

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Beers Elementary School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Beers Elementary School
School Address	3600 Alabama Ave SE Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 14, 2013; March 22, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO

One classroom in Beers Elementary School was flagged for Extraordinary Growth and Wrong to Right (WTR) Erasures for both the Math and Reading portions of the 2012 DC CAS.

Extraordinary Growth is based on a student's growth from 2011 to 2012 on the DC CAS test. Growth of an individual student is measured by the change in the Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL). In addition, the average Median Growth Percentile scores of the flagged classroom indicates that the students in the flagged classroom experienced substantial growth as compared to the state growth average. Classes in which the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) scores of the students were significant were also flagged for extraordinary growth.

The presence of WTR erasures, well above the state average, is typically a sound, and singular, indicator of testing abnormalities.¹

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary

Classroom information is provided below.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg. Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	3.2	0.5	12.0	2.6	0.5	77.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	12.0	0.8	0.1	48.7
	Reading (CLASS)	3.2	0.3	8.6	2.3	0.6	84.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	9.9	0.6	0.1	49.5

The flagged classroom displayed an average growth in proficiency level of 0.5 in Math, compared with the state-wide growth of 0.1. The classroom's average growth for the Reading portion of the 2012 DC CAS was 0.6, while Reading growth at the state-wide level was 0.1.

In addition, the classroom was flagged for an average of 2.6 WTR erasures in Math compared to the state average of 0.8; and 2.3 WTR erasures in Reading compared to 0.6 at the state level.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Beers ES	3/14/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Beers ES	3/14/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	Beers ES	3/14/2013
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Beers ES	3/14/2013
[REDACTED]	Proctor 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Beers ES	3/14/2013
[REDACTED]	Proctor 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Beers ES	3/14/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	John Philip Sousa MS	3/21/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	John Philip Sousa MS	3/21/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	John Philip Sousa MS	3/21/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	John Philip Sousa MS	3/21/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1E	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Attending middle	Attending middle

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
				school – did not interview	school – did not interview

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extraordinary level of growth and the number of WTR erasures in Math and Reading for the flagged classroom, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator provided assistance to students before or during the test.

We interviewed five current staff members, one former staff member, and four students. Since this was a 5th grade class, all the students had graduated to middle school and therefore were no longer at Beers and had to be interviewed at their respective new schools. We did not interview Student 1E, who had moved to a different middle school than the other four students.

During the 2011-2012 school year, Teacher 1 was a [REDACTED] classroom teacher and administered the Reading, Math, and Science sections of the 2012 DC CAS to her students. Teacher 1 most likely did not have a proctor in the classroom during DC CAS testing. Teacher 1 appeared to act in an intentionally dishonest manner during our interviews.

During our interviews we noted a process issue; however, the issue is not a clear test violation and has, therefore, not been described in the detail section below. This issue relates to statements by Teacher 1, Proctor 1, and students indicating that Proctor 1, who served as a Test Administrator for the special education students from Teacher 1's class, collected test booklets for the special education students from Teacher 1 rather than from the Test Chairperson (i.e., Teacher 1 would sign out all of the books for her class, including those for the special education students who were not part of her testing group). At the end of testing, Proctor 1 returned the booklets to Teacher 1, who then returned the booklets of the entire class to the Test Coordinator.

Based on interviews with the flagged teacher, proctors and students, it appears Teacher 1 helped the students by clarifying or explaining parts of the test questions, which is a violation of the 2012 Test Security Guidelines. This potential violation is described in detail below. In addition to noting identified testing violations, we have also noted other procedural lapses which came up during the course of our interviews.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Beers ES, 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: Simplified, clarified, broke down into steps, or explained a part of the test question.

We interviewed three students who took the Reading and Math portions of the 2012 DC CAS test in Teacher 1's classroom. Two students, Student 1B and Student 1C, indicated Teacher 1 assisted students on the exam by reading words aloud and explaining the meaning of difficult words in test questions.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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.

Any explanation or clarification of a 2012 DC CAS test question or part of a question is a violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

B. Testing Violation 2: Procedural Lapses

1. *Test materials for SPED testing group collected from and returned to Teacher 1 rather than Test Chairperson*

Statements made by Teacher 1, Proctor 1, and students indicated that Proctor 1, who served as a Test Administrator for the special education students from Teacher 1's class, collected test booklets for the special education students from the Teacher 1 rather than from the test Chairperson (i.e., Teacher 1 would sign out all of the books for her class, including the special education students who were not part of her testing group). At the end of testing Proctor 1 returned the booklets to Teacher 1, who then returned the booklets of the entire class to the Test Coordinator

2. Inconsistencies Regarding Who Actually Proctored in Flagged Classroom

Teacher 1 did not appear truthful during her interviews and made contradictory statements regarding who her proctor was – statements that were not corroborated by the proctors that she identified (and with whom we spoke).

Teacher 1 could not recall the proctor in her classroom for the 2012 DC CAS. According to Admin 2 and the school's 2012 Test Plan, Teacher 1's proctor was Proctor 1. Proctor 1 had no memory of proctoring for Teacher 1. According to Proctor 1, his role in the 2012 DC CAS was to take the special education students out of Teacher 1's classroom and administer the test to those students in another room. During our first interview with Teacher 1, she stated that Proctor 1 removed the special education students from her classroom and did not return.

After we spoke with Proctor 1, who claimed he had "never been a proctor in a general education classroom," we conducted a follow up interview with Teacher 1. During our second interview, Teacher 1 insisted that there was a proctor in her room "90% of the time," however the proctor "popped in and out." Initially she claimed Proctor 1 had been a proctor in her testing room, then changed her story and stated he was never in the room. We noted that Teacher 1 appeared to be defensive and intentionally unclear in her responses. After we showed her the school's Test Plan, which listed the teacher/proctor combinations for the 2012 DC CAS, Teacher 1 indicated that her proctors had changed every day and she had three different proctors rotating "in and out" of her classroom. When pressed for the names of these proctors, Teacher 1 stated that Proctor 1, Proctor 2, and Proctor 3 had been her proctors.

We interviewed Proctor 1 a second time. He did not recall proctoring for Teacher 1 or rotating with Proctor 2 or Proctor 3. When we interviewed Proctor 2, he clearly stated he was a proctor for another teacher and despite Teacher 1's claims, he "had never stepped foot in her class" for any part of the 2012 DC CAS. The Test Plan and a test seating chart verified that Proctor 2 was listed as proctor for another teacher in 2012. Proctor 3 left the school at the end of the 2012 school year, however Admin, who knew that we wanted to talk to Proctor 3, later discovered that he was visiting the school on the day of our interviews and sent him up to talk with us. We spoke to Proctor 3 and he stated that he "was never a proctor" for Teacher 1 for the DC CAS or for any other test.

Based on the interviews with Teacher 1 and Proctors 1, 2 and 3, we are not certain if Teacher 1 had a proctor in the classroom. Having a proctor in the classroom is not a testing requirement. We have significant concerns about the inconsistent responses offered by Teacher 1; she appeared to intentionally attempt to confuse the interviewers regarding the proctor situation.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Based on our interviews, it appears that the proctor listed for Teacher 1's classroom was not her proctor during the test.
Irregularity Reports	None cited for 2012
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; however Teacher 1 was not listed on the Training attendance sheet.
Verification of DC CAS training form	We reviewed the 2012 Non-Disclosure Agreements and did not find one signed by Teacher 1.
Other Documents Reviewed	2012 Test seating charts verified that Proctor 2 was a proctor for another teacher as he claimed.

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Brightwood Education Campus

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Brightwood Education Campus
School Address	1300 Nicholson Street NW, Washington D.C., 20008
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 18, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
Teacher 2	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on data analysis performed by OSSE, one 6th grade classroom at Brightwood Education Campus was flagged for its 2012 DC CAS test results in the areas of:

- Wrong-to-Right erasures in Math in 2012;
- Wrong-to-Right erasures in Math and Reading in 2011;
- Extraordinary Growth in Math.

Additionally, one 7th grade classroom was flagged by OSSE for Low Variance in Math. However, DCPS also flagged this classroom for its 2012 DC CAS test results in the areas of:

- Extraordinary Growth in Math;
- Low Variance in Math and Reading;
- MGP Loss to ANET in Math and Reading; and
- % Basic to Proficient in Math.

The presence of WTR erasures, well above the state average, is typically a sound, and singular, indicator of testing abnormalities.¹ Extraordinary Growth is based on a student's growth from 2011 to 2012 on the DC CAS test; the extraordinary growth was measured by Median Growth Percentile (MGP) and Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL). Low variance indicates the degree of clustering of test scores within a test group. The average Median Growth Percentile scores of the flagged classroom indicates that the students in the flagged classroom experienced substantial growth as compared to the state growth average. % Basic to Proficient indicates that a significant number of students improved from "Basic" on the 2011 DC CAS test to "Proficient" on the 2012 DC CAS.

Classroom information is provided below.

6 th Grade	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	3.7	0.4	0.7	4.2	90.5
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	0.1	0.7	49.8

The classroom flagged by OSSE had a high Median Growth Percentile score of 90.5 in the Math portion of the test while the state average totaled 49.8, indicating that the students in the flagged classroom experienced substantial growth as compared to the state growth average. Moreover, this classroom had average WTR math erasures of 4.2 while the state average was 0.7.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Administrator 1			School	3/18/13
	Administrator 2			School	3/18/13
	Teacher 1		Test Administrator	School	3/18/13
	Teacher 2		Test Administrator	School	3/18/13
	Proctor 1		Proctor	School	3/18/13
	Proctor 2	Teacher	Proctor	School	3/18/13
	Student 1A	7 th Grader	6 th Grader	School	3/18/13
	Student 1B	7 th Grader	6 th Grader	School	3/18/13
	Student 1C	7 th Grader	6 th Grader	School	3/18/13

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Student 2A	8 th Grader	7 th Grader	School	3/18/13
	Student 2B	8 th Grader	7 th Grader	School	3/18/13
	Student 3C	8 th Grader	7 th Grader	School	3/18/13

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of the Extraordinary Growth, WTR erasures and other flags on the 2012 DC CAS test, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrators and/or Proctors engaged in behavior before, during, or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 12 individuals - 6 current staff, and 6 students.

Our investigation revealed one potential testing violation during the administration of the 2012 DC CAS test. This violation is described in detail below.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Brightwood EC, 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: Assisted, pointed out, re-read questions aloud, or used booklets to tell the students to go back and review answers for specific questions.

Student 1A stated that Teacher 1 would help students during the 2012 DC CAS test by reading aloud an entire question and by asking students to read specific questions carefully.

Student 1B stated that both Teacher 1 and Proctor 1 would tell individual students to check over a specific question by mentioning the question number. She recalled that when students said that they didn't understand a question, Teacher 1 and Proctor 1 would help them understand the question or word by explaining it or saying what it means. She stated that Teacher 1 helped with Reading and Proctor 1 helped with Math.

Student 1C also stated that, during the 2012 DC CAS test, Teacher 1 would ask specific students "to go back and re-read question #5 or #10" while standing next to them.

Students 1A, 1B and 1C indicated that Teacher 1 assisted students during the 2012 DC CAS test. Student 1B indicated that Proctor 1 assisted students during the 2012 DC CAS test; however, assistance by Proctor 1 was not corroborated by Students 1A or 1C. Teacher 1 and Proctor 1 denied helping students during the 2012 DC CAS test.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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.

Providing explanations or clarifications of 2012 DC CAS test questions and asking students to re-check specific questions are violations of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	None cited for 2012
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Training Materials; Non-Disclosure Agreements.

VII. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name	Name Reference	Position
	Teacher W	
	Teacher S	
	Teacher F	
	Student E	Student
	Student C	Student

Name		Name Reference	Position
		Student J	Student

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Eaton Elementary School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Eaton Elementary School
School Address	3301 Lowell Street NW, Washington D.C., 20008
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 14, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Subject Teacher 1	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on data analysis performed by OSSE, one classroom at Eaton Elementary School was flagged for its 2012 DC CAS test results in the areas of:

- Extraordinary Growth in Math and Reading; and
- Low Variance in Math.

Additionally DCPS has also flagged this classroom for its 2012 DC CAS test results in the areas of:

- Extraordinary Growth in Math and Reading;
- Low Variance in Math and Reading;
- MGP Loss to PIA in Reading; and
- SR/CR in Reading.

Extraordinary Growth is based on a student's growth from 2011 to 2012 on the DC CAS test; the extraordinary growth was measured by Median Growth Percentile (MGP) and Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL). Low variance indicates the degree of clustering of test scores within a test group. In addition, the average Median Growth Percentile scores of the flagged classroom indicates that the students in the flagged classroom experienced substantial growth as compared

to the state growth average. SR/CR flag looks at the correlation between students' performance on the constructive response questions and the multiple choice questions.

Classroom information is provided below.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	4.0	0.1	5.3	0.7	0.5	86.5
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.3	0.9	0.2	50.2
	Reading (CLASS)	3.8	0.1	6.5	0.5	0.4	79.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	10.9	0.7	0.1	50.2

The flagged classroom experienced a low variance among student test scores in the Math section of the 2012 DC CAS. The State variance was 11.3, while the classroom variance was only 5.3, indicating that it is possible that Math test answers were altered. In addition, the MGP scores in the Math portion of the test were significantly higher than the state score, indicating that students had substantial growth as compared to the state growth average.

DCPS also flagged this classroom for Low Variance and high MGP scores in both Reading and Math, MGP loss in the PIA in Reading (i.e., significant drop in the first PIA scores of the current school year versus the last PIA scores of the 2011-2012 school year), and low correlation in answers between constructive and multiple choice responses.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Admin 1			School	3/14/2013
	Admin 2			School	3/14/2013
	Teacher 1		Test Administrator	School	3/14/2013
	Proctor 1		Test Proctor	School	3/14/2013
	Student 1A			School	3/14/2013
	Student 1B			School	3/14/2013
	Student 1C			School	3/14/2013
	Student 1D			School	3/14/2013

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of the Extraordinary Growth and Low Variance in math on the 2012 DC CAS test, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator and/or Proctor engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 8 individuals: 4 current staff and 4 students.

Our investigation revealed two potential violations during the administration of the 2012 DC CAS test. These violations are described in detail below.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Eaton Elementary School, 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. Inappropriate monitoring during the test administration

Based on interviews with Proctor 1 and Student 1C, it appears that Proctor 1 read a book during the administration of the 2012 DC CAS. Proctor 1, by her own admission, stated that that she had a book with her during the 2012 DC CAS test and would glance over the book while monitoring the class.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

When administering tests in the statewide system of assessment, schools must:

7. Supervise students at all times during testing sessions.

Reading a book while administering the 2012 DC CAS test is a violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

B. Use of cell phones, electronics, or computer devices by test administrators and proctors during testing

Student 1B and Student 1D indicated that Teacher 1 was working on a computer while administering the 2012 DC CAS test. However, Student 1C said that Teacher 1 was doing paperwork during the 2012 DC CAS test. Teacher 1 and Proctor 1 denied that Teacher 1 was using a computer during the test. No incident reports were filed by either the monitor or the school with regard to the use of a computer by Teacher 1 while administering the DC CAS test.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 1), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

When administering tests in the statewide system of assessment, schools must:

4. Prohibit the use of cell phones, electronics, or computer devices by test administrators and proctors during testing;
7. Supervise students at all times during testing sessions.

Any usage of computers during the administration of the 2012 DC CAS test is a violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

Because of the contradictory information provided by students and the absence of any incident reports it is unclear if Teacher 1 used a computer during testing.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	None cited for 2012
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Training Materials; Non-Disclosure Agreements; Packing slips – DC CAS Test Materials; Sign-in and Sign-out sheets for each day of DC CAS testing

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Hendley Elementary School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Hendley Elementary School
School Address	425 Chesapeake Street SE, Washington, DC 20032
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 18, 2013; March 19, 2013; March 26, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Teacher 2	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Teacher 3	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Teacher 4	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Hendley Elementary School was flagged for Extraordinary Growth and Low Variance in the Math portion of the DC CAS, and Extraordinary Growth, Low Variance and Score Drop among students in the Reading portion of the DC CAS in the same classroom. Four (4) classrooms were flagged; three (3) 4th grade classrooms and one (1) 5th grade classroom.

The table above reflects the flags per OSSE's data analysis; however, two of the classrooms (Teacher 2 and Teacher 4) were added as a result of DCPS's flagging criteria.

OSSE Classroom information is provided below.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Reading (CLASS)	3.0	0.2	5.9	0.4	0.6	78.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	10.9	0.6	0.1	50.2

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	3.0	0.1	5.0	0.4	0.6	69.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.3	0.9	0.2	50.2
Teacher 3	Reading (CLASS)	3.0	0.3	8.6	1.0	0.5	80.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	10.9	0.7	0.1	50.2
Teacher 3	Math (CLASS)	3.3	0.2	7.0	0.7	1.0	88.5
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.3	0.9	0.2	50.2
Teacher 4	Math (CLASS)	3.7	0.3	10.8	0.9	1.0	96.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	12.0	0.8	0.1	48.7

The first classroom (Teacher 1) was flagged by OSSE for investigation in both the Reading and Math sections of the 2012 DC CAS. The classroom's growth in the Reading portion of the test, as noted by the change in the weighted proficiency level (WPL) was 0.6, compared to 0.1 across the State. In addition, the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) scores in Reading were 78.0, which were significantly higher than the State's average of 50.2, indicating that students had substantial growth as compared to the State average. The classroom also experienced Low Variance in the Reading section, with 5.9 in the classroom versus 10.9 across the State, while the Math section had 5.0 in the classroom versus 11.3 across the State.

The second classroom (Teacher 2) was not flagged by OSSE; however, DCPS requested an investigation based on their flagging criteria. The DCPS flags for this classroom were for:

- Low Variance in Reading
- High MGPs in Reading and Math
- SR/CR in Reading; and
- MGP loss on the ANET in both reading and Math

The third classroom (Teacher 3) was flagged by OSSE in both the Reading and Math portions of the 2012 DC CAS. The Reading section showed Score Drop and Extraordinary Growth, while the Math section showed Extraordinary Growth. The classroom's growth in the Reading portion of the test, as noted by the change in the WPL was 0.5 compared to 0.1 across the State, while the classroom's growth in Math was 1.0 compared to 0.2 across the State, indicating that students had substantial growth as compared to the State average.

The fourth classroom (Teacher 4) was flagged by OSSE for Extraordinary Growth in the Math portion of the test. The classroom's growth in the Math portion of the test was 1.0 compared to 0.1 across the State. In addition, the MGP scores in Math were 96.0, which were significantly higher than the State's average of 48.7, indicating that students had substantial growth as compared to the state average. Due to there only being one flag, this classroom was not flagged for investigation by OSSE; however, DCPS requested that this classroom be added based on its flagging criteria. The DCPS flags are as follows:

- High MGPs in Reading and Math
- SR/CR in Reading and Math; and
- MGP loss on the ANET in both reading and Math
- % Basic to Proficient in Math

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Admin 1			School	3/19/13
	Admin 2	N/A		N/A	N/A – Could not reach to schedule an interview
	Teacher 1		Test Administrator	School	3/18/13
	Teacher 2	N/A	Test Administrator	N/A	N/A
	Teacher 3	N/A	Test Administrator	N/A	N/A – Could not reach to schedule an interview
	Teacher 4		Test Administrator	School	3/19/13
	Proctor 1		Proctor	School	3/18/13
	Proctor 2		Proctor	School	3/18/13

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
		Teacher			
	Proctor 3		Proctor	School	3/18/13
	Proctor 4	N/A	Proctor	N/A	N/A – Could not reach to schedule an interview
	Student 1A			School	3/18/13
	Student 1B			School	3/18/13
	Student 1C			School	3/18/13
	Student 2A			School	3/18/13
	Student 2B			School	3/18/13
	Student 2C			School	3/18/13
	Student 2D			School	3/18/13
	Student 3A			School	3/18/13
	Student 3B			School	3/18/13
	Student 4A			Hart Middle School	3/26/13
	Student 4B			Hart Middle School	3/26/13
	Student 4C			Hart Middle School	3/26/13

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extraordinary growth, low variance, and score drop among student scores in the Reading and/or Math sections in multiple classrooms, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrators and/or Proctors were engaged in behavior before, during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 18 individuals: 5 current staff personnel, 1 former staff member, and 12 students. Teacher 2 is no longer at the school, and administered the 2012 DC CAS to a class requiring accommodations. Investigators attempted to schedule interviews with Administrator 2 and Teacher 3, but were unable to reach them.

During our interviews, a Student stated that Teacher 4 used her cell phone during the test. This statement was not corroborated through any of our other interviews and has therefore not been included as a potential testing violation.

We found four (4) potential testing violations at this school during the 2012 DC CAS, including: teachers assisting students; students cheating; students moving to the next section of test improperly; teachers and proctors not actively monitoring; teacher using a cell phone during the test; and unapproved accommodations. Most notably, 10 of the 12 students interviewed cited teacher assistance and/or students cheating during the test; 1 of the 12 students would not answer questions so the interview was concluded almost immediately.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings in the flagged classrooms at Hendley 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: Assisted, pointed out, re-read questions aloud, or used booklets to tell the students to go back and review answers for specific questions.

Based on interviews with Student 1B, Student 1C, Student 2B, Student 3A, Student 3B, Student 4B and 4C, it appears highly likely that teachers provided assistance to their students during the 2012 DC CAS.

Specifically, Teacher 1 re-read questions to students during the test and reviewed student test materials and answers during the test, telling students to go back and check their answers.

Teacher 2 reviewed test materials and answers during the test, identified incorrect answers, and told students to go back and check their answers. Note that only one student from Teacher 2's class noted this incident in our interviews. This has therefore not been corroborated for Teacher 2.

Teacher 3 pointed to students' test materials during the test and "helped" students.

Teacher 4 and Proctor 4 used booklets to review student answers, point at questions, and tell the students to go back and check their work. They also clarified questions for students during the test.

Teacher 1, Proctor 1, Proctor 2, Proctor 3 and Teacher 4 deny that any help or assistance was provided to the students in their respective classrooms. Teachers 2, Teacher 3 and Proctor 4 were not been reached for interviews.

In addition, Student 4A recalled taking the 2011 DC CAS with Teacher 1 the year before, and stated that Teacher 1 is known for helping students during the test, and that Teacher 1 personally helped Student 4A during the 2011 DC CAS.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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;
11. Scoring student responses; and
12. Making statements regarding the accuracy of the student's responses on the state test.

Helping students during the test by pointing or advising them to re-check their answers to specific questions is a clear violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

B. Testing Violation 2: Student(s) cheating

Based on interviews with Student 1A, Student 1C, Student 2B, Student 3B, Student 4B, and Student 4C, it is possible students were cheating during the 2012 DC CAS. Student 1A stated that cheating occurred, but did not give examples of how it occurred, and did not provide names. Student 1C stated that students used symbols during the test to communicate answers with one another, like using hand gestures. Student 2B, Student 3B, Student 4B, and Student 4C indicated that students cheated during test by attempting to look at other students' answers. Teacher 1, Proctor 1, Proctor 2 and Proctor 3 all stated that no cheating occurred during the DC CAS. However, Teacher 1 noted that he has had problems with students cheating outside of the DC CAS, and has had to give students detention and call their parents about the cheating in the classroom.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines....by a student shall constitute a test security violation ..; such violations include but are not limited to the following:

1. Sharing test answers with another student, through written, electronic, verbal or gestured means; and
2. Copying another student's answers, or requesting or accepting help from another person.

It has not been validated that student cheating occurred during the 2012 DC CAS in Classroom 1. However, multiple students reported that it happened during the test, and Teacher 1 confirmed student cheating on non-standardized testing. This is a possible violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

C. Testing Violation 3: Allowed students to go back to a previous section or move ahead to the next section of test

Based on interviews with Administrator 1, Proctor 1, Student 1B and Student 4A, it appears that multiple students looked ahead to the next section of the test. Administrator 1 indicated that he was aware of possibly one student moving ahead to the next section of the test, but stated that if that occurred during testing, monitors are required to be notified. Proctor 1 stated that one or two students in her classroom moved ahead to the next section on the 2012 DC CAS, and that she reported it to Teacher 1. She wasn't sure if Teacher 1 ever reported it. She believed this was on the Math section of the test. Student 1B stated that when she was done with a section on the test, she was allowed to "look and see what's coming up" on the test. Student 4A stated that she was allowed to look at the next section of the test when she was finished with her current section.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 2), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

When administering tests in the statewide system of assessment, schools must:

7. Supervise students at all times during testing sessions.

In addition, the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines....by a student shall constitute a test security violation ..; such violations include but are not limited to the following:

17. Failure to report any state test security breach.

Allowing students to move ahead to next section of the test while administering the 2012 DC CAS test is a violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

D. Testing Violation 4: Provided unapproved accommodation(s) to a student(s)

Based on interviews with Proctor 2, it appears one student in the class with accommodations was not allowed to have questions read aloud during the test. Students with similar accommodations should be tested together.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines....by a student shall constitute a test security violation ..; such violations include but are not limited to the following:

7. Providing unapproved test accommodations to a student.

Further, *OSSE Testing Accommodations Manual* (Page 30), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

For small group testing accommodations:

The number in a room is to be determined by student need and grouping of those with similar needs.

Investigators were not able to review a copy of each students' IEPs to validate this occurred.

Providing unapproved test accommodations, while administering the 2012 DC CAS test is a violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	None cited for 2012
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Non-Disclosure Agreements;	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	N/A

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Kenilworth Elementary School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Kenilworth Elementary School
School Address	1300 44th St NE, Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 13, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO

Kenilworth Elementary School (Kenilworth) was flagged for Score Drop and Wrong-to-Right (WTR) Erasures in 2012 among students in the Math and Reading portions of the DC CAS in one classroom. There were no flags for Extraordinary Growth, Low Variance and WTR Erasure (2011). Classroom information is provided below.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Reading (CLASS)	2.4	0.3	13.9	3.5	NaN	NA
	Reading (STATE)	2.8	0.3	11.2	1.0	0.3	NaN
	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	2.8	0.6	14.7	4.2	NaN	NA
	Math (STATE)	2.8	0.4	12.9	1.4	0.5	NaN

The flagged classroom experienced a Score Drop and high levels of WTR Erasures among student test scores in the Reading and Math section of the 2012 DC CAS.

For the two flags for this classroom, Score Drop and WTR Erasure, we only have detailed student data for WTR Erasures, and therefore there is no Score Drop information displayed in the above table.

The Score Drop for this classroom is based on the Reading and Math scores of the students to which Teacher 1 administered the 2011 DC CAS test; there was a significant drop, as compared to the state average, in these students' scores from 2011 to their Reading and Math scores in 2012. Teacher 1 received this flag because OSSE's analysis of both the 2011 and 2012 CAS scores revealed that in her 2011 classroom, more than 70% of the students had a corresponding 2012 score that showed an improbable drop (less than 5.0% chance). Accordingly, since Teacher 1's 2011 students were not in Teacher 1's classroom for the 2012 DC CAS test, we did not interview any of the students in relation to the Score Drop flag. The students we interviewed were in Teacher 1's classroom for the 2012 DC CAS and therefore the only relevant flag for these students was the WTR Erasure flag. Teacher 1 was interviewed with respect to both flags – Score Drop and WTR Erasure.

In addition, the classroom was flagged for an average of 3.5 WTR erasures in Reading compared to the state average of 1.0; and 4.2 WTR erasures in Math compared to a 1.4 average at the state level.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/13/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/13/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	Teacher	Test Administrator	School	3/13/2013
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	Proctor	Telephone	3/28/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/13/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/13/2013

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Student 1C	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/13/2013
	Student 1D	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/13/2013
	Student 1E	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/13/2013

IV. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name	Name Reference	Position
	Proctor J	

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extraordinary WTR Erasures and Score Drop among student scores in the Math and Reading sections, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator and/or Proctor provided assistance to students before, during or after the test.

We interviewed nine individuals: three current staff personnel, one former staff person and five students.

For the school year 2011-2012, Teacher 1 was teaching 3rd grade and administered the Reading and Math sections of the 2012 DC CAS to her students.

Based on interviews with the flagged teacher and students in her classroom, it appears Teacher 1 helped the students by clarifying or explaining part of the test questions, which is a violation of the 2012 Test Security Guidelines. This potential violation is described in detail below.

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

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Testing Violation 1: Assisted, pointed out, re-read questions aloud, or used booklets to tell the students to go back and review answers for specific questions

During our interviews, three of the five students stated that Teacher 1 helped them on the test by specifically pointing to a question. Student 1A said Teacher 1 would “point to the question I got wrong and say to pick another answer.” Additionally, Student 1C recalled Teacher 1 would look over his shoulder and point to a question and say “look again.” He knew that meant the question

might be wrong and he would change his answer. Student 1D also said that Teacher 1 pointed to specific questions and told him to check them over.

In addition, Teacher 1 stated that while not pointing to a specific question, she told students to “look again” running her index finger up and down the length of a page.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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.

Pointing to questions and advising students to re-check their answers is a violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	No issues noted
Irregularity Reports	None cited for 2012
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	No issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	No issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed	Training Materials; Letter to parents; Non-Disclosure Agreements; Packing slips – DC CAS Test Materials; Sign-in and Sign-out sheets for each day of DC CAS testing

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Langdon Education Campus

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Langdon EC
School Address	1900 Evarts St. NE Washington, DC 20018
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO

Langdon Education Campus had one classroom flagged for Score Drop in Math and Reading and Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures on the Reading portion of the 2012 DC CAS.

Classroom information is provided below.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg. Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	2.8	0.5	12.4	3.0	0.6	N/A
	Math (STATE)	2.8	0.4	12.9	1.4	0.5	N/A
	Reading (CLASS)	3.1	0.4	14.5	5.2	0.6	N/A
	Reading (STATE)	2.8	0.3	11.2	1.0	0.3	N/A

The flagged classroom for Teacher 1 displayed a significant number of Wrong to Right erasures in Reading. The average number of WTR erasures in the classroom was 5.2, while the State-wide average WTR for Reading was 1.0. The presence of WTR erasures, well above the State average, is typically a sound, and singular, indicator of testing abnormalities.¹

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary

Teacher 1 was also flagged for a Score Drop, indicating that students in her class during the 2011 test scored significantly lower with a different teacher on the 2012 test. In a score drop simulation performed by OSSE, 100% of simulations indicated that Teacher 1's 2011 students should have scored higher than they did in 2012.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Would not interview without attorney present; did not provide attorney contact information	
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/26/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 5	[REDACTED]	None	Phone Interview	6/4/2012
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 3	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/21/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 5	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	Phone Interview	3/26/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	8/24/2012
[REDACTED]	Teacher 7	Unknown – No longer works for DCPS	[REDACTED]	Did not respond to voicemails left on 3/22/2013 and 3/26/2013	
[REDACTED]	Teacher 8	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	Phone Interview	3/26/2013
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	N/A	Proctor	Phone	3/22/2013

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		Interview	
[REDACTED]	Proctor 2	No longer at Langdon	Proctor	Phone Interview	3/22/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/19/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 6A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Langdon EC	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 6B	N/A – No longer at school	[REDACTED]	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Student 6C	N/A – Currently in PG County Schools	[REDACTED]	N/A	N/A

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The investigation at Langdon focused on 3 areas:

- Flagged Classroom – as noted above, Teacher 1's classroom was flagged in Reading for both score drop and extraordinary growth.
- Incident Reports – Two incident reports categorized as "critical" were filed regarding the 2012 test administration at Langdon. One report was based on an anonymous tip alleging a culture of cheating at Langdon including cheating on the 2012 DC CAS. The second incident report was filed by a DCPS observer.
- Missing test booklets – CTB reported that five test booklets were never returned to the CTB facility. The booklets include a Grade 2 Reading & Math test booklet, three Grade 7 Reading & Math test booklets and a Grade 4 Composition test booklet.

In March 2013, we interviewed 15 individuals: 8 current staff, 2 former staff, a former parent volunteer and 4 students.

A. Flagged Classroom

Given the extent of Wrong-to-Right erasures on the 2012 DC CAS test, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator and/or Proctor engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

With regards to this flag, we interviewed Teacher 1 (the flagged teacher), Proctor 1, and three students that tested in Teacher 1's classroom in 2012. All three students interviewed indicated that students received assistance from Teacher 1 during the 2012 DC CAS. Teacher 1 and Proctor 1, however, denied providing any assistance.

In total, 17 of Teacher 1's 24 students had 5 or more WTR erasures, representing 71% of the class. 11 of these students had 10 or more WTR erasures on the test, representing 46% of the class. Teacher 1 claimed that she did not recall students erasing many answers during the test.

B. Incident Reports

On May 9, 2012, DCPS received an anonymous tip alleging that staff members at Langdon Education Campus ("Langdon") have been violating testing policies during DC CAS tests, including the 2012 DC CAS test. The allegation stated that, "For years, Langdon has been cheating on the DCCAS. They [Staff members] have been copying the test in the late afternoon and would share it with the students. The students would take the test home and practice." It further stated that, "For the current 2012 DC CAS, they [staff members] did the same thing. When the test arrived at Langdon, they looked at the test questions and shared it with the students... Some of the staff members looked at the test before the monitors came on Wednesday." The anonymous tip did not specify which staff members were involved in the alleged cheating at Langdon.

We reviewed these allegations as well as a report generated as a result of a DCPS-led investigation in May through August 2012 (See Appendix A). That investigation included thirty-four interviews (including some of the same individuals that we interviewed in March 2013). Based on the findings in the initial May investigation and our follow up interviews, although there is no confirmation of cheating on the 2012 DC CAS, former staff members confirmed that test booklets were reviewed in advance of the 2010 DC CAS administration.

On April 19, 2012, a DCPS Observer at the school filed an incident report noting that, in a classroom designated for testing special education students (there were 3 2nd Grade special education students testing), each time she observed the room through the window, the test administrator, who she noted as being [REDACTED] was sitting at a student desk within an arm's length of one student and on the Observer's third visit to the classroom, she "saw the teacher with the student's answer book in her lap-there was nothing on the student's desk." She continued to note that the teacher "flipped through 3-5 pages of the book and then put the book back on the student's desk. She pointed to a place in the student's book."

We attempted to speak with the Test Administrator for the classroom; however, due to the disorganization of the Test Security binder and Admin 2's refusal to speak with us, we were unable to confirm which teacher actually administered the test to that class. Based on the DCPS Observer's notes, we spoke to Proctor 1 and Proctor 2 regarding this incident, but both indicated that they did not administer a test to 2nd Grade students. Based on handwritten notes in the Test Security binder, we were able to determine the

names of the 2nd graders who tested as special education students. Of the three students noted, two were no longer at the school and our interview with the one remaining student was brief as he was unable to recall anything about the test. As such we were unable to reach a conclusion as to what actually occurred in the classroom.

C. Missing Booklets

CTB reported that five test booklets were never returned to the CTB facility. The booklets include a Grade 2 Reading & Math test booklet, three Grade 7 Reading & Math test booklets and a Grade 4 Composition test booklet. Admin 2 responded to OSSE's request for support regarding the missing information indicating that "all test materials used and unused were packaged by [Admin 3] and the monitors assigned by central administration." The school also noted that three of the five missing booklets were actually assigned to students. Admin 1 was not employed by the school until the current school year and is unaware of the missing booklets. Admin 3, though an Assistant Test Coordinator, was unaware that there was an issue regarding missing test booklets and Admin 2 refused to meet with us so we were unable to receive any further insight regarding the missing test materials.

Our investigation (including our findings from our earlier 2012 investigation – See Appendix A) revealed three potential testing violations related to the integrity of test answers, strong circumstantial evidence of potential violations involving teachers obtaining test materials prior to test day, and inappropriate monitoring during test administration. These potential violations are described in detail below.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Langdon EC, 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. Simplified, clarified, broke down into steps, or explained a part of the test question

Based on our interviews with students, it appears that Teacher 1 assisted students during the test by clarifying test questions.

Student 1A noted that during the test, students would often ask Teacher 1 what a word meant and Teacher 1 would respond by "explaining the word" in a way that was "helpful" to students.

Student 1B recalled that students would raise their hands to ask questions and Teacher 1 would respond by "giving a few hints" toward the correct answer.

Student 1C stated that Teacher 1 would often "give hints" in both the Reading and Math sections of the 2012 DC CAS test. On the Reading portion, Teacher 1 clarified words and pronounced them out loud to assist students in understanding them. According to Student 1C, Teacher 1

would also point to specific questions on student answer sheets and say “this is wrong, check it again.” Student 1C understood this to mean that he should change his answer.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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.

Any explanation or clarification of a 2012 DC CAS test question or part of a question is a clear violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

B. Inappropriate Monitoring During the Test Administration

During our interview with Teacher 1, she noted that [REDACTED] so she did not walk up and down the room to monitor students during testing. In addition, Proctor 1 noted that both she and Teacher 1 remained seated on opposite sides of the room throughout testing.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 7), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, that, during testing, Test Monitors and Proctors are required to “[w]alk around the room quietly and frequently...” Sitting throughout the test administration is a clear violation of the DC State Test Security Guidelines.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	We reviewed several incident reports;
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted

Document	Notes
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Anonymous letter regarding school-wide cheating;

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Miner Elementary School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Miner ES
School Address	601 15th St. NE Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 15, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
Subject	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Teacher 2	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on data analysis performed by OSSE, two classrooms at Miner Elementary School ("Miner ES") were flagged for their 2012 DC CAS test results in at least two of the following three areas:

- Score Drop
- Extraordinary Growth
- Low Variance; and
- Wrong-to-Right (WTR) Erasures in 2012.

The presence of WTR erasures, well above the state average, is typically a sound, and singular, indicator of testing abnormalities.¹ Score Drop is based on a statistically significant drop in the performance of a test group in 2012 versus the group's performance when it tested with the flagged teacher in 2011. Extraordinary Growth is based on a student's growth from 2011 to 2012 on the DC CAS test; the extraordinary growth was measured by Median Growth Percentile

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary.

(MGP) and Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL). Low Variance indicates that there is a high degree of clustering of test scores and is used as a proxy for similarities in testing patterns within a test grouping.

There were two 4th grade classrooms flagged. One classroom was flagged for Low Variance among students in Math responses and for significant Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures for both Reading and Math. The second classroom was flagged for Score Drop and for Extraordinary Growth in both Reading and Math.

Classroom-level information is provided below:

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg. Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	2.8	0.2	6.7	2.9	0.1	35.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.3	0.9	0.2	50.2
	Reading (CLASS)	3.2	0.3	11.6	3.3	0.4	60.5
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	10.9	0.7	0.1	50.2

The flagged classroom for Teacher 1 displayed a low average variance in student answers for Math of 6.7 as compared to the State-wide variance for Math of 11.3, indicating possible testing irregularities, either through assistance from a teacher or among the students. In addition, Teacher 1's classroom was flagged for significant wrong to right erasures in reading and math, where the average WTR erasures for the classroom was 2.9 for Math and 3.3 for Reading versus the State averages of 0.9 and 0.7, respectively.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg. Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 2	Math (CLASS)	2.8	0.4	12.1	0.7	0.7	80.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.3	0.9	0.2	50.2
	Reading (CLASS)	2.5	0.3	11.1	0.2	0.4	74.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	10.9	0.7	0.1	50.2

Teacher 2's classroom was flagged for extraordinary growth based on the average growth in the weighted proficiency levels of 0.7 in Math and 0.4 in Reading, compared to State-wide growth of 0.2 and 0.1, respectively. Furthermore, the Median Growth Percentile scores in Math and Reading were 80.0 and 74.0, compared to the State averages of 50.2 for both subjects. Teacher 2's students from her 2011 testing cohort also displayed a statistically significant score drop in 2012 where they tested with a different administrator. This classroom was not flagged for Wrong to Right erasures.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Admin 1			Miner ES	3/15/2013

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]					
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	Teacher	Teacher	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	Teacher	Teacher/Proctor	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	Teacher	Teacher	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013
	Student 1C	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013
	Student 2A	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013
	Student 2B	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 2C	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 2D	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	Miner ES	3/15/2013

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the level of extraordinary growth, and the significance of the score drop and WTR erasures in math and reading, our investigation focused on the possibilities that: 1) the flagged Test Administrators provided assistance to students during the test or 2) the administrator flagged for WTR erasures modified the answers of some of her students.

We interviewed 12 individuals: 5 current staff and 7 students. During the 2011-2012 school year, Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 both taught 4th Grade. Based on our review, the score drop may be attributed to the fact that, according to Admin 1, the school has very strong 4th Grade teachers and very weak 5th Grade teachers. However, our student interviews revealed that both flagged teachers likely provided assistance to students by reading out loud and by explaining certain words/questions during the 2012 DC CAS.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Miner 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. Assisted, pointed out, re-read questions aloud, or used booklets to tell the students to go back and review answers for specific questions

Students 1A and Student 1B both indicated that when students had a question during the 2012 DC CAS test, Teacher 1 would re-read the question aloud to assist them in understanding the question. Both students also noted that Teacher 1 would occasionally explain the meaning of a word in a test question if students did not understand it.

Student 1A also indicated that Teacher 1 would point out wrong answers and tell students to “check their work.”

Two of the students interviewed indicated that Teacher 2 read questions aloud during the test. Student 2B and Student 2C stated that when students had questions, Teacher 2 would “explain the question” or read the sentence to assist the students.

Both Teacher 1, Proctor 1 and Teacher 2 denied providing any help to the students during administration of the test.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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 clear violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above. Based on the recounts of four students, two students in each of the flagged classroom, it is our understanding that both Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 likely provided assistance to students by reading out loud and by explaining certain word/questions during the 2012 DC CAS.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	One incident of a disruptive student removed from testing.
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Training materials, testing procedures, etc.

ALVAREZ & MARSAL
2012 District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS)
Test Security Investigation
School Summary Report

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Winston Education Campus

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Winston Education Campus
School Address	3100 Erie St., SE Washington, DC 20020
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 19, 2013 and March 25, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES

Flag	Score Drop		Extraordinary Growth		Low Variance		WTR Erasure (2012)		WTR Erasure (2011)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Teacher 2	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES

Based on a data analysis performed by OSSE, two classrooms at Winston Education Campus (Winston), were flagged for its 2012 DC CAS test results in the areas of:

- Wrong-to-Right (WTR) Erasures in 2012; and
- WTR Erasures in 2011.

Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 administered the 2012 DC CAS test to the flagged 3rd grade class and 8th grade class, respectively. Both teachers were flagged for a high number of WTR erasures on the Reading section of the DC CAS test in 2011 and 2012.

Additionally DCPS has also flagged Teacher 2's 8th grade classroom for its 2012 DC CAS test results in the areas of:

- Low Variance in Math and Reading;
- MGP Loss to PIA in Math; and

- SR/CR in Reading.

The presence of WTR erasures, well above the State average, is typically a sound, and singular, indicator of testing abnormalities.¹ Low variance indicates the degree of clustering of test scores within a test group. MGP Loss to PIA indicates that students' scores dropped significantly from the last PIA test for the 2011-2012 school year to the first PIA test of the 2012-2013 school year. SR/CR flag looks at the correlation between students' performance on the constructive response questions and the multiple choice questions.

Below is a comparison of the classroom and State-level data for the 2012 DC CAS for Teacher 1 and Teacher 2, specifically the average WTR erasures in each teacher's classroom compared to the Statewide average, for the same grade level and test subject.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Avg WTR Erasures 2012
Teacher 1	Reading (CLASS)	2.6	0.5	0.9	3.9
	Reading (STATE)	2.8	0.3	0.3	1.0

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Avg WTR Erasures 2012
Teacher 2	Reading (CLASS)	3.0	0.2	-0.1	1.7
	Reading (STATE)	3.0	0.3	-0.1	0.6

Winston was one of the schools flagged in our 2011 DC CAS Test Security Investigation. Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 are two of the three Test Administrators who were flagged for their 2011 DC CAS results. Teacher 1 was flagged for a 3rd grade class and Teacher 2 for a 7th grade class. No potential testing violations were identified at the school in last year's investigation. For 2012, the WTR erasures in Teacher 1's testing group are almost four times the State average. Teacher 2's erasures are lower (but still high) at almost three times the State average.

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	03/19/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A	N/A

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary.

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Admin 3	No Longer at School		N/A	N/A
	Teacher 1	Teacher	Test Administrator	School	3/19/13
	Proctor 1	Teacher	Proctor to Teacher 1	School	03/19/13
	Teacher 2	No Longer at School	Test Administrator	N/A	N/A
	Proctor 2	No Longer at School	Proctor to Teacher 2	N/A	N/A
	Student 1A	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/19/13
	Student 1B	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/19/13
	Student 1C	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/19/13
	Student 2A	9 th Grade	8 th Grade	High School	3/25/13
	Student 2B	9 th Grade	8 th Grade	High School	3/25/13
	Student 2C	9 th Grade	8 th Grade	High School	3/25/13

IV. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name	Name Reference	Position
	Teacher H	
	Teacher M	
	Teacher F	
	Teacher C	

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the high number of WTR erasures in 2012 and 2011 on the students' answer sheets for the DC CAS Reading test, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrators and/or Proctor's engaged in behavior before, during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed nine individuals: Three current staff members and six students.

We have attempted to contact the following individuals who are no longer at the school to schedule interviews: Admin 2; Admin 3; Teacher 2; and Proctor 2. At the date of this report, we had received no response from these individuals.

Our investigation revealed one potential testing violation related to the integrity of test answers at the classroom level. The potential violation is described in detail below.

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

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Testing Violation 1: Simplified, clarified, broke down into steps, or explained a part of the test question

Based on interviews with Students 2A and 2C, it appears Teacher 2 helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test by clarifying or simplifying a part of the test question.

Student 2A stated that during the test Teacher 2 helped the students, specifically by showing them how to answer the questions. He confirmed that this was during the 2012 DC CAS test, not a practice test. Student 2A stated he was helped in this way “maybe once” but could not remember the subject. When asked if Teacher 2 ever pointed to specific questions on his test, and given the example of what the teacher might say - “Student 2A, check question number 5,” Student 2A stated he was told to check specific questions because he got the answer wrong. We then asked what Student 2A thought Teacher 2 meant when she pointed to a specific question on his tests, Student 2A backtracked on his earlier comment, and said, in his opinion; it meant he should check all of his answers.

Student 2A did not recall the number of times he changed answers on his test and in the course of the interview he stated three times that they were not given test answers.

Student 2C stated that, while taking the test, if a student raised his/her hand asking for help understanding a question, Teacher 2 simplified the question for them. She explicitly confirmed that Teacher 2 provided this help to students during the 2012 DC CAS test, not during a practice test.

Teacher 2 and Proctor 2 are no longer employed by Winston ES. We were provided their contact information, but our attempts to contact them were unsuccessful. As a result, we were unable to speak with them regarding the 2012 DC CAS test, specifically the above statements made by Student 2A and Student 2C during our interviews.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 9), 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:

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.

Any explanation or clarification of a 2012 DC CAS test question or part of a question is a clear violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
DCPS Assessment Guidance Completed Test Plan; Completed Test Security & Non-Disclosure Agreements; School-level training Sign-in sheets	No issues noted.
DC CAS Calendar Completed Test Coordinator Deliverables Check list	No issues noted.
Important Contacts for Test Coordinator; DCPS Roles & Responsibilities	No issues noted.
Instructions for DC CAS 2012 Data Verification Completed Data Verification Form; Printed Accommodations Report; Cohort Report; CAS Admission Withdrawal Reports	No issues noted.
Observer Forms Completed Before / After Testing Feedback Form; Completed Observation Forms; Completed Student Absentee Report	No issues noted.
FAQs Memos and Letters; Completed Accommodations Letters	No issues noted.
DC CAS Training Handouts OSSE Training Handouts; Accommodations Training Handouts; School-level Training Handouts	No issues noted.
Make up Testing List Completed List	No issues noted.
OSSE Security Guidelines	No issues noted.

Document	Notes
OSSE Accommodations Manual	No issues noted.
OSSE AYP Manual	No issues noted.
Miscellaneous Sign out / in sheets; Seating charts	No issues noted.