

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

**CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

**JC NALLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>School Name</b>	JC Nalle Elementary School
<b>School Address</b>	219 50 <sup>th</sup> St. SE Washington, DC 20019
<b>Field Team</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Date Interviews Conducted</b>	1/16/2014 & 2/4/2014

**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
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the 2013 DC CAS comprehensive data analysis and random selection performed by OSSE, one [REDACTED] testing group at JC Nalle Elementary School (“Nalle”) was flagged for investigation. Test Administrator 1’s testing group for Math was chosen based on random selection.

For the 2013 DC CAS, OSSE developed a flagging methodology consisting of three methods. For a classroom to be investigated, two or more test security flags in the same subject is required to be present, or instances where only a flag for WTR erasures is present, an investigation will be triggered if there was a WTR erasure flag in both math and reading.

The methods consist of the following as described in the 2013 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. Classrooms

---

<sup>1</sup> 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

are flagged when there are a large number of WTR erasures as compared to the state average.

- 2) Test Score Analysis – This method is divided into two sub-methods. Each sub-method is independent of the other; therefore it only takes one of the sub-methods to flag a classroom.
  - a. Test Score Extraordinary Growth - Student Growth is measured by taking the differences between the granular proficiency level (GPL) scores for each student for 2012 and 2013. Classrooms with significant growth from 2012 to 2013 were flagged.
  - b. Question Type Comparison - 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 triggered 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, 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>

Classroom-level information is provided below:

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.78	0.34	1.17	0.09	0.18
	Math (STATE)	3.07	0.31	0.73	0.04	0.21
	Reading (CLASS)	2.89	0.22	0.48	0.09	0.18
	Reading (STATE)	2.97	0.23	0.60	0.04	0.21

Nalle was a randomly selected school and there were no classrooms with data flags on which to conduct our investigation. Test Administrator 1’s Math testing group was chosen at random and Student 1A, Student 1B and Student 1C were selected based on their individual test results.

### III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2013 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Admin 1				

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

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2013 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1B	[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]

**IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Because Nalle was a random selection school our investigation was general in nature. Test Administrator 1’s Math testing group was selected randomly, and three students were selected based upon their individual test results.

We interviewed 8 individuals: 5 current and former staff and 3 students. [REDACTED]

The data provided by OSSE reflected that Test Administrator 3 was the Test Administrator assigned to the flagged testing group; however, upon speaking with Admin 1, we determined that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] to the class and that test was administered by two other teachers: the Math portion was administered by Test Administrator 2, and the Reading portion was administered by Test Administrator 1. Test Administrator 2 did not teach any of the students that [REDACTED] tested in 2013; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The groupings provided in the school's test plan were completely different from the actual grouping during testing.

Proctor 1B did not remember signing a State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement ("NDA") or receiving training. We were unable to locate a signed NDA for [REDACTED] in the school's 2013 DC CAS Test Security file and the school was not able to produce a copy of a signed NDA for Proctor 1B; therefore noted this as a testing violation.

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

## V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

### A. Failure to sign the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement.

Proctor 1B did not remember signing a Non-Disclosure Agreement prior to proctoring during the 2013 DC CAS. Per our review of the school's 2013 DC CAS Test Security File, a Non-Disclosure Agreement with [REDACTED] Proctor 1B's signature was not observed.

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 Principal before Testing [must]...

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

Failure to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement is not consistent with the DC CAS administrative procedures provided by OSSE.

**VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Notes</b>
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	None noted
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement	Yes; signed NDA not observed for Proctor 1B
Other Documents Reviewed.	IEPs and Accommodations Plans; Training Materials; etc.