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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

PERRY STREET PCS

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Perry Street PCS
School Address	1800 Perry St NE, Washington, DC 20018
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	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, two ████████ testing groups at Perry Street PCS ("Perry Street") were flagged. Both Test Administrators' classrooms were flagged for Wrong-to-Right ("WTR") erasures in Reading and Math.

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

---

[1] 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

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.

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]

Testing group information is provided below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.92	0.28	3.06	-0.05	0.01
	Math (STATE)	2.86	0.02	1.07	0.06	-0.01
	Reading (CLASS)	2.89	0.21	2.38	0.15	0.28
	Reading (STATE)	2.78	0.00	0.83	0.05	0.26

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 1 displayed high WTR erasures in both Reading and Math. The testing group had average WTR erasures of 2.38 and 3.06 for Reading and Math, respectively. The State average WTR erasures for Reading was 0.83, and 1.07 for Math. Thus, Test Administrator 1's testing group displayed almost three times as many WTR erasures as the State average in both subjects.

---

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

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 2	Math (CLASS)	2.08	-0.03	9.13	-0.08	-0.19
	Math (STATE)	2.86	0.02	1.07	0.06	-0.01
	Reading (CLASS)	2.09	-0.09	8.13	0.28	0.31
	Reading (STATE)	2.78	0.00	0.83	0.05	0.26

The flagged testing group for Test Administrator 2 displayed high WTR erasures in both Reading and Math. The testing group had average WTR erasures of 8.13 and 9.13 for Reading and Math, respectively. The State average WTR erasures for Reading was 0.83, and 1.07 for Math. Thus, Test Administrator 2's testing group displayed a level of Reading WTRs 9.8 times higher than the State average and a Math WTR level 8.5 times the State average.

III.   INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

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

IV.   SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of WTR erasures in Math and Reading for both Test Administrators' testing groups, our investigation focused on the possibilities that the flagged Test Administrators and/or

Proctors engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test. As more fully discussed below, we also investigated a self-reported testing violation related to a teacher providing unapproved/unauthorized materials to students prior to the test.

We interviewed 12 individuals: 6 current staff and 6 students. █████████████████
██████████████████████████████████████

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

V.   DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Providing post-it notes to a student.

On May 3, 2013, the Test Chairperson submitted an incident report to OSSE detailing the use of post-it notes during testing. A ██████ teacher for a non-flagged testing group gave out post-it notes of encouragement to all the students in the classroom. █████████████████████
███████████████████████████ The sticky notes contained statements of encouragement. The sticky notes contained statements such as ████████████████████
██████████████," and "████████████. & use those strategies!"

The acronyms ██████████████████ relate to test-taking strategies and were meant to remind the students of those strategies. These sticky notes would therefore be considered to be inconsistent with the administering the test according the procedures provided by OSSE. Test Administrator 3 was the Test Administrator for the testing group. Test Administrator 3 claimed that the students "did not care for the sticky notes" and that "most students threw them in trash." Test Administrator 3 said ██ informed the students to "throw out the sticky notes or keep them."

According to the incident report which was later confirmed though our interview, Admin 2 talked to the ██████ teacher about the incident immediately after it had occurred. Admin 2 instructed ██ that "██ could give students words of encouragement but they could not contain strategies nor could they be on the students desks during testing." ██████████████████
█████████████████████████████

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 test violation…such violations include but are not limited to the following:
>
> 2. Administering the 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.

Providing students with unapproved testing materials is a clear violation of the *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above. Based on the recollection of the staff and students at Perry Street, even though a different person created the notes, it appears that Test Administrator 3 permitted students to use unapproved testing materials.

B. Compromise in the chain of custody of testing materials.

We discovered during our interviews that, during 2013 DC CAS testing, Test Administrator 2 left test materials under ▇ desk during ▇ testing group's breaks in testing. During this time, Test Administrator 2 would not always remain in the room; ▇ occasionally took students to the restrooms.

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 test violation…such violations include but are not limited to the following:

> 3. Secure all state test materials prior to, during, and following each test administration and prohibit unauthorized access to test questions at all times.

Further, the *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), provided to us by OSSE, indicate that the requirements for Test Administrators during Testing include a requirement that Administrators maintain control of testing materials at all times:

> 10. Do not leave students or testing materials unattended at any time.

Leaving test materials unattended is a clear violation of the *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above. Test Administrator 2, by ▇ own admission, left test materials unattended during testing.

VI.   DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; reviewed

Document	Notes
Irregularity Reports	Yes; reveiwed
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; All Staff signed the NDA.
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; No issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Yes; No issues noted