

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

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

OPTIONS PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

School Name	Options Public Charter School
School Address	1375 E Street NE, Washington, DC 20002
Field Team	[REDACTED]
Date Interviews Conducted	2/3/2014

II. CLASSROOM FLAG INFORMATION

Flag	Extraordinary Growth		WTR Erasure (2013)		WTR Erasure (2012)		Person Fit		Question Type Comparison (QTC)	
	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read
Test Administrator 1	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on 2013 DC CAS data analysis performed by OSSE, Options Public Charter School (“Options”) had one classroom flagged for Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures in Math. [REDACTED]

For the 2013 DC CAS, OSSE developed a flagging methodology consisting of three methods. Classrooms will be investigated if they trigger two or more test security flags in the same subject.

The methods consist of the following as described in the 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology:¹

- 1) Wrong to Right Erasures (WTR) - Erasures occur for at least three reasons: rethinking, misalignment or irregularities. Therefore, high numbers of WTR erasures by themselves do not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation. Classrooms

¹ 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

are flagged when there is a large number of Wrong to Right (WTR) erasures as compared to the state average.

- 2) Test Score Analysis – This method is divided into three sub-methods. Each sub-method is independent of each other; therefore it only takes one of the sub-methods to flag a classroom.
 - a. Test Score Growth - Student Growth is measured by taking the differences between the granular proficiency level scores for each student for 2012 and 2013. Classrooms with significant growth from 2012 to 2013 were flagged.
 - b. Test Score Drop - Similar to test score growth described above, the test score drop looks at extraordinary declines in student scores from 2012 to 2013.
 - c. Question Type Comparison (QTC) - QTC measures differences in performance between 1) frequently used test questions versus newer questions; and 2) multiple choice questions and constructive response items. Significant differences in QTC performance will trigger a classroom flag.

- 3) Person-Fit Analysis - The model measures the likelihood of an examinee’s response pattern given their estimated ability level. A Person-Fit over 1.0 indicates an unusual response pattern that may be the result of testing abnormalities.

In addition, due to the requirements of the Testing Integrity Act of 2013, OSSE selected certain classrooms for investigation based on a random selection.²

Classroom-level information is provided below:

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	2.59	0.24	6.33	0.63	0.31
	Math (STATE)	3.02	0.08	0.60	0.01	0.28
	Reading (CLASS)	1.95	-0.02	0.33	0.46	0.21
	Reading (STATE)	2.77	-0.12	0.52	0.01	0.22

The flagged classroom for Test Administrator 1 displayed a significant number of Wrong to Right erasures in Math. The average number of WTR erasures in the classroom was 6.33 for Math, while the State average for Math was 0.60. The presence of WTR erasures, by themselves, does not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation.

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

III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED

Name of Interviewee	Name Reference	Current Position	2013 Testing Role/Position	Interview Location	Date Interview Conducted
[REDACTED]	Admin 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Admin 2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Test Administrator 1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1A	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Student 1B	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Given the high levels of WTR for Test Administrator 1’s classroom, our investigation focused on the possibility that Test Administrator 1 engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 3 individuals: 1 current staff and 2 students.

We found one potential testing violation related to a missing State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement. This potential violation is described in detail below.

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

V. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF POSSIBLE TESTING VIOLATIONS

A. Missing State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement.

Our investigation revealed a possible testing violation related to the maintenance of the DC Test Security File. Based on our review, copies all signed State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDA) were included in the DC CAS Test Security File for all individuals involved except for Admin 2.

During the interview, Admin 2 indicated that [REDACTED] recalls having signed it, but could not explain why the form was not in the file. As of the date of this report, the team has not received a copy of the NDA signed by Admin 2.

The *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 8), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

The Test Chairperson before Testing [must]...

2. Read, sign and return to the principal the *State Test Security and Non-Disclosure Agreement*.

VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted.
Irregularity Reports	Yes; no issues noted.
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted.
Verification of DC CAS training form	Yes; no issues noted.
Non-Disclosure Agreements	Yes; the team found signed NDAs for all individuals who appear to have been involved in the 2013 DC CAS Testing Process except for Admin 2.