

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

FRIENDSHIP TECH PREP PCS

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Friendship Tech Prep PCS
School Address	620 Milwaukee Place SE
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	1/31/2014; 2/18/2014

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

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

The testing group at this school was randomly selected for review by OSSE. As a result, there were no testing group flags.

For the 2013 DC CAS, OSSE developed a flagging methodology consisting of three methods. Classrooms 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. Classrooms 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 classroom.
- 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. Classrooms 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 classroom 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, and in compliance with the requirements of the Testing Integrity Act of 2013, OSSE selected certain classrooms for investigation based on a random selection.²

The statistics for the randomly selected testing group at Friendship Tech Prep PCS 2013 DC CAS are as follows:

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.56	-0.39	0.71	0.29	0.31
	Math (STATE)	3.02	0.08	0.60	0.01	0.28
	Reading (CLASS)	2.52	-0.30	0.35	0.15	0.29
	Reading (STATE)	2.77	-0.12	0.52	0.01	0.22

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
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1E	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This testing group was randomly selected by OSSE for review. Test Administrator 1's test group was selected randomly, and the students interviewed were selected based upon their individual test results.

We interviewed 7 individuals: 2 current staff and 5 students. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Based on our interviews, we are aware of one potential testing violation. The potential violation is related to the security of test materials.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Friendship Tech Prep, this school has been classified as minor (i.e., having minor test administration errors).

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Inconsistent sign-in sheet process for test materials

When the interviewers reviewed the Test Security File at Friendship Tech, it was discovered that security protocols for test material sign-in sheet were not consistently observed. The sign-in sheets had several pages where test materials were signed out for a test day, but were never signed back in.

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;

Further, the *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Pages 7), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Test Chairperson before Testing must...

9. Develop a distribution process for state test materials;
11. Account for the quantity of state test books distributed to each Test Administrator.

Further, the *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 8), provided to us by OSSE, require, in relevant part, that:

The Test Chairperson during Testing [must]:

3. Ensure that all secured materials are signed in and signed out daily.

By failing to keep accurate records of the sign-in sheet process, it makes it challenging to verify that the chain-of-custody requirements for testing materials were consistently observed.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; issues noted
Incident Reports	Yes; no issues noted
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Yes; no issues noted