

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

SHEPHERD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Shepherd ES
School Address	7800 14 th St NW
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	1/24/2014; 2/4/2014; 2/6/2014

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										
Test Administrator 1	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

One testing group at Shepherd Elementary (“Shepherd”) was flagged for Extraordinary Growth and Wrong to Right (“WTR”) Erasures in Math.

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, due to the requirements of the Testing Integrity Act of 2013, OSSE selected certain classrooms for investigation based on a random selection.²

The Testing Group level and State level data for the flagged Testing Group is shown below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.85	0.96	2.80	-0.05	0.08
	Math (STATE)	3.02	0.08	0.61	-0.03	0.08
	Reading (CLASS)	2.61	0.13	0.00	0.31	0.17
	Reading (STATE)	2.98	0.12	0.57	0.00	0.23

This testing group was flagged for Extraordinary Growth and WTR erasures in Math. The average growth in Math was 0.96, which is higher than the State average of 0.08. The average number of Math WTR erasures for this group was 2.80, which is higher than the State average of 0.61. High numbers of WTR erasures by themselves do not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation.

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

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of WTR Erasures and Extraordinary Growth in this testing group, this investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator(s) engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 6 individuals: 3 current staff and 3 students.

Student 1A indicated that Test Administrator 1 may have told students to check specific answers on the test, but this was not corroborated by Student 1B or Student 1C.

We identified one possible violation related to the sign-in sheet process for test materials. During our review of the DC CAS Test Security Binder, we noted that the sign-in sheets showed that Test Administrator 1 signed out test materials for several other students in addition to those in ██████ flagged testing group.

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

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Test materials were not signed out by the appropriate Test Administrator.

The sign-in sheets in the DC CAS Test Security binder show that Test Administrator 1 signed out the test materials for all of the school’s special education students. However, ██████ only served

as the Test Administrator for one of the [REDACTED] testing groups in the school. Admin 2 explained that the school chose to have Test Administrator 1 sign out all special education test booklets [REDACTED]. Test Administrator 1 then distributed the test booklets to Test Administrators for three other testing groups.

This process compromised the security of the testing process because the exact quantity of test materials that was distributed to each Test Administrator was not documented, and could not be confirmed by the interviewers. Also, because Test Administrator 1 signed out all of the test booklets, there was confusion on the day of our initial interviews as to which Test Administrator actually administered the DC CAS to the flagged testing group. We were initially informed by Admin 2 that the flagged testing group was tested by Test Administrator 2 [REDACTED]. However, all three of the students we interviewed confirmed that Test Administrator 1 was their Test Administrator, not Test Administrator 2. We eventually confirmed that Test Administrator 1 was in fact their Test Administrator.

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

The Test Chairperson before Testing [must]...

11. Account for the quantity of state test books distributed to each Test Administrator.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Incident Reports	Yes; no issues noted
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Reviewed sign in/out sheets and noted that Test Administrator 1 signed out test booklets for students in testing groups other than [REDACTED] own.