

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Arts and Technology Academy Public Charter School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Arts and Technology Academy Public Charter School
School Address	5300 Blaine St NE, Washington, DC 20019
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 20, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

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

Based on a data analysis performed by OSSE of the results of the 2012 DC CAS across the state, one classroom, a 4th grade class, at Arts and Technology Academy (ATA) Public Charter School was flagged in Math, in the following three areas:

- Score Drop;
- Extraordinary Growth; and
- Wrong-to-Right (WTR) Erasures in 2011.

The Score Drop for this Teacher is based on a comparison between the Reading and Math scores for Teacher 1's 2011 DC CAS students and the 2012 scores for those same students. While this class was flagged for both subjects for Score Drop, a subject area is only identified as having potential testing abnormalities if it is flagged in two or more areas. In this case, the Reading test was only identified for Score Drop so it was not flagged overall.

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 Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL) and the WPL change between years, and Median Growth Percentile (MGP) scores. Classes in which the MGP scores of the students grew significantly in Math and/or Reading, as compared to classes at the same grade level and in the same subject are also a determinant in identifying if growth is extraordinary. In addition, while we do not have student data for the 2011 WTRs, the presence of

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

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	AVG WTR 2012	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	2.9	0.6	0.4	2.3	77.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	0.2	0.9	50.2

Of the three flags for this classroom, Extraordinary Growth, Score Drop, and WTR Erasures in 2011, we do not have detailed student data for the latter two.

Teacher 1 received the Score Drop 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. Similarly, we do not have student data on the number of WTRs on the answer sheets of each student in Teacher 1's 2011 class.

The students we interviewed were in Teacher 1's classroom for the 2012 DC CAS and therefore were interviewed with respect to only the Extraordinary Growth flag, as it is the only relevant flag for the 2012 group of students. Teacher 1 was interviewed with respect to all three flags.

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	3/20/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/20/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED] Teacher	Test Administrator	School	3/20/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1A	No Longer at School	Proctor to Teacher 1	Unable to obtain contact info	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
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1B	[REDACTED]	Substitute Proctor to Teacher 1	Phone	3/21/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	5 th grade	4 th grade	School	3/20/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	5 th grade	4 th grade	School	3/20/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	5 th grade	4 th grade	School	3/20/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	5 th grade	4 th grade	School	3/20/13

A. Persons named by interviewees and not interviewed

Name	Name Reference	Position
[REDACTED]	Admin R	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin A	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Teacher L	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Teacher H	[REDACTED]

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the Score Drop on both the Math and Reading sections of the 2012 DC CAS, the Extraordinary Growth in Math, and the presence of WTR Erasures on the 2011 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 eight individuals: Four current staff and four students.

We attempted to schedule an interview with Proctor 1A, the former [REDACTED] Teacher at ATA who has since left the school. As of March 25, 2013, we were not able to obtain his contact information and, as a result, did not interview him.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings in the flagged classroom at the Arts and Technology Academy Public Charter 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: Simplified, clarified, broke down into steps, or explained a part of the test question.

Based on interviews with four students in Teacher 1's 2012 DC CAS classroom, it appears that Teacher 1 and Proctor 1A assisted students during the 2012 DC CAS test by helping them understand a test question. All four students indicated that this occurred.

Student 1A stated Teacher 1 and Proctor 1A helped "guide" the students on the test questions and sometimes they helped by reading the students the question. Student 1B stated that, during the test, Teacher 1 and Proctor 1A "helped a little," and if a student raised their hand for assistance, either Teacher 1 or Proctor 1A would help with understanding test questions. Student 1C stated Teacher 1 and Proctor 1A "gave pointers" while the students were testing. Student 1D stated that, if students raised their hands during the test, the teachers would help by walking them through the question; in addition, they would remind them about certain key parts to the question. He told us that Teacher 1 provided the most help and that help was given to almost everyone in the class.

During our interview with Teacher 1 she indicated that on the Math test she had been told you can say, "this word means this." After we indicated that students in her classroom had said she assisted them with breaking down or simplifying a test question, Teacher 1 responded, "You said they said I helped them with the *answers*," (she placed emphasis on "answers"), and then said she did not give answers, followed by, "I mean, maybe explain a word, but not..." (Her sentence trailed off there).

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

Therefore, any explanation or clarification of a 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: 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 students in Teacher 1's 2012 DC CAS classroom, it appears that Teacher 1 and Proctor 1A helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test by pointing to specific questions and answers, asking them to re-check their answers, and pointing out incorrect answers. Three of the four students interviewed indicated that this occurred.

Student 1A stated that Teacher 1 and Proctor 1A would tell them to look over their answers because they got a question wrong. Student 1B said both teachers pointed out wrong answers on the students' answer sheets, and Student 1C stated both teachers provided help by indicating to him that he got an answer wrong or did something wrong in the problem, and therefore, he knew he needed to re-check the question. He indicated that the teacher would point to a question to show him which question to re-check.

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 violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
OSSE State Test Security Guidelines	No issues noted.
OSSE Accommodations Manual	No issues noted.
DC CAS Testing Schedule	No issues noted.
DC CAS Parent Letter	No issues noted.
Special Education Room Assignments; Test Administrator and Proctor List	No issues noted.
DC CAS Training Sign-in	No issues noted.
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements	No issues noted.
Parent Permission Forms for DC CAS	No issues noted.
School Security Checklist (Test materials Sign out/in logs)	No issues noted.

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy PCS

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy PCS
School Address	1404 Jackson St NE, Washington, DC 20011
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 12, 25, 27, 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	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO

Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy PCS was flagged for Extraordinary Growth, Low Variance and Wrong-to-Right Erasures (WTR) among students in the Math and Reading portions of the DC CAS in one classroom. There were no flags for Score Drop or Wrong-to-Right 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)	3.0	0.3	8.8	4.4	0.3	69.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	10.9	0.7	0.1	50.2
	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	3.3	0.1	5.4	4.8	0.8	84.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.3	0.9	0.2	50.2

The flagged classroom experienced Extraordinary Growth, Low Variance and a high incidence of WTR Erasures in the Math section; in addition, the Reading section also experienced a high level of WTR Erasures. In a class of 13 students, 5 students had 5 to 10 WTR Erasures on the Reading section, while 7 students had 5 to 8 WTR Erasures on the Math section of the DC CAS. The classroom's growth, as noted by the change in the weighted proficiency level (WPL) was 0.8, compared to 0.2 across the State. In addition, the class Median Growth Percentile (MGP) score in the Math portion of the test was 84.0, which is significantly higher than the State score of 50.2, indicating that students had substantial growth as compared to the State average. The prevalence of WTR Erasures, coupled with the Extraordinary Growth and Low Variance indicates it is possible there was interference at the classroom level on the 2012 DC CAS.

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	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	Teacher	Test Administrator	A&M Offices	3/25/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/12/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1E	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/27/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1F	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/27/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1G	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/27/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1H	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	3/27/2013

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extraordinary WTR erasures, low variance and extraordinary growth among student scores in the Math section and WTR erasures in the Reading section, our investigation focused

on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator and/or Proctor were engaged in behavior before, during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.¹

We interviewed 13 individuals: five (5) current staff and eight (8) students. During our initial visit to the school on March 12, 2013, we were informed by the school that Teacher 1, the Test Administrator for the flagged classroom, was on temporary suspension, pending the results of this investigation. During our interview with Teacher 1 on March 25, 2013, she informed us that Teacher 2 had been terminated on March 22, 2013.

Our investigation did not provide conclusive evidence of cheating in the classroom. Only 1 of the 8 students interviewed indicated they received help during the 2012 DC CAS. However, Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 gave differing accounts of testing procedures in the classroom, leading the investigators to believe that some irregularity occurred during administration of the DC CAS. Below is a recap of the differing stories, and what the investigators were able or unable to validate.

1. Active Monitoring in the Classroom

Teacher 2 originally stated he stood in the back of the classroom, not actively monitoring the students. Aside from one student, no one else validated this statement. He later clarified that he had to have been walking around during the test due to his assisting in reading the instructions to students.

2. Outside Monitors in the classroom

Teacher 2 stated there was always a monitor present during testing. Teacher 1, Administrator 3 and Student 1F did not validate this statement, each stating that outside monitors were only present part of the time.

3. Use of Hand Gestures during testing to communicate answers

Teacher 1 stated that a student informed her that Teacher 2 taught the class to use hand gestures to communicate answers during the DC CAS, and that he used the gestures during the administration of the test. The student who provided this information to Teacher 1 no longer attends the school and cannot be reached. Teacher 2 cannot be reached for a follow-up interview to confirm or deny this. All students interviewed after the interview with Teacher 1 deny this occurred.

4. Teacher assistance during test and between breaks

One student interviewed stated that the teachers helped during the test by providing practice problems during breaks, and telling students to re-read questions. Both teachers deny

¹ Teacher 1 was also flagged for high erasures in 2011 at her previous school but was never interviewed. She was no longer at the school at the time of the 2011 investigation and investigators were unable to reach her to conduct an interview. During the 2011 investigation, two of her students stated that she had provided assistance during the 2011 DC CAS.

providing any assistance during the test. The remaining students deny that their teachers helped them during the test.

5. Leaving the room during testing

Two students recalled Teacher 1 leaving the classroom during testing. Teacher 1 denied leaving the room at all. Teacher 2 could not be reached to confirm or deny this occurred.

6. Teachers talking to each other during the test

Two students recalled Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 talking to each other during the test. Teacher 1 intimated that she did not pay attention to Teacher 2 during the test. Teacher 2 cannot be reached to confirm or deny if there were any discussions during the test.

7. Picking up and returning of Test Materials

At the school, both teachers in the classroom are labeled “Test Administrators,” and have equal duties during test. The school’s policy is for the Teacher’s Assistant, in this case Teacher 2, to pick up and return the test materials each day of testing. Teacher 1, Teacher 2 and Student 1F confirmed that Teacher 2 picked up and returned the test materials.

8. Administering the ANet Test

The school’s process to administer the ANet testing is similar to the DC CAS. They utilize the morning only, not the entire day. Teacher 1 recalled Administrator 3 allowing Test Administrators to take the entire day to complete the test, specifically referencing morning and afternoon sessions. The students’ answer sheets were not being filled in until the afternoon.

9. Missing State Test Security & Non-Disclosure Agreements

Administrator 2 stated that the *State Test Security & Non-Disclosure Agreements* were signed, however, the forms were missing, and investigators were unable to review.

Though we have identified various potential issues, as noted above, most of these issues have not been reported by more than one interviewee. As the information has not been corroborated, we have not included it in our list of detailed test violations.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Mary McLeod Bethune Day Academy PCS, 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. Failure to sign the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement and have available

Although Administrator 2 has stated that the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements for the school were signed, he was unable to provide copies of those agreements for our review. To the extent that individuals refuse to sign the agreements, this is considered a clear testing violation.

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:

1. Refusal to sign the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement*

Failure to sign and/or have available the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement is a clear violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

B. Inappropriate Monitoring During the Test Administration

In our initial interview with Teacher 2, he noted that Teacher 1 stood in one corner of the room and he stayed on the opposite end while testing occurred, standing, but not really walking around, so there was no possibility for interacting with students during the test. In a follow-up phone call, Teacher 2 stated that his original statement couldn't be possible because he helped read the instructions to the students, so clearly he had to have been walking around.

Student 1E was the only student who stated the teachers only stood, one at the front and one in the back of the room, watching the students.

Proctors and Teachers are required to actively monitor during the DC CAS administration.

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	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;	Admin 2 stated that she had seen these forms on the day of the interview, but could not find them during and after the interview
Other Documents Reviewed.	Packing slips; Student Pre-ID Roster; Attendance Sheets; Testing Schedule; Letter from McGraw Hill to Test Chairpersons; Sign-in / Sign-out sheets

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

COMMUNITY ACADEMY PCS – AMOS 1

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Community Academy PCS - Amos 1
School Address	1300 Allison St. NW, Washington, DC 20011
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 5, 2013 & March 8, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

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

Based on data analysis performed by OSSE, one 3rd Grade classroom at Community Academy PCS - Amos 1 Campus (Amos 1) was flagged for the 2012 DC CAS test results in the following areas:

- Score Drop (Math and Reading); and
- Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in 2012 (Reading and Math) and 2011 (Reading).

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.

Classroom information is provided below:

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Low Variance (Flagging)
Teacher 1	Math (CLASS)	3.7	0.4	10.7	5.7
	Math (STATE)	2.8	0.4	0.2	0.3
	Reading (CLASS)	3.4	0.2	8.1	3.6
	Reading (STATE)	2.8	0.3	11.2	1.0

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	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED] Teacher	Test Administrator/ [REDACTED]	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	Retired Volunteer	Volunteer/Proctor	Phone	3/8/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1D	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/5/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1E	4 th Grade	3 rd Grade	School	3/5/13

IV. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES BUT NOT INTERVIEWED

Name	Name Reference	Position
[REDACTED]	Teacher X	Teacher

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of WTR erasures in Teacher 1's 2012 testing group and the significance of the score drop experience by her 2011 testing group, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator engaged in behavior during or after test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 11 individuals: 5 current staff, 1 volunteer and 5 students. In some cases, described in the interview summaries below, we interviewed individuals on more than one occasion.

We noted that there were a total of 487 WTR erasures in Reading and Math in the school. Of that amount, 44 percent of those WTR erasures occurred in Teacher 1's classroom. There was one student with 17 erasures in Math that we were unable to interview as he no longer attended the school.

In one instance, a student noted that, days after the test, Teacher 1 would "help figure out what the answers [on the DC CAS test] would be." However, because this statement was not corroborated by the other students interviewed, it has not been included in the detail of potential test violations.

Our investigation revealed one potential testing violation related to Teacher 1 providing assistance to students during the test. This potential violation is described in detail below.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Amos 1, 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. 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 Students 1A, 1B and 1E as well as by Teacher 1's own admission, it appears that Teacher 1 helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test by telling students during the test to go back and check specific answers.

Student 1A stated that Teacher 1 would say "look at the answer" and that's how he figured out that his answer was wrong. He stated that she did that for a lot of the students.

Student 1B noted that, if students did not know the answer, Teacher 1 "might tell them the answer." Teacher 1 would tell students to look back in the booklet. Student 1B noted that Teacher 1 "helped a lot of kids in the class." She also noted that teacher 1 would "point to the answer when [the proctor] wasn't looking."

Student 1E stated that Teacher 1 pointed at the questions that the students should look at again – she would help them figure it out. He noted that this is how he knew which of his answers were wrong.

Teacher 1 stated that she would tell students to make sure that they checked certain questions. She noted that “if a math question said plus or minus” she would tell students to make sure they check “what the question is asking.”

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; and
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.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Irregularity Reports	Yes; issue was identified and resolved.
DC CAS 2012 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes.
Other Documents Reviewed	Training materials, testing schedule, test security checklists, CAPCS Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation guidebook etc.

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

William E. Doar Public Charter School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	William E. Doar Public Charter School for the Performing Arts
School Address	705 Edgewood St., NE, Washington, DC 20017
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 5, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

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

Based on a data analysis performed by OSSE of the results of the 2012 DC CAS, one classroom at the William E. Doar Public Charter School for the Performing Arts (Doar) was flagged in the following three areas:

- Extraordinary Growth;
- Wrong-to-Right Erasures in 2012; and
- Wrong-to-Right Erasures in 2011.

The flagged classroom was a 4th grade class and the flags occurred on the Reading test.

The presence of Wrong to Right (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. Growth of an individual student is measured by Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL) and the WPL change between years, and Median Growth Percentile (MGP) scores. Classes in which the MGP scores of the students grew significantly in Math and/or Reading, as compared to classes at the same grade level and in the same subject are also a determinant in identifying if growth is extraordinary.

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary

The comparison of the flagged classroom and State-wide averages for Extraordinary Growth and WTR erasures are below.

	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	MGP Scores
Teacher 1	Reading (CLASS)	3.2	0.8	0.5	3.5	90.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	0.1	0.7	50.2

The WPL growth of the flagged class is a 0.5 improvement over 2011, well above 0.1, the State average WPL. This teacher was flagged for the high number of WTR erasures in Reading on the 2011 DC CAS results; however, 2012 is the first year that student-level WTR data is available so it is not possible to compare the 2012 data to the 2011 results.

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	03/05/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	03/05/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	School	03/05/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	No Longer at School	Proctor to Teacher 1	Unable to obtain contact info	N/A
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	School	03/05/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 2	No Longer at School	Named by interviewee as Proctor to Teacher 2	Unable to obtain contact info	N/A
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	03/05/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	03/05/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	03/05/13

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
	Student 1D	5 th Grade	4 th Grade	School	03/05/13

IV. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name	Name Reference	Position
	Admin RH	
	Admin RC	
	Admin LA	
	Proctor KL	

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the high level of WTRs in this classroom in Reading for the 2012 and 2011 DC CAS tests, and the extraordinary growth levels of the students, in conjunction with this being the only classroom that met the flagging criteria at the school, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator may have engaged in behavior before, during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed eight individuals: four current staff members and four students.

Our interviews revealed that the Test Security binder for 2012 could not be located. As such we were unable to confirm whether State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements were actually signed by individuals involved in testing and whether those individuals signed in for DC CAS training in 2012. We have therefore, noted this as a potential testing violation.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at William E. Doar Public Charter School for the Performing Arts, this school has been classified as moderate (i.e., having defined violations; not test tampering or academic fraud).

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Failure to sign the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement and have available.

The Test Chairperson for 2012 DC CAS is no longer employed by the school and the current staff was unable to locate the 2012 Test Security binder that the school is required to maintain. As such we were unable to confirm whether State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements

were actually signed by individuals involved in testing and whether those individuals signed in for DC CAS training in 2012.

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:

1. Refusal to sign the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement*.

Failure to sign the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement* is a violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED*

Document	Notes
OSSE 2012 DC CAS Test Security Guidelines	No issues noted.
Testing Procedures	No issues noted.
School Test Plan; Test Plan Contacts	Proctor assignments were not listed.
State Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements	No signed Non-Disclosure Agreements were in the binder; only a copy of the blank form was included.
Incident Reports	None cited for 2012. Only blank form included.
Test Material sign-in sheets	Not in binder.

*The Test Chairperson for 2012 DC CAS is no longer at the school and the current staff could not locate the 2012 Test Security binder the school is required to keep. The binder we reviewed was compiled by the staff in preparation for the 2013 CAS and consisted of the documents they could locate in their electronic files.

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

E.L. Haynes Public Charter School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	E.L. Haynes Public Charter School
School Address	3600 Georgia Avenue NW Washington, DC 20010
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 20, 2013

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

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

One 6th Grade classroom at E.L. Haynes PCS was flagged by OSSE for Extraordinary Growth and Score Drop on the Math section of the test.

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 (MGP) and Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL).

In addition to the aforementioned flags, OSSE had a concern about the DC CAS test prepping materials that the 6th grade students utilized to prepare for the test, given that the students' answer patterns were very close in range. OSSE requested that the investigators obtain practice tests and/or other test prep materials from the 6th grade teachers.

Teacher 1	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Low Variance (Flagging)	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Avg Growth WPL	MGP Scores
	Math (CLASS)	4.0	0.3	8.1	1.2	0.5	87.5
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	11.5	0.7	0.1	49.8

The 6th grade classroom was flagged by OSSE for investigation in the Math section of the 2012 DC CAS. The classroom experienced Extraordinary Growth and Score Drop. The classroom's growth, as noted by the change in the weighted proficiency level (WPL) was 0.5, compared to an average 0.1 change across the State. In addition, the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) scores in the Math portion of the test were 87.5, which are significantly higher than the State score of 49.8, indicating that students had substantial growth as compared to the State growth 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	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator/ [REDACTED]	School	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	School	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 3	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	School	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 4	No Longer at School – [REDACTED]	Test Administrator/ [REDACTED]	Phone Interview	3/28/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/20/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/20/2013

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of the Extraordinary Growth in the Math section of the 2012 DC CAS test, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator engaged in behavior before, during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 9 individuals: 5 current staff, 1 former staff person and 3 students. Administrator 3 was an intern in 2012 and is no longer at the school.

Based on our interviews with Admin 1 and Admin 2, the extraordinary growth may be attributed to the fact that Teacher 1 is a phenomenal and nationally recognized teacher. The score drop may result from the ineffectiveness of the 2012 ■ grade teacher, who was ultimately fired. The claimed change in the quality of instruction, transitioning from Teacher 1 (a top-rated ■ grade teacher) to a very low-rated ■ grade teacher, may have contributed to the score drop.

Student 1B indicated that the teacher helped students during the test by defining words; however, this was not corroborated by any other interview, and has therefore not been included as a potential testing violation.

We have also identified a testing violation regarding the school inaccurately reporting the number of testing groups to OSSE.

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

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Misrepresented test groupings

Based on our interview, it is evident that the number of actual test groups at EL Haynes is substantially greater than what has been reported to OSSE. An inaccurate reporting of test groups inhibits OSSE's ability to perform meaningful data analysis on the results of the DC CAS test results.

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

Document	Notes
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed.	Training Materials; Non-Disclosure Agreements; Sign-in and Sign-out sheets for each day of DC CAS testing; DC CAS prep materials used by various 6 th grade teachers.

VII. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name	Name Reference	Position
[REDACTED]	Teacher 5	[REDACTED] 2012 Test Administrator

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Imagine Hope Community Charter School – Lamond Campus

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Imagine Hope Community Charter School – Lamond Campus
School Address	6200 Kansas Ave, NE, Washington, DC 20011
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 7, 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	NO	NO

Imagine Hope Community Charter School – Lamond Campus was flagged for Extraordinary Growth and significant Wrong-to-Right (WTR) Erasures among 5th grade students in the Math section of the 2012 DC CAS. Five (5) students out of the class of sixteen (16) students had six (6) or more WTR erasures in the Math section of the test.

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)	3.6	0.7	14.2	3.9	0.9	93.0
	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	12.0	0.8	0.1	48.7

The flagged classroom experienced Extraordinary Growth and a high incidence of WTR Erasures in the Math section of the 2012 DC CAS. The State WTR Erasure average was 0.8, while in the classroom the WTR Erasure average was 3.9, almost 5 times the State average, indicating that it is possible that Math test answers were altered.

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	3/7/2013
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/7/2013
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	N/A – P.G. County System	[REDACTED] Teacher	Could not be reached for interview	N/A
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/7/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 1	6 th Grade	5 th Grade	School	3/7/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 2	6 th Grade	5 th Grade	School	3/7/2013
[REDACTED]	Student 3	6 th Grade	5 th Grade	N/A – no longer at the school	N/A
[REDACTED]	Student 4	6 th Grade	5 th Grade	N/A – no longer at the school	N/A
[REDACTED]	Student 5	6 th Grade	5 th Grade	N/A – no longer at the school	N/A

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extraordinary growth and preponderance of WTR Erasure among student scores in the 5th Grade Math section of the 2012 DC CAS, 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 five (5) individuals: three (3) current staff and two (2) students. Teacher 1, the 2012 Test Administrator for the flagged classroom, is no longer an employee at the school and is currently teaching in the Prince George's County school system. Three of the students selected for interviews with high WTR erasures are no longer enrolled at the school.

This investigation concludes that three possible testing violations occurred during administration of the Math section of the 2012 DC CAS, violations related to the integrity of test answers, assisting students during the test, and the Test Chairperson not signing the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement*.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Imagine Hope Community Charter School – Lamond Campus, 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

Based on interviews with Student 2, it appears that Teacher 1 helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test during break times by reviewing their answers and helping individual students to understand questions they had answered incorrectly, in case the next section of the test contained similar questions. Proctor 1 was not present during breaks to confirm or deny this. Teacher 1 has not been interviewed, as she has left the school district and is now teaching in a new school district.

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;
11. Scoring student responses;
12. Making statements about the accuracy of the students' responses on the state test.

Reviewing the test for correct/incorrect answers and providing 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. Testing Violation 2: 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 1 and Student 2, it appears that Teacher 1 helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test by telling students during the test to go back and check specific answers. Proctor 1 confirmed that Teacher 1 gave verbal cues to students during the test, validating Student 1 and Student 2's responses. Teacher 1 has not been interviewed, as she has left the school district and is now teaching in a new school district.

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; and
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.

C. Testing Violation 3: Failure to sign the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement and have available

Based on interviews with Administrator 2, the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement* was not signed and returned to the Principal. Administrator 2 did not state that she refused to sign it; rather she stated that she did not believe she was required to. Interviewers reviewed the school's binder and did not find the signed Non-Disclosure Agreement for Administrator 2.

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:

1. Refusal to sign the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement*.

Though Administrator 2 did not indicate a “refusal” to sign, she should have been aware of her obligation to sign as it is clearly noted in the State Test Security Guidelines. Not signing the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement* appears to be 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
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; 2012 ANET results

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Meridian Public Charter School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Meridian Public Charter School
School Address	2120 13th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009
Field Team	
Date Interviews Conducted	March 12, 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	YES	NO	YES
Teacher 2	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher 3	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Teacher 4	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Teacher 5	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO

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	0.6	9.0	79.0
Teacher 2	Math (CLASS)	3.2	1.3	0.5	7.1	71.0
State	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	0.1	0.7	49.8
Teacher 1	Reading (CLASS)	3.3	0.2	0.1	3.3	63.0
Teacher 2	Reading (CLASS)	2.9	0.8	0.3	3.1	73.0
State	Reading (STATE)	2.8	0.3	-0.1	0.6	48.6

5 th Grade	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	MGP Scores
Teacher 3	Math (CLASS)	3.2	0.4	0.5	10.4	80.0
Teacher 4	Math (CLASS)	3.3	0.4	0.2	7.1	64.0

State	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	0.1	0.8	48.7
Teacher 3	Reading (CLASS)	3.1	0.3	0.1	3.8	59.5
Teacher 4	Reading (CLASS)	3.2	0.3	0.2	2.8	75.0
State	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	0.1	0.6	49.5

4 th Grade	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Avg WTR Erasure 2012	MGP Scores
Teacher 5	Math (CLASS)	2.9	0.5	0.4	5.0	61.0
State	Math (STATE)	3.0	0.4	0.2	0.9	50.2
Teacher 5	Reading (CLASS)	3.1	0.4	0.5	4.4	75.0
State	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	0.1	0.7	50.2

Based on data analysis performed by OSSE, five classrooms at Meridian Public Charter School were flagged for their 2012 DC CAS test results in the following three areas:

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

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).

The five classrooms, two 6th grade classes, two 5th grade classes, and one 4th grade class, were flagged for the following:

- All five class rooms were flagged for WTR erasures on both the Math and Reading sections of the 2012 DC CAS test.
- One 6th grade classroom and one 5th grade classroom were also flagged for WTR erasures on both the Math and Reading sections of the 2011 DC CAS test while another 6th grade class was flagged for Reading in the 2011 DC CAS test.
- One 5th grade and one 6th grade class had Extraordinary Growth in Math, while the three other classrooms had Extraordinary Growth in Reading.

¹ DC CAS 2011 - 2012 Flagging Criterion Summary.

In addition to the flagging criteria contained in this report, Meridian was flagged for alleged testing violations during the 2011 DC CAS test. We documented the alleged 2011 DC CAS testing violations in an earlier report.

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	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	Teacher	Test Administrator	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 2	No Longer at School	Test Administrator	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Teacher 3	Teacher	Test Administrator	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 4	Teacher	Test Administrator	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 5	Out on Sick Leave	Test Administrator	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	Teacher	Proctor for Teacher 1	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 2	No Longer at the School	Proctor for Teacher 2	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Proctor 3	[REDACTED]	Proctor for Teacher 3	Teleconference	3/26/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 4	No Longer at the School	Proctor for Teacher 4	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Proctor 5	No Longer at the School	Proctor for Teacher 5	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Monitor	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A	N/A
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2012 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]					
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 2A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 2B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 2C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 2D	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 3A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 3B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 3C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 4A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 4B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 4C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 5A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 5B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13
[REDACTED]	Student 5C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/12/13

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the extent of Wrong-to-Right erasures on the 2011 and 2012 DC CAS tests and the Extraordinary Growth in reading or math on the 2012 DC CAS test, our investigation focused on the possibilities that: 1) the flagged Test Administrators and/or Proctors engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test; 2) administrators at levels above the classroom engaged in WTR erasures.

We interviewed 25 individuals: 9 current staff and 16 students.

Our investigation revealed five potential testing violations related to the integrity of test answers and strong circumstantial evidence that potential violations involving WTR erasures occurred at the school level and not at the classroom level. These potential violations are described in detail below.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Meridian Public Charter 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: Simplified, clarified, broke down into steps, or explained a part of the test question

Based on interviews with Test Administrator (Teacher 3) and students, it appears that Teacher 3 helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test by clarifying or explaining a part of the test question.

Teacher 3, by his own admission, stated that, when students raise their hands with a question related to “vocabulary,” he would sometimes “explain the word.” He said, “If the word is related to the answer,” he would say, “Do the best you can.” However, if he thought by explaining the word, he was not leading the students to the answer, then he would explain/clarify the word to the students. This was confirmed by Student 3B, who stated that when students asked for help in understanding a question, Teacher 3 would sometimes say he couldn’t help but that at other times he would help students in understanding a question on 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.

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. Testing Violation 2: 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 students, it appears that Teacher 5 and Proctor 5 helped students during the 2012 DC CAS test by pointing to specific questions and asking them to re-check their answers.

Student 5A recalled that Teacher 5 told her once, during the 2012 DC CAS test, to re-read the question and said, "Do you think that's right?" Student 5A also said Teacher 5 pointed to questions and asked her to re-check her answers at least twice. Student 5A also specified that Teacher 5 and Proctor 5, "Told other students to check specific questions by pointing to questions." However, she does not remember Proctor 5 pointing out any questions to her.

Student 5B stated that Proctor 5 had helped him three or four times with reading the question but did not provide any answers. He also said Teacher 5 and Proctor 5 helped other students in a similar manner. He also stated that Teacher 5 would look in the booklets and ask students to check answers for particular questions. Student 5B would re-read questions and bubble in different answers. Student 5B stated that, for the 2012 DC CAS Math test, Teacher 5 told him three times to re-check his answers to specific 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;
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.

C. Testing Violation 3: Failure to attend mandatory training

Proctor 1 stated that she did not attend training, provided by the school for the 2012 DC CAS test; though she thinks she signed the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement as she does each year. However, Teacher 1 stated that Proctor 1 would have attended the 2012 DC CAS training provided by the school.

Proctor 3 adamantly insisted that she did not receive any training for the DC CAS nor did she receive or view any training materials. However, she recalled discussing the DC CAS during a general staff meeting at which the dos and don'ts such as walking around the classrooms, no talking with students, removing items from walls, etc. were covered. She was never told about the pick-up and drop-off process for test booklets. Proctor 3 also claimed that she has never seen any power point presentation regarding DC CAS.

In Meridian's test security binder we did not see any evidence which indicated that Proctor 1 and Proctor 3 attended DC CAS training. We were also not able to confirm if Proctor 1 and other flagged test administrators signed the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements, because, as in 2011, the school failed to maintain copies of these documents, and failed to maintain evidence that it conducted the required DC CAS administrator training.

The *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 3 & 7), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that Proctor's *Roles and Responsibilities: Before Testing* includes:

1. Attend[ing] state test administration training session at the school.

Failure to attend 2012 DC CAS test administration training provided by the school is a violation of the February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines listed above.

D. Testing Violation 4: Failure to sign the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement and have available.

Upon reviewing the 2012 Test Security Binder we discovered that copies of the signed State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements and the DC CAS training logs were missing. In speaking with Admin 2 she stated that all teachers and staff had signed the Agreements, and the Agreements were then taken by the OSSE monitor who was on site at Meridian for the DC CAS last year. Admin 4 stated she thought the Agreements, and the DC CAS training logs, had been sent to OSSE. We told Admin 4 that Admin 2 stated the OSSE monitor had taken them at the conclusion of last year's testing; she said she did not see any reason why that would have occurred.

As such, we were unable to verify, either way, whether the State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements were signed by those individuals involved in testing, or whether those individuals signed in for DC CAS training in 2012.

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:

1. Refusal to sign the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement*.

Failure to sign the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement* is a violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above.

E. Testing Violation 5: Extraordinary WTR Erasures

Across the entire school, including the five flagged classrooms and all other testing classes, 1,804 answers were changed from wrong-to-right on the 2012 DC CAS test.² This represents one of the highest levels of WTR erasures in a single school across District of Columbia Public Charter Schools (DCPCS) and District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS). Meridian had 227 students take the 2012 DC CAS Reading and Math tests; therefore the average WTR erasures per student at Meridian are approximately 8.

The average WTR erasures on the 2012 DC CAS test by grade level were as follows:³

	Subject	Teacher 1 (Grade 6)	Teacher 2 (Grade 6)	Teacher 3 (Grade 5)	Teacher 4 (Grade 5)	Teacher 5 (Grade 4)	Meridian (All Grades)
Avg WTR Erasure 2012	Math (CLASS)	9.0	7.1	10.4	7.1	5.0	5.01
	Math (STATE)	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	
	Reading (CLASS)	3.3	3.1	3.8	2.8	4.4	2.95
	Reading (STATE)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	

In Math, the five flagged classrooms' average WTR erasures were 5 to 13 times above the State average for the 2012 DC CAS test. In Reading, the five flagged classrooms' average WTR erasures were 5 to 6 times above the State average for the 2012 DC CAS test.

Every one of the interviewed Test Administrators reported that the test materials were picked up from Admin 2 or Admin 4 just before testing began, and were dropped off with Admin 2 or Admin 4 as soon as testing ended. All of the students corroborated the Test Administrators' assertion that testing materials were only in the classrooms while testing was being conducted.

Given the consistent responses at the classroom level, our investigation indicates a low probability of material WTR erasure violations occurring at the classroom level, except for the ones identified in Teacher 3 and Teacher 5's classrooms.

² We do not have the WTR erasure data by individual school for 2011. We also do not have data on Wrong-to-Wrong or Right-to-Wrong erasures at the school; as such data is not generally helpful in identifying potential testing violations.

³ Flagged classrooms are represented in red.

Despite extensive questioning, Admin 1, Admin 2, Admin 3 and Admin 4 did not offer any potential explanations for the extraordinary level of WTR erasures reported at Meridian. In response to numerous questions regarding erasures, they repeatedly stated that they stood behind the students' scores. Each of them denied erasing or changing answers on the 2012 DC CAS test and denied ordering others to do so.

During interviews, most students initially indicated that they had changed only a couple of answers. However, when shown their actual data demonstrating high number of erasures, they generally, and not unexpectedly, did not challenge the data.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
DC CAS 2012 Testing Schedule / Plan	Yes; no issues noted
CTB Packing List	Yes; no issues noted
CAS School Group List	Yes; no issues noted
School Security Checklist > Sign out/in records for Science, Comp, Health, Math and Reading tests	Yes; no issues noted
Unused books list	Yes; no issues noted
Special Education Sign out/in	Yes; no issues noted
Make up testing Sign out/in	Yes; no issues noted
Health testing opt-outs	Yes; no issues noted
State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements	Not in binder; we were told OSSE has them
DC CAS training logs	Not in binder; we were told OSSE has them

We were unable to conclude that all of the flagged administrators signed Non-Disclosure Agreements for 2012 DC CAS test. As in 2011, the school failed to maintain copies of these documents, and failed to maintain evidence that it conducted the required DC CAS administrator training.

VII. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name		Name Reference	Position
		Teacher N	No longer at school
		Teacher T	
		Teacher O	
		Teacher P	

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	National Collegiate Preparatory Public Charter High School
School Address	4600 Livingston Road SE, Washington, DC 20032
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	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on a data analysis performed by OSSE of the results of the 2012 DC CAS across the state, one classroom at National Collegiate Preparatory (NCP) was flagged in the following two areas:

- Extraordinary Growth; and
- Low Variance.

The one classroom was flagged for Extraordinary Growth on both the Math and Reading tests, while only the students' Reading test scores were flagged for Low Variance.

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 Weighted Proficiency Level (WPL) between years, and Median Growth Percentile (MGP) scores. Classes in which the MGP scores of the students grew significantly in Math and/or Reading, as compared to classes at the same grade level and in the same subject are also a determinant in identifying if growth is extraordinary.

Low Variance looks at the answer patterns of the students in a testing group and compares the variance of scores in a single class to the average across the State, at the same grade level; those with a significantly lower average are identified as having low within class variance.

The table below shows a comparison between the test scores of Teacher 1's students and the Statewide averages, at the same grade level and test subject, for the 2012 DC CAS results, with respect to the Extraordinary Growth and Low Variance.

Teacher 1	Subject	WPL	WPL Variance	Avg Growth WPL	Low Variance	MGP Scores
	Reading (CLASS)	3.6	0.1	N/A	3.8	73.0
	Reading (STATE)	2.9	0.3	-0.1	9.9	49.4

As noted in the table above, the Within-Classroom variance for the flagged test group of 3.8 is significantly lower than that average State variance of 9.9. In addition the MGP of the test group is approximately 1.5 times the MGP of the State.

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	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Admin 3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Teacher 1	[REDACTED]	Test Administrator	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Proctor 1	[REDACTED]	Proctor for Teacher 1	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Student 1C	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/18/13
[REDACTED]	Student 2A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School	3/18/13

IV. PERSONS NAMED BY INTERVIEWEES AND NOT INTERVIEWED

Name		Name Reference	Position	
		Admin P		
		Admin J		
		Teacher C		
		Teacher B		
		Teacher R		

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

NCP was flagged for investigation as a result of the Extraordinary Growth and Low Variance identified based on the results on the 2012 DC CAS Reading test.

Given the extent of the students' growth in the one classroom, as compared to the growth within their respective grade levels across the State, coupled with the clustering of these students' scores, the variance of which is significantly lower than the Statewide average, our investigation focused on the possibility the flagged Test Administrator(s) engaged in behavior before, during, or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed nine individuals: Five current staff members, and four students.

Our investigation revealed a potential testing violation related to Teacher 1 engaging in discussions with students during the administration of the test.

Our student interviews indicated that the Teacher 1 may have explained certain words/questions during the 2012 DC CAS test. One student also indicated that sometimes Admin 3 was called in to help a student understand a math question. Our interviews with Teacher 1, Proctor 1 and Admin 3 did not corroborate the statements of the students and Teacher 1. This potential violation is described in detail below.

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

VI. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Test Violation 1: Failure of the Test Administrator to perform his/her duties assigned as evidenced by inappropriate conversation in the testing environment

Student 1B indicated that both teachers helped students try to understand the test questions and indicated that she received help with clarifying a question on the Reading test and that other students were helped in this way. Student 1B stated that based on their relationship with their teachers, they would help simplify the question but she still had to look for the answer herself.

Student 1C indicated that the teachers helped them understand a test question, for example, saying it in a different form, but not give the answer. Student 1C said she did not ask for help on the test, but the teachers helped others. She said it was mainly Teacher 1 who helped, and sometimes Teacher 1 or Proctor 1 called in Admin 3 to help a student understand a Math question. Student 1C said Teacher 1 helped for the Biology test, but she was not sure who helped for Reading. She was very open about the teachers helping the students.

Student 1A could not confirm that Teacher 1 provided assistance to students but noted that she saw Teacher 1 speaking, in a whisper, to students; she thought he was helping clarify a test question but did not know who he helped.

Student 1D noted that the teachers helped some students by helping them understand questions. She said it did not happen a lot and did not remember on which portion of the test.

None of our interviews with adults corroborated the statements made by the students. Teacher 1, Proctor 1 and Admin 3 stated that no assistance was provided by them during the 2012 DC CAS administration.

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

Engaging in inappropriate discussions with students during testing is a violation of the *February 2012 DC State Test Security Guidelines* listed above. Based on the recounts of four students, it appears that both Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 may have engaged in discussions with students during the 2012 DC CAS.

1. Additional Findings

We believe our interview with Teacher 1 and the specific characteristics of his testing group for the 2012 DC CAS warrant consideration alongside the above findings.

In our interview with Teacher 1 we did not observe any indicators, either overt or otherwise, that led us to believe he assisted his students during the 2012 DC CAS. We explicitly told Teacher 1 his students indicated that he provided assistance, either to them personally or to other students in the class, with understanding test questions. He appeared genuinely surprised and twice stated he was “shocked” and “floored” by the students’ comments. Teacher 1 was open and cooperative for the duration of the interview. Teacher 1 was not defensive or anxious, even when we

discussed his students' claims; and nothing in his behavior or responses indicated he was dishonest.

We believe it is worth noting that Teacher 1 is a [REDACTED] teacher and his classroom was flagged for Extraordinary Growth and Low Variance on the DC CAS Reading test. In addition, Teacher 1 administered the test to the [REDACTED] class and this group of students outperformed all other NCP students, including those in higher grades. The concentration of high performing students is a plausible reason the results were identified as having low within class variance and extraordinary growth.

VII. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
DC CAS Training Sign-in	No issues noted.
Signed State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements	No issues noted.
Group School Lists	No issues noted.
School Security Checklist (Sign out/in sheets)	No issues noted.
Parent notification letters	No issues noted.
OSSE Chairperson Training 2012	No issues noted.
2012 OSSE Test Security Guidelines	No issues noted.
2012 Accommodations Instructions (from OSSE)	No issues noted.
NCP Test Plan / Schedule for 2012	No issues noted.
2012 DC CAS Test Groups (with Proctors listed)	No issues noted.
2012 Student Accommodations	No issues noted.
Group Lists (Scoreable vs. Non Scoreable)	No issues noted.