

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Ideal Academy Public Charter School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Ideal Academy Public Charter School
School Address	6130 N. Capitol Street NE, Washington, DC 20011
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	01/27/2014,02/05/2014, 2/18/2014

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	YES	NO	N/A	N/A	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by OSSE, one [REDACTED] testing group at Ideal Academy Public Charter School (“Ideal”) was selected for investigation.

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. Classrooms are flagged when there is a large number of Wrong to Right (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 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 information is provided below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	3.46	0.62	2.73	-0.27	0.07
	Math (STATE)	3.07	0.31	0.73	0.04	0.21
	Reading (CLASS)	3.39	0.43	1.27	-0.44	0.19
	Reading (STATE)	2.97	0.23	0.60	-0.03	0.21

The testing group administered by Test Administrator 1 displayed a higher than average number of Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in Math. The average number of WTR erasures in the classroom was 2.73 for Math, while the State average for Math was 0.73. Generally, the mere presence of WTR erasures does not provide conclusive evidence of testing irregularities, but it may warrant further investigation.

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]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1E	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the level of WTRs for Test Administrator 1’s testing group, our investigation focused on the possibility that Test Administrator 1 engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 8 individuals: 3 current staff and 5 students. [REDACTED]

Our investigation revealed one possible testing violation related to the Test Administrator assisting students during the exam and advising them to change and/or revise certain answers.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Ideal, this school has been classified as classified as critical (i.e., having definitive test security violations; test tampering or academic fraud).

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Aided student(s) during test by pointing out specific questions and by making statements regarding the accuracy of student responses on the test.

Students 1A and 1B gave virtually identical stories about receiving assistance on the 2013 DC CAS test. According to both students, when they would have questions pertaining to the test, Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 would urge the students to work through their problems. The two adults would also suggest that the students use particular methods in order to complete their problems successfully. The students also indicated that the Test Administrator and the Proctor would point to specific questions and tell the students that they should check their work.

The interviewers returned to Ideal on February 18, 2014 to interview three additional students, to obtain further corroboration of the statements made by Student 1A and Student 1B. Student 1D made corroborating statements. ■ stated that Test Administrator 1 would walk around and tell some students to go back and check their work for specific answers. Student 1E stated that Test Administrator 1 walked around the class and told the students to “go over your work and check your answers.” However, ■ did not state that ■ did this for specific questions.

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;
- 5. Aiding or assisting an examinee with a response or answer to a secure test item or prompt.

Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 both denied these statements. However, given the consistency of the students’ recollection, their interviewers determined that their statements were credible.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	Yes; reviewed

Document	Notes
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Non-Disclosure Agreements	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed	IEPs and Accommodations Plans; Training Materials; etc. No issues noted.