

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

**CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

PLUMMER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>School Name</b>	Plummer Elementary School
<b>School Address</b>	4601 Texas Ave. SE Washington DC, 20019
<b>Field Team</b>	██████████
<b>Date Interviews Conducted</b>	January 17, 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	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the 2013 DC CAS comprehensive data analysis and random selection performed by OSSE, one ██████████ testing group in Plummer Elementary School (“Plummer”) was flagged for Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures for both the Math and Reading portions of the 2013 DC CAS.

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 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.

---

<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 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.<sup>2</sup>

Classroom-level information is provided below.

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	3.15	0.36	2.85	-0.11	0.06
	Math (STATE)	2.86	0.02	1.07	0.06	-0.01
	Reading (CLASS)	3.16	-0.13	3.23	-0.30	0.32
	Reading (STATE)	2.78	0.00	0.83	0.05	0.26

The average WTR erasures for Reading and Math in this testing group were significantly higher than the State average. The testing group WTR erasure average for Math was 2.85, while the State average was 1.07. The testing group WTR erasure average for Reading was 3.23, while the State average was 0.83.

---

<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]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Given the extent of the number of WTR erasures in Math and Reading, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed seven individuals: three current staff and four students. All the students and staff were present at the school during the administration of the 2013 DC CAS.

During our interviews we noted one potential DC CAS test violation related to the aiding of students during the test. This potential violation is described in detail below.

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

**V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS**

**A. Testing Violation 1: Teacher pointed out incorrect answers.**

We interviewed four students who took the Reading and Math portions of the 2013 DC CAS test in Test Administrator 1’s testing group. The testing group was comprised of students that Test Administrator 1 did not teach during the 2012-2013 school year; however, all four students indicated that Test Administrator 1 assisted the students on the exam.

Student 1A stated that Test Administrator 1 would clarify questions by reading them aloud. The student also said Test Administrator 1 “would read it and I would understand what it was.” No other student corroborated Student 1A’s statement that Test Administrator 1 read questions out loud.

Students 1B, 1C and 1D all recalled that Test Administrator 1 would assist them by telling them to recheck their work on the test. When asked more specifically, the three students said that Test Administrator 1’s help was geared towards specific questions and not to the overall test. The students knew when a particular question was wrong when the teacher told them to recheck their work.

Student 1B said that the Test Administrator would sometimes say, “you need to go over that answer.” When asked what that statement meant to ■■■, Student 1B said “it meant I should check my answer and see if it is wrong.”

Student 1C said that the teacher would say to “check [your answer] again.” We asked what that statement meant to Student 1C, and the student responded that it meant that the answer was wrong and needed to be changed.

Student 1D noted that Test Administrator 1 “gave us hints,” and further stated “■■■ would tell us where to look, but not the answer.” Student 1D recalled that, for Reading, Test Administrator 1 would “read the question in ■■■ head” and then tell the student where to look. Student 1D also said that Test Administrator 1 would walk up to ■■■, and tell ■■■ to “check ■■■ work” and ■■■ took that to mean that the answer to a specific question was wrong.

Test Administrator 1 denied providing any help to the students during administration of the test.

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. Engaging in discussions, instruction, or reviews of any contents of any portion of a state test before, during or after the testing period;
5. Aiding or assisting an examinee with a response or answer to a secure test item or prompt;
12. Making statements regarding the accuracy of the student’s responses on the state test.

Advising students to re-check their answers to specific questions is a violation of the State Test Security Guidelines listed above. Based on the statements of the four students interviewed, we conclude that Test Administrator 1 likely provided assistance to students during the 2013 DC CAS.

**VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Notes</b>
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	Yes; Reviewed
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Signed NDA Agreements for all staff interviewed