

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

TRUESDELL EDUCATION CAMPUS
 Case Ref No. 001_0327_001_2014

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Truesdell Education Campus
School Address	800 Ingraham Street NW, Washington DC 20011
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	December 4 & 12, 2014 & January 6, 2015

II. TESTING GROUP FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		Significant Score Drop		WTR Erasure (2014)		Person Fit		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Science	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the 2014 DC CAS data analysis, one [REDACTED] Testing Group at Truesdell Education Campus (“Truesdell”) was flagged for a high number of Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in both the Math and Science portions of the 2014 DC CAS. Test Administrator 1 administered the test to this testing group.

The flagged testing group was comprised of [REDACTED] students. According to information provided by OSSE and DCPS, this was an [REDACTED].

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 the 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 groups are flagged when there is 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

¹ 2014 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

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

The average WTR erasures for Math and Science in this testing group were significantly higher than the State average. The testing group's WTR erasure average for Math was 3.67, while the State average was 0.62. The testing group's WTR erasure average for Science was 1.56, while the State average was 0.45. Eight of the nine students had WTR erasures that exceeded the State average in Math, and five of the nine students had WTR erasures that exceeded the State average in Science.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2014 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/4/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/4/2014
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Phone	1/6/2015
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/4/2014
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	12/4/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/12/2014
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/12/2014

IV. OTHER INDIVIDUALS REFERENCED DURING INTERVIEWS

Name of Individual	Name Reference
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1
[REDACTED]	Teacher 3
[REDACTED]	Teacher 4



Name of Individual	Name Reference
[REDACTED]	Student 1
[REDACTED]	Student 2
[REDACTED]	Student 3
[REDACTED]	Student 4
[REDACTED]	Student 5
[REDACTED]	Student 6

V. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

Given the extent of WTR erasures, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator and/or Proctor(s) engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test. The flagged testing group consisted of only [REDACTED] who were to receive accommodations in accordance with their [REDACTED].

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

We found one possible testing violation related to the administration of the 2014 DC CAS – 1) The process for signing test materials in/out was inconsistent leading to a lack of a clear chain of custody for testing materials.

Both students interviewed indicated that they received unauthorized accommodations during the 2014 DC CAS. Student 1A stated that if [REDACTED] didn't find a word [REDACTED], Test Administrator 1 would, "tell what the word meant." Similarly, Student 1B stated that Test Administrator 1 would [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], the evidence obtained does not adequately distinguish between the allowable accommodations and any unallowable accommodations provided. It is unclear that the accommodations provided exceeded the

accommodations permitted. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We have therefore not included this as a possible testing violation.

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Inconsistent Sign-In/Sign-Out Sheet Process for Test Materials

In one instance, the Test Chairperson's assistant (Admin 2) did not initial the sign-in sheet for 3 answer booklets to indicate that Test Administrator 1 returned the testing materials. On April 4, a [REDACTED] grade testing group whose Test Administrator was Test Administrator 1 had three answer booklets⁴ for which the sign-in sheet was not initialed upon their return to Admin 2, the Test Chairperson's assistant. For the other [REDACTED] students, when test materials were signed in/out, Test Administrator 1, as the assigned Test Administrator, initialed the sign-in/sign-out sheets. When the test materials were signed back in, Admin 2, as the Test Chairperson's assistant, initialed the sign-in/sign-out sheets. Test Administrator 1 assured us that all of the test materials were returned to the Test Coordinator's assistant.

In addition to the inconsistencies noted above which related to Test Administrator 1's testing group, there were many other inconsistencies noted in the Truesdell 2014 DC CAS School Security Checklist including multiple instances of booklets and answer documents being signed out, but not signed back in, and test booklets being signed out without the accompanying answer documents.

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 that the chain-of-custody requirements for testing materials were observed.

4 [REDACTED]

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted.
Incident Reports	Yes, reviewed.
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; reviewed.
School Security Checklist	Yes; reviewed. The sign-in sheet for the flagged testing group showed 3 Math answer booklets were not signed back in on April 4 th after the completion of P.M. testing.
Other Documents Reviewed	N/A

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