

ATTACHMENT B

**2009 DC CAS TEST INTEGRITY REVIEW
LEA INVESTIGATION REPORT TO OSSE**

Date	1/28/10
LEA	DCPS
Investigators	John Olson, Dave Couchman - Caveon
School	Stanton Elementary School
Principal	<i>[Redacted]</i>

List of individuals interviewed (add rows as necessary):

Name	Position	Role in testing
<i>[Redacted]</i>	Principal	Supervised testing process
<i>[Redacted]</i>	Test Coordinator	Staff training, all testing activities
<i>[Redacted]</i>	Assistant Principal	Supervised testing, proctored
<i>[Redacted]</i>	<i>[Redacted]</i> teacher	Administered testing in classroom

Investigation:

Summarize steps taken by the LEA during the investigation
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Reviewed erasure and pattern analysis report provided by the OSSE2. Reviewed School Security plan maintained by the LEA3. Reviewed daily observation reports made by central office observers for each day of testing4. Spoke with principal off-site to inform them of investigation and ask for any initial comments.
Describe the test security plan in the school
Each school is required to submit a test security plan to DCPS on an annual basis. The plan is then reviewed and accepted by DCPS Office of Assessment and Accountability. The plan is kept on file at the DCPS Office of Assessment and Accountability. Caveon also reviewed the plans using a rubric of test security best practices to measure the effectiveness of the security plan. These reviews took on January 14 and 15, 2010 and the plan was found to be acceptable.
Summarize each interview that occurred (add rows as necessary)
<u>Interview 1:</u> [Redacted], Principal <u>Summary:</u> [Redacted]
<u>Interview 2:</u> [Redacted], Assistant Principal <u>Summary:</u> [Redacted]
<u>Interview 3:</u> [Redacted], [Redacted] teacher <u>Summary:</u> [Redacted], was not very responsive in [Redacted] answers to questions. For example, [Redacted] didn't remember getting test security training, but did remember signing a paper saying [Redacted] received training. All tests were collected at the same time then returned to test coordinator. All testing was done by lunch. [Redacted] remembered that a few students had makeup tests. Several students had restroom breaks during testing and were escorted by proctors to restroom. [Redacted] instructed students to eliminate the wrong answers then change to what they thought was the correct answer, which could account for the high number of wrong-to-right erasures.
<u>Interview 4:</u> [Redacted], Test Coordinator <u>Summary:</u> [Redacted]

Findings:

List and describe school's test security documents collected

Caveon reviewed the school's test security plan using a rubric of test security best practices to measure the effectiveness of the security plan. These reviews took place on January 14 and 15, 2010 and the plan was found to be acceptable.

Onsite observation reports are submitted by DCPS personnel involved in the DC CAS testing that took place in 2009. Each day of DC CAS test administration, detailed observation reports are submitted to DCPS Office of Assessment and Accountability by each observer at each school. These reports were reviewed by Caveon on January 14 and 15, 2010. The observations noted did not reveal any test security irregularities that would require further investigation.

Summarize findings of investigation

The [Redacted], [Redacted] is now at [Redacted] and was not interviewed. [Redacted], [Redacted], helped [Redacted] with tests, including initial assembly, collation and bar coding. At testing time, a "blue lock" is used and only [Redacted] has the key to that lock, excellent procedure for this room. Nine "City Year" volunteers and six Rotary Club volunteers served as proctors and helped at testing time, but didn't enter classrooms, unless trained by [Redacted]. Only one or two students needed extended time just past noon. When students finish testing, they move to the back of the classroom, with testing students remaining in the front. Another excellent suggestion by [Redacted]— have proctors handle tests and booklets, not the teachers. One teacher with high erasure rate, [Redacted], was not very responsive in [Redacted] answers to questions. [Redacted] instructed students to eliminate the wrong answers then change to what they thought was the correct answer, which could account for the high number of wrong-to-right erasures.

The data showed flagged gains only for reading in grade 4 (35%), although math scores showed large growth at this grade also (51%). When comparing growth in grade 4 to the other grades, which did not show this large growth, one grade and teacher stands out. When comparing the growth to state averages, again this one grade stands out. In addition, total wrong to right (WtR) erasures for this one grade were over 15 for both reading and math, an extremely high number in comparison to other grades and state averages.

Onsite interviews will send the message that test security is taken very seriously at DCPS.

Recommendations: Increase classroom monitoring of teachers in question. Run specialized data forensics analysis on suspected teachers for a more in-depth analysis of unusual gains and erasure patterns. Require seating charts for suspected classrooms. Have a special training session for teachers that are in question, and consider having a test for them to make sure they are knowledgeable about proper testing procedures. Have specially assigned DCPS monitors handle all test materials at a minimum and ideally be present during entire testing process of any teacher in question. Alternatively, don't allow the teachers in question to participate in DC CAS testing. Analyze test data and interview teachers immediately following the 2010 DC CAS testing.

LEA leader's acknowledgement of review of the report	
Name	
Title	
E-mail	
Phone number	
Signature	