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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Community Academy PCS Amos

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Community Academy PCS Amos
School Address	1300 Allison Street NW
Field Team	██████████████
Date Interviews Conducted	01/28/2014; 01/29/2014

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	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Test Administrator 2	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by OSSE, Community Academy PCS Amos ("Amos") had two classrooms flagged for Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in Math and Reading.

For the 2013 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

---

[1] 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

are flagged when there is a large number of wrong to right (WTR) erasures as compared to the state average.

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]

Classroom-level information is provided below:

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.75	0.15	3.44	-0.14	-0.08
	Math (STATE)	2.86	0.02	1.07	0.06	-0.01
	Reading (CLASS)	2.69	0.20	2.67	0.20	0.32
	Reading (STATE)	2.78	0.00	0.83	0.05	0.26

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 1 displayed a significant number of WTR erasures in Math and Reading. The average number of WTR erasures in the classroom was 3.44 for Math and 2.67 for Reading, while the State averages for Math and Reading were 1.07 and 0.83 respectively. Generally, the presence of WTR erasures alone does not provide conclusive evidence of testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation.

---

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

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 2	Math (CLASS)	2.95	0.07	1.61	-0.82	0.09
	Math (STATE)	3.02	0.08	0.61	-0.03	0.08
	Reading (CLASS)	3.17	0.33	1.44	-0.13	0.16
	Reading (STATE)	2.98	0.12	0.57	0.00	0.23

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 2 displayed a higher than average number of WTR erasures in Math and Reading. The average number of WTR erasures in the classroom was 1.61 for Math and 1.44 for Reading, while the State averages for Math and Reading were 0.61 and 0.57 respectively. Generally, the presence of WTR erasures alone does not provide conclusive evidence of testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation.

III.   INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2013 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
██████	Admin 1	████	███	██	███
███	Test Administrator 1	██	█████	██	██
████	Admin 2	██	███	██	███
██	Student 1A	███	███	██	███
███	Student 1B	███	███	██	██
██	Admin 3	███	███	██	██
████	Admin 4	███	███	██	███
███	Admin 5	██	███	███	███
███	Test Administrator 2	██	███	██	███
██	Student 2A	███	███	███	██

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2013 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
███	Student 2B	███	███	███	███
███	Proctor 1	███	███	███	███

IV.   SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the high level of WTRs in the flagged testing groups, our investigation focused on the possibilities that the flagged Test Administrators engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 11 individuals: 7 current and former staff and 4 students.

Our investigation revealed one potential testing violation related to the security of test materials.

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

V.   DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Inconsistent sign-in sheet process for test materials.

When the interviewers reviewed the Test Security File at Amos it was discovered that security protocols for test material sign-in sheet were not observed. The sign-in sheets had several pages where test materials were signed out for a test day, but were never signed back in. Additionally, there were columns where test booklets were signed in and out, but answer sheets were not. The interviewers asked several of the personnel how materials were signed in and out, and none were able to explain the issues with the sign-in sheets.

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;

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

Test Chairperson before Testing must…

9. Develop a distribution process for state test materials;

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

Further, the *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 8), provided to us by OSSE, require, in relevant part, that:

The Test Chairperson during Testing [must]:

3. Ensure that all secured materials are signed in and signed out daily.

By failing to keep accurate records of the sign-in sheet process, the Test Chairperson at Amos has made it impossible to verify that the chain-of-custody requirements for testing materials were observed. Admin 2 was unable to explain why there were discrepancies with this process.

VI.   DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	Yes; no issues noted
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Test Sign-out/in Forms	Yes; issue noted with signing procedure
Other Documents Reviewed.	Non-Disclosure Agreements, Seating Charts, Test Administrator and Proctor assignments, etc.