

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

**CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

**OYSTER-ADAMS BILINGUAL SCHOOL**

**I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION**

<b>School Name</b>	Oyster-Adams Bilingual School
<b>School Address</b>	2020 19 <sup>th</sup> St. NW
<b>Field Team</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Date Interviews Conducted</b>	1/16/2014

**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	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the 2013 DC CAS comprehensive data analysis and random selection performed by OSSE, one Testing Group in this school was flagged for Wrong to Right (WTR) Erasures in Math and Reading and Extraordinary Growth in Reading.

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

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

- 1) Wrong to Right (WTR) Erasures - Erasures occur for at least three reasons: rethinking, misalignment or irregularities. Therefore, high numbers of WTR erasures by themselves do not indicate testing irregularities, but may warrant further investigation. Classrooms are flagged when there is a large number of WTR erasures as compared to the state average.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2013 Test Integrity Flagging Methodology.

- 2) Test Score Analysis – This method is divided into three sub-methods. Each sub-method is independent of each other; therefore it only takes one of the sub-methods to flag a classroom.
  - a. Test Score Growth - Student Growth is measured by taking the differences between the granular proficiency level (GPL) scores for each student for 2012 and 2013. Classrooms with significant growth from 2012 to 2013 were flagged.
  - b. Test Score Drop - Similar to test score growth described above, the test score drop looks at extraordinary declines in student scores from 2012 to 2013.
  - c. Question Type Comparison (QTC) - QTC measures differences in performance between 1) frequently used test questions versus newer questions; and 2) multiple choice questions and constructive response items. Significant differences in QTC performance will trigger a classroom flag.
  
- 3) Person-Fit Analysis - The model measures the likelihood of an examinee’s response pattern given their estimated ability level. A Person-Fit over 1.0 indicates an unusual response pattern that may be the result of testing abnormalities.

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

	Subject	GPL	GPL Delta	WTR	Person Fit	QTC
Test Administrator 1	Math (CLASS)	3.03	0.64	4.62	0.55	0.16
	Math (STATE)	3.07	0.31	0.73	0.04	0.21
	Reading (CLASS)	3.15	0.62	3.54	0.75	0.06
	Reading (STATE)	2.97	0.23	0.60	-0.03	0.21

The average WTR Erasures for Reading and Math in this Testing Group were significantly above the State average. The Testing Group WTR average for Math was 4.62, while the State average was 0.73. The Testing Group WTR average for Reading was 3.54, while the State average was 0.60. Additionally, each individual student in this Testing Group had more WTR Erasures than the State average. All students in this testing group had 4 or more cumulative WTRs on the test, with some having as many as 10, 11, and 18 cumulative WTRs.

This Testing Group was also flagged for Extraordinary Growth. The GPL Delta, or change in proficiency level from the previous year, for this Testing Group was 0.62 for Reading compared to the State average GPL of 0.23 for Reading. This indicates significant growth in students’ test scores since the previous year.

---

<sup>2</sup> Testing Integrity Act of 2013, Title II, Sec. 201(c).

**III. INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED**

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

**IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Given the extent of WTR Erasures and Extraordinary Growth in this Testing Group, our investigation focused on the possibility that the flagged Test Administrator(s) engaged in behavior during or after the test administration that violated the security of the test.

We interviewed 7 individuals: 4 current staff and 3 students. During the 2012-2013 school year, Test Administrator 1 was a [REDACTED] teacher [REDACTED] at the school. [REDACTED] was the DC CAS Test Administrator for [REDACTED] class. Our student interviews revealed that both Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 likely provided assistance to students during the 2013 DC CAS.

Our investigation revealed 2 potential testing violations. These related to: 1) the Test Administrator and Proctor telling students to review answers for specific questions, and 2) the Test Administrator and Proctor explaining the test questions to students.

Overall, based on the relative severity of the findings at Oyster Adams, 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, or used booklets to tell the students to go back and review answers for specific questions**

Student 1A, Student 1B, and Student 1C all reported that Test Administrator 1 reviewed their answers once they completed the test and directed them to check their work on specific questions.

According to Student 1A, Test Administrator 1 would come over to ■ desk, look at ■ answers and tell ■ which ones were not correct.

Student 1B indicated that Test Administrator 1 would look over each of the students' tests before they turned them in and would point out which answers they should go back and check.

Student 1C remembered Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 walking around the room during the test, pointing to specific questions, and telling students to check their answers for those questions.

Both Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 denied telling students to check specific answers on the test. They both stated that they would tell students to check their answers generally during the test, but did not point out which answers students should review.

The *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 11), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines listed above by school personnel shall constitute a test security violation and must be reported; such violations include but are not limited to the following:

12. Making statements regarding the accuracy of the student's responses on the state test.

**B. Simplified, clarified, broke down into steps, or explained a part of the test question**

All three students we interviewed stated that Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 helped explain the meaning of test questions they did not understand.

Student 1A said that Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 would "help ■ figure out how to do the questions" on the DC CAS test. Neither teacher would tell ■ the answer, but they would come over and give ■ "strategies" to help solve questions ■ was having trouble with during the test.

Student 1B noted that when ■ was having trouble with a test question, ■ would raise ■ hand and either Test Administrator 1 or Proctor 1 would "explain the question" or give ■ "strategies" for answering difficult questions.

Student 1C recalled that Test Administrator 1 and Proctor 1 “would help [REDACTED] figure out the question, but not give [REDACTED] the answer.”

According to Proctor 1, Student 1B generally “needs things explained” more than the other students in the class. During DC CAS testing, Proctor 1 noted that Test Administrator 1 would explain test questions to Student 1B and help [REDACTED] use strategies to solve it. Sometimes, [REDACTED] would give Student 1B an example or ask [REDACTED] another question to help [REDACTED] understand. Test Administrator 1 had to explain “almost everything” to Student 1B during the test.

Proctor 1 also noted that [REDACTED] would help explain questions to some of the students. However, [REDACTED] believed these explanations were within their testing accommodations and indicated that [REDACTED] was unsure of how much Test Administrators and Proctors are allowed to help students with accommodations. The explaining test questions to students are never an allowable test accommodation.

The *January 2013 DC State Test Security Guidelines* (Page 11), provided to us by OSSE, indicate, in relevant part, that:

Any violation of the guidelines listed above by school personnel shall constitute a test security violation and must be reported; such violations include but are not limited to the following:

5. Aiding or assisting an examinee with a response or answer to a secure test item or prompt.

## VI. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	Notes
School Test Plan	Yes; no issues noted
Incident Reports	Yes; no issues noted
DC CAS 2013 Training Sign-In Sheet	Yes; no issues noted
Other Documents Reviewed	Signed NDA Agreements for all staff interviewed