

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

**CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

**ACHIEVEMENT PREPARATORY ACADEMY PCS**

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>School Name</b>	Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS
<b>School Address</b>	908 Wahler Pl SE
<b>Field Team</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Date Interviews Conducted</b>	1/29/2014, 2/5/14 & 2/13/14

**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

Based on 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by OSSE, one [REDACTED] testing group at Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS (“Achievement”) was randomly selected for review by OSSE. As a result, there were no testing group flags at this school.

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:<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 are flagged when there is a large number of Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures as compared to the state average.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 (GPL) 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.<sup>2</sup>

2013 DC CAS Statistics for the randomly selected testing group at Achievement are as follows:

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	3.97	0.05	0.65	0.00	0.24
	Math (STATE)	3.16	0.09	0.60	-0.04	0.21
	Reading (CLASS)	3.68	-0.12	0.12	-0.49	0.22
	Reading (STATE)	3.03	0.02	0.54	-0.02	0.25

---

<sup>2</sup> 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]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Because Achievement was a randomly selected school, our investigation was general in nature. Test Administrator 1's classroom was also selected randomly, and two students were selected based upon their individual test results.

We interviewed 6 individuals: 4 current staff and 2 former students.

Upon arriving at the school, the team was told that the individual listed as the Test Administrator per the data received from OSSE, did not administer the test to the flagged testing group. Admin 2 was able to identify the three Test Administrators that were actually assigned to the testing group:

[REDACTED]

Student 1B indicated that Test Administrators were allowed to use cell phones and laptops during the test, and noted that [REDACTED] saw a few of [REDACTED] Test Administrators doing work on their

laptops during testing. Student 1B could not recall who those Test Administrators were. This statement has not been corroborated by other individuals and has, therefore, not been included as a test security violation. Both Test Administrator 1 and Test Administrator 2 indicated that they did not use electronics during the DC CAS.

Our investigation revealed one possible testing violation related to the maintenance of the 2013 DC CAS Test Security Files.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Achievement, this school has been classified as moderate (i.e., having defined violations; not test tampering or academic fraud).

## V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

### A. Missing 2013 DC CAS Test Security File.

Admin 1 and Admin 2 were unable to locate the 2013 DC CAS Test Security File. Admin 1 had relocated [REDACTED] office since the administration of the 2013 DC CAS test, and explained that the file must have been lost during the move. The school tried to locate the file, but as of the date of this report, efforts have been unsuccessful.

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:

Test Chairperson, before Testing, [must]...

6. Attend and/or host a test administration training session;
10. Create a test security file (please refer to *Definitions* in the appendix);
11. Account for the quantity of state test books distributed to each Test Administrator;
18. Outline instructions and conduct training sessions for Test Administrators and helpers.

The Test Security File is necessary to validate the school's compliance with the *Test Security Guidelines*. It provides corroborating evidence that the school personnel attended test security training, followed OSSE's test administration guidelines, and that each employee signed the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements*.

**VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Notes</b>
School Test Plan	Did not review, 2013 DC CAS file was missing.
Incident Reports	Did not review, 2013 DC CAS file was missing.
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Did not review, 2013 DC CAS file was missing.
Other Documents Reviewed.	Did not review, 2013 DC CAS file was missing.