returned. Considering all of the available evidence: 1) the School Security Checklist reflecting that both test booklets were properly signed in and out, 2) the DC CAS 2014

4 [REDACTED]

Observer Form affirming that all listed booklets in the School Security Checklist were stacked in the non-scoreable box, as appropriate and 3) the Test Letter of Verification, we conclude that the school has demonstrated that the missing booklets were properly checked out and in and were a part of the shipment returned to the vendor.

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Providing Unauthorized Test Accommodations

Test Administrator 1 explained that during parts of the tests where ■ was allowed to read aloud, ■ would read each test question aloud to the entire testing group twice. When asked if ■ read the test questions to any individual student, by standing next to the student, Test Administrator 1 said ■ did not recall reading test questions to any student individually. ■ also did not recall simplifying or translating any test questions to students.

None of the students interviewed recalled that questions were read to the testing group. Student 1A recalled that the Test Administrator, who ■ noted to be a “sub who filled in,” would re-read the questions to students “not out loud but would whisper next to them.” Student 1A also recalled that “if there was a word they couldn’t understand, the Test Administrator would break it down for the student and would re-read it to them.” The team noted that the translation of words and phrases was an allowed accommodation for Student 1A. Student 1B did not recall any questions being read out loud by Test Administrator 1 and Student 1C stated that Test Administrator 1 only read the instructions.

Per a review of the accommodations allowed for Test Administrator 1’s testing group, the team noted that ■ the ■ students were approved to receive an accommodation for the reading aloud of test questions and ■ the ■ students were approved to receive an accommodation for the translation of words and phrases.

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

- (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

Although Test Administrator 1’s testing group is a ■, the accommodations provided to each student vary. ■ the ■ students in Test Administrator 1’s testing group are not approved to receive the accommodation for the reading aloud of test

questions in Math, Science and Composition; however, Test Administrator has stated that [REDACTED] provided the read-aloud accommodation to the entire group. Students with approved accommodations 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. 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 back in. When asked about these instances, the Admin 2 was unable to determine why the materials had not been signed back in.

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.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted.
Incident Reports	None noted for 2014.
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; reviewed.

State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements ⁵	Yes; noted agreements signed by all adults interviewed.
School Security Checklist	Reviewed; noted several instances where materials had not been signed back in.
Other Documents Reviewed	DC CAS 2013-2014 Test Materials Letter of Verification.

⁵ Referred to in Testing Integrity Act Sec. 103(a)(1)(B) as Testing Integrity and Security Agreements.