

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Maya Angelou Public Charter School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Maya Angelou Public Charter School
School Address	5600 E. Capitol Street, NE Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	January 28, 2014

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		WTR Erasure (2013)		WTR Erasure (2012)		Person Fit		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

For the 2013 DC CAS test, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) selected schools to flag for investigation based upon a comprehensive data analysis, as well as random selection. For the 2013 DC CAS test integrity investigation, one testing group from Maya Angelou Public Charter School (“Angelou”) was randomly selected by OSSE.

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. Testing groups are flagged when there is a large number of 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 testing group.
 - 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 testing group 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

Classroom-level information is provided below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.05	0.26	0.67	0.10	0.15
	Math (STATE)	3.06	0.10	0.62	-0.01	0.17
	Reading (CLASS)	2.06	-0.04	1.17	0.62	0.16
	Reading (STATE)	3.12	0.35	0.49	-0.02	0.24

Angelou was a randomly selected school and our investigation was conducted on Test Administrator 1's testing group. Test Administrator 1 left the school at the end of the 2013 school year. Therefore, A&M interviewed an alternate test administrator, Test Administrator 2.

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
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Because Angelou 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 4 individuals: 2 current staff and 2 students.

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

Overall, based on the findings at Angelou, 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 Test Security File.

When the interviewers arrived at Angelou on January 24, 2014, Admin 1 was unable to locate the Test Security File. Admin 1 had moved offices since the administration of the 2013 DC CAS test, and explained that [REDACTED] must have misplaced the file during the move. Admin 1 stated that the file, "was around somewhere." [REDACTED] took the interviewers' contact information and indicated that [REDACTED] would get in touch when the file was located. At the date of this report, the interviewers have not reviewed the Test Security File or received notice from Admin 1 that it has been located.

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

Document	Notes
Test Security File	No; file missing.
Irregularity Reports	Yes; one cited for 2013, which is detailed in Admin 1's interview summary.
Other Documents Reviewed.	None