Minnesota Department of Education

Test Policies and Procedures Committee

Recommendations and Final Report

July 2015

Test Policies and Procedures Committee Final Report

Executive Summary

In response to directives from the U.S. Department of Education and reports of educator misconduct in some school districts across the country, the Statewide Testing Division of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) formed a working committee to evaluate the Agency's test and data integrity measures. The Test Policies and Procedures Committee (TPPC) included representatives from various divisions within MDE, administrators from school districts and education organizations, technical experts and community stakeholders. Invited speakers included leaders in the field of test and data integrity. TPPC reviewed current measures to prevent, detect, investigate and resolve security breaches and provided numerous recommendations to improve Minnesota's test policies and procedures.

TPPC believes that intentional educator misconduct in statewide testing is rare. The focus of the Committee's work was ensuring the quality of statewide test data and the decisions based on test results. Many threats to test data integrity can be prevented with training and point-of-testing reminders of security procedures for both educators and students. The Committee provided a number of recommendations for MDE and local education agencies (LEAs) regarding support for a culture of academic integrity, the training of personnel involved in test administration and the dissemination of information about the quality of Minnesota assessments and the data they provide to students, families, schools, districts and the State.

The Committee considered the oversight responsibility of MDE in ensuring the integrity of test data used to report the achievement of Minnesota students. TPPC recommended ways for the State to improve its monitoring of test administrations and to protect secure test content from theft and exposure. The Committee also discussed the need to enhance MDE's current procedures for investigating reported security breaches and applying consequences when misconduct is found to have occurred. TPPC advised MDE of the need to develop a data forensics program to detect anomalies in the data that may indicate cheating, tampering and fraud.

It was frequently noted that there are no specific requirements to protect test and data integrity in Minnesota law. The Committee recommended that MDE seek legal authority to enforce test security and data integrity policy and to impose consequences for violations. In addition, legal counsel should be available as needed during the development of new policies and procedures.

The Committee's recommendations are detailed in this report and organized by the following categories:

- Culture of Academic Integrity
- Training
- Monitoring and Oversight
- Protecting Test Content
- Preventing Educator and Student Misconduct
- Reporting and Investigating Testing Irregularities
- Detecting Testing Irregularities

The current status of existing policies and procedures aligned to the Committee's recommendations are discussed, along with timelines and resources that may be required to make suggested enhancements. Where MDE does not currently have policy addressing specific TPPC recommendations, the feasibility of implementation with current resources is indicated. Some of the recommendations represent ambitious projects that involve significant cost.

Background

In October 2014, The Minnesota Department of Education formed the Test Policies and Procedures Committee (TPPC) to evaluate the measures MDE has in place to ensure the integrity of statewide testing data and the validity of the interpretations that can be drawn from these data. TPPC was also charged with identifying and prioritizing the steps that MDE could take to strengthen policies and procedures around test security and data integrity. The purpose of this document is to detail the Committee's recommendations and to discuss the feasibility of implementing specific measures and the potential timeframes to do so.

When stakes are attached to test scores, there is the potential for fraud. There may be individual stakes in test results, such as a good course grade, admission to college, certification to exercise a chosen profession, or a positive evaluation of one's work. There may also be stakes in aggregated performance on tests, as in the case of federal accountability testing under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Those responsible for administering tests and reporting their results are required to take steps to ensure that test scores are accurate and meaningful. In its consideration of MDE's policies to ensure test and data integrity, TPPC recognized that the majority of Minnesota educators behave ethically and follow the rules for test administration. The Committee also recognized, however, that unethical or illegal conduct by a single educator has the potential to have a widespread negative impact on the integrity of test data, with the result that false information about the performance of individual students and school systems is shared with students, families and the public. The following background information was shared with TPPC to provide context for its work:

- On June 24, 2011, Arne Duncan, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education (the Department), issued a policy letter[1] to chief state school officers. In his letter, Secretary Duncan stressed the importance of test security and data quality and the responsibility of state and local education agencies to ensure the integrity of test data in their accountability programs. The Secretary urged states to "make assessment security a high priority by reviewing and, if necessary, strengthening your efforts to protect assessment and accountability data, ensure the quality of those data, and enforce test security."

- In February 2013, the Department published a report[2] based on a February 28, 2012, symposium devoted to testing integrity. A panel of experts shared information on the prevention, detection and investigation of testing irregularities, as well as how policies and

---

[1] *Key Policy Letters from the Education Secretary or Deputy Secretary*, June 24, 2011. Available at http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/secletter/110624.html.

[2] National Center for Education Statistics (2013). *Testing integrity symposium: Issues and recommendations for best practice*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/1109163/testing-integrity-symposium.pdf.

practices to ensure test data integrity are impacted by the increasing use of computer-based testing.

- On March 31, 2014, the Department's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued the final audit report[3] of its assessment of systems of internal control over statewide test results. The audit evaluated the policies and procedures in place at the Department and five State educational agencies (SEAs) to determine their effectiveness in preventing and detecting testing irregularities and providing corrective action when irregularities are found.

- Incidents of educators' inappropriate actions to inflate students' test scores by various means are reported to have occurred in a number of local educational agencies (LEA). The most wide ranging and high profile of these cases took place in the Atlanta Public Schools, where 44 schools and 178 teachers, principals and administrators were implicated. At the conclusion of a multi-year investigation that played out on a national stage, a number of these educators were convicted of felony racketeering in criminal court and received prison sentences. The Department notes in the OIG report that such misconduct on the part of educators severely damages the credibility of State accountability systems.

Recommendations to SEAs and LEAs to enhance test security and data integrity from the Secretary's 2011 letter, the 2013 symposium report and the 2014 OIG audit report are summarized in Table 1. These recommendations served as a starting point for the work of TPPC. The OIG audit report also had three recommendations directed to the Department. These recommendations refer to federal oversight of State testing programs and include: 1) revising the peer review process to incorporate evaluation of SEAs' policies and procedures to ensure the integrity of test data, 2) requiring SEAs to certify annually that they have such policies and procedures in place, and 3) monitoring whether SEAs have and use methods to identify schools with possible test administration irregularities. Although the recommendations directed to the Department did not directly impact TPPC discussions, the possible evaluation of SEAs' measures to ensure test data integrity in the peer review process of State assessment systems did lend urgency to the need for Minnesota to strengthen its test security policies and procedures.

---

[3] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General (2014). *The U.S. Department of Education's and Five State Educational Agencies' Systems of Internal Control over Statewide Test Results.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2014/a07m0001.pdf.

Table 1. Recommended Actions for SEAs and LEAs

2011 Letter recommends that SEAs:	2013 Symposium Report recommends specific practices to SEAs and LEAs to:	2014 OIG Audit Report recommends that SEAs:
Assess the capacity to implement test security and data quality procedures at the district and school level. Ensure that contracts with testing vendors include support for activities related to monitoring test administration, including forensic analyses. Conduct unannounced onsite visits during test administration to review compliance with test security policies. Enact strict and meaningful sanctions against individuals who transgress the law or compromise professional standards of conduct.	Prevent test administration irregularities. Detect and analyze test administration irregularities. Respond to and investigate possible test administration irregularities. Ensure the integrity of computer-delivered tests.	Monitor schools identified as high risk for having test administration irregularities and share the results of monitoring with LEAs. Strengthen prevention and handling of test administration irregularities, including formal processes for: • timely reporting by LEAs • timely resolution by SEA • documentation of corrective action recommendations and resolution Strengthen test security by training test administrators, safeguarding test materials and access to online systems, and requiring timely test administration reports from contractors. Ensure that LEAs and schools put in place procedures that will prevent irregularities from occurring.

The Test Policies and Procedures Committee

MDE currently has test security policies and procedures that place it in good stead with a number of the recommendations from the various Department initiatives above. Through TPPC, MDE sought the input of stakeholders to evaluate where current documents and practices met the needs identified by the Department and where MDE needed to concentrate its efforts to strengthen test security and data integrity. A list of the committee members and the meeting agenda are included in Appendix A.

Following an October 24, 2014, kickoff meeting, TPPC met for three full-day sessions from November 2014 through April 2015, and for a final half-day wrap-up meeting on June 3, 2015. TPPC began by

reviewing current MDE policies and procedures, and identifying areas of strength and weakness. The Committee generated recommendations to improve MDE's test security policies and procedures and reviewed documents MDE prepared in response to these recommendations.

Policies and Procedures to Prevent, Report and Resolve Testing Irregularities

The Committee found that MDE had appropriate measures in place in several areas identified in the Department's 2011 letter, the 2013 Symposium report and the 2014 OIG audit report. MDE has comprehensive policies and procedures around the prevention, reporting and resolution of testing irregularities. MDE's current test security measures include:

- Requirements that LEAs train staff in test security, including ethical and unethical behavior, keeping materials secure, appropriate monitoring during testing, configuring physical spaces to prevent cheating, and reporting observed misconduct.
- Unannounced site visits to monitor test administrations.
- Processes for reporting and investigating misadministrations and misconduct, both intentional and unintentional.
- Processes for following up on reported misadministrations and misconduct.

Although the above list identifies strengths, TPPC had suggestions for improvement in MDE's efforts in these areas, as well as in areas where MDE has not yet developed policies and procedures that impact test data integrity. Most recommendations that follow are directed to MDE, but some would be carried out by the LEAs, and others require action on the part of test monitors and students.

Culture of Academic Integrity

To foster a culture of academic integrity, an understanding of the value of the assessments and the importance of test score validity, TPPC made the following recommendations:

1. MDE and LEAs to disseminate information to staff and families regarding the high quality of the Minnesota assessment program so all parties are aware of the value of the information the tests provide.
2. MDE to define test integrity for various audiences, explain its importance and why it is a shared responsibility.
3. MDE Statewide Testing to work with the Board of Teaching to share information with teacher preparation programs about the importance of educator integrity and the validity of test score interpretations.
4. LEAs to train staff on test integrity and inform staff and students of the consequences for misconduct.
5. Test monitors to confirm their understanding of, and intention to enforce, policies and procedures to ensure test integrity as well as their understanding of the consequences for violating these measures.
6. Students to affirm their understanding of the meaning of test score integrity and their acceptance of consequences for misconduct.

Documents were drafted and reviewed by TPPC in response to recommendations 2, 5 and 6 above. Short definitions of test integrity (2) for elementary and secondary school students were combined

with text describing acceptable testing behavior and consequences for unacceptable behavior (6). The preferred method to present this information to students is through the online testing interface before students begin the test. For paper accommodations, the information will appear on a page at the beginning of the test booklet. Test monitors will also read this information to students from the script in the test monitor directions. Recommendation 6 was altered during the course of conversations and drafting of language to not require an affirmation of agreement from students in the form of a signature or electronic equivalent.

TPPC approved an *Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure* to replace MDE's current non-disclosure agreement in accord with recommendation 5 above. This document details specific policies and procedures to ensure test integrity and indicates potential consequences for violations. Test monitors, along with all other personnel involved with testing, must sign the assurance.

To accomplish recommendations 1 and 4, MDE will create a working group of MDE and district staff to:
- Develop appropriate language accessible to a wide audience regarding the quality of Minnesota tests and the information they provide.
- Recommend ways to disseminate information about test quality and value.
- Develop language for LEAs to use when training staff on test integrity.
- Review and disseminate model language informing staff and students of the consequences for violating academic integrity requirements.

Depending upon MDE and district staff availability, language could be developed in the short term and with minimal cost. Timelines and costs need to be explored for the dissemination methods proposed by the working group.

Recommendation 3 requires MDE Statewide Testing to meet with the Board of Teaching, and possibly Educator Licensing, to discuss ways to supplement teacher education curricula with specific information about the role of educators in the validity of test score interpretations. Discussions can begin within the year to better understand the scope of this task and the resources required.

Training

The need to train all individuals participating in test administration on test security was discussed at length. MDE described the trainings it provides to LEAs, and members of TPPC who are District Assessment Coordinators (DACs) described how they use and augment training materials developed by MDE. Although test administration and security training were noted as strengths of the program, TPPC had specific recommendations for improvements:

7. MDE to require LEAs to send a DAC or an appointed representative to MDE-led trainings.
8. MDE to train DACs in targeted methods to prevent, detect, investigate and follow through on reports of cheating, breaches of security or other improper behavior; in turn, DACs to train School Assessment Coordinators and test monitors.
9. MDE and LEAs to cite in trainings Minnesota statute and Board of Teaching or Board of School Administrators policies regarding suspension or termination of employment and possible revocation of license for unethical conduct.
10. MDE to inform LEAs of steps it will take (e.g., data forensics and investigation) to ensure test score integrity.

11. MDE, LEAs and test monitors to make clear the expectations for compliance with test administration standards, and students to assure their compliance with the standards.
12. MDE to create training modules for use by LEAs that:
    o Are engaging, concise and scenario-based
    o Include videos and quizzes
    o Are available on demand
    o Provide specific examples of allowed and prohibited behavior by test monitors and students
    o Describe and illustrate active monitoring and explain how to prevent prohibited behavior
    o Are supported by a learning management system allowing DACs to track staff completion of modules and performance on quizzes
13. LEAs to verify their DACs have been appropriately trained to oversee the administration of Minnesota tests and to ensure the integrity of test scores.
14. LEAs to monitor staff and student compliance with test administration standards.
15. LEAs to document completion of training by staff and maintain documentation for at least two years.

MDE can amend its current policies and trainings to meet recommendations 7, 8 and 9. MDE will seek guidance on these changes from stakeholders through standing advisory committees or other existing opportunities to gather input from the field. Recommendations 7 and 9 can likely be accomplished in the near term; recommendation 8 requires updates to training resources, possibly with a one-year timeline for completion with annual updates thereafter.

Recommendation 11 is addressed in the test integrity definitions and *Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure* discussed with regard to recommendations 2 and 5 in the previous section of this report.

Recommendations 13, 14 and 15 are policy amendments that will be included in MDE Statewide Testing's primary resource for LEAs, *Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessment (Procedures Manual)*, which is updated annually.

Currently, recommendation 10 is partially met through the *Procedures Manual* where procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating test security breaches are discussed. However, the conversations with TPPC made clear that any future methods MDE puts in place to detect and investigate unexpected results should be explained to the LEAs, in part for the deterrent effect this may have.

Professionally developed, media-rich training modules supported by a learning management system are described in recommendation 12. In the short term, MDE can convene an internal group to lay out the parameters for this ambitious recommendation and write a request for proposals if funding is made available. This project would likely span several years and incur significant annual costs.

Monitoring and Oversight

MDE currently conducts unannounced visits to schools on their scheduled days for MCA testing. Districts are required to post their testing schedules to their websites so that MDE can plan efficiently to visit as many sites across the state as possible during the testing window. Sites are selected in three ways:

- Randomly
- As follow-up to a report of misconduct or documented misadministration the previous year
- As follow-up to a report of misconduct during the current administration

MDE informed the Committee that the scope of its monitoring visits is limited by staff availability. In addition to a recommendation to MDE to increase resources for the purpose of observing test administrations in schools, the Committee recommended that MDE and LEAs take steps to increase their oversight of compliance with test policies and procedures:

16. MDE to define requirements for cooperation with site visits.
17. MDE to establish qualifications requirements (i.e., education, credential and training) for test monitors.
18. LEAs to require District and School Assessment Coordinators and their designees to conduct random, unannounced visits to testing rooms to observe test monitor adherence to State and local requirements.
19. LEAs to require point-of-testing assurances from DACs, School Assessment Coordinators (SACs) and test monitors to not engage in prohibited behaviors and to actively monitor students to prevent prohibited behaviors.
20. LEAs to require point-of-testing assurances from students to not engage in prohibited behaviors.

Recommendations 16, 17 and 18 require policy amendments to the *Procedures Manual* and implementation by the LEAs. Statutory authority should also be sought to support MDE's monitoring role and to define qualifications for personnel administering tests. A working group consisting of MDE Statewide Testing staff and DACs will convene to write requirements and create protocols for observations of test administrations by DACs and SACs. Depending upon staff availability and resources, it may be possible to define requirements in the short term for consideration in a future legislative session. Cost for MDE would largely be staff time; cost for the LEAs to implement the policy amendments derived from these recommendations needs to be determined.

All LEA staff involved with testing are required to receive training in test security and sign the revised *Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure* prior to participating in statewide assessment. They may sign the *Assurance* at the beginning of the school year, however, and need a reminder when the testing window is about to open of their commitment to follow requirements to ensure test data integrity. Recommendation 19 refers to such a point-of-testing refresher on testing policies and procedures. MDE will work with DACs to offer recommendations to LEAs on how to effectively deliver a reminder of the language in the *Assurance*. Depending upon staff availability and resources, it may be possible to accomplish this goal in the short term.

Recommendation 20 is largely accomplished through the materials developed in response to recommendations 2, 5 and 6 in the "Culture of Academic Integrity" section of this report.

Protecting Test Content

At the November 2014 TPPC meeting, Dr. Wayne Camara, ACT, presented to the Committee via webinar a thorough overview of test security and current research and practice in the prevention, detection and resolution of threats to test score integrity. Incentives for misconduct increase as test scores are used to evaluate individuals in addition to systems, and Dr. Camara spoke of the many methods used to gather and share test content by parties who wish to cheat and/or to profit from cheating.

MDE has an obligation to protect its significant financial investment in statewide tests. It has well-developed procedures for protecting paper test materials and for following up on unreturned materials at the conclusion of testing. As the majority of Minnesota's statewide tests move to online delivery, however, some of these procedures become obsolete while new policies and procedures must be developed to meet the challenges to test security afforded by an online environment. TPPC made the following recommendations to protect test content and ensure test takers do not have access to content prior to testing:

21. MDE to investigate the procedures and cost to copyright Minnesota test items.
22. MDE and its testing contractor to implement measures within test design and delivery to prevent the theft of test content.
23. MDE and its testing contractor to develop procedures to detect if secure test content is being disseminated (e.g., monitor postings to social media) after first investigating the State of Minnesota's position on privacy related to content posted to social media.
24. MDE to establish a calendar for testing with as narrow a testing window as possible and to encourage LEAs to schedule narrow windows by subject and to test all students at a grade level in one subject before testing in the next subject.
25. MDE to implement consequences for the use of prohibited devices and prohibited Internet access during testing.
26. LEAs to develop and enforce procedures to protect test content from exposure or release, including local procedures for ensuring prohibited devices (e.g., smart phones, cameras) are not accessible during testing sessions.
27. LEAs to develop and enforce procedures to ensure students do not access the Internet during testing sessions and in testing locations for any other purpose than taking the online test.

Recommendations 24, 26 and 27 require policy amendments to the *Procedures Manual* and implementation by the LEAs. MDE will gather sample policies from districts regarding prohibited devices and internet access to share as examples for others.

The test delivery platform on which Minnesota tests are administered includes many security features to prevent theft and dissemination of content. Recommendation 22 is addressed, in part, by the discussion of recommendations 30, 31 and 32 below. MDE will also review some test design options that may improve test security such as the discrete option multiple choice item type (response options are presented one at a time and the test taker indicates "yes" or "no"; once the test taker indicates "yes," no additional response options are presented, thus reducing their exposure) and performance tasks that can be machine scored.

The Statewide Testing Division at MDE would benefit from legal counsel in order to address recommendations 21, 23 and 25. If funding is available, MDE can work through its testing contractor to investigate copyrighting content and detect postings of secure material to the web. Effective web monitoring requires continuous effort, and costs need to be determined. At present, MDE requires the invalidation of tests where students use prohibited electronic devices during testing. In some cases, students have taken pictures of secure test content and posted them to social media sites. If MDE copyrights its content, it then needs to pursue instances of copyright infringement. It is possible that such infringement results in content that can no longer be used in operational tests, which represents a financial loss to the State. Determining the consequences MDE is willing to impose in cases of copyright infringement and content theft requires internal discussion with legal staff.

Preventing Educator and Student Misconduct

The majority of high-profile test security breaches in recent years involved educators inflating student scores by changing answers on test documents, pre-teaching test items, coaching students while testing, influencing students to change answers, and excluding student records from data sets by various means. Some cases of intentional misconduct have resulted in criminal convictions and prison terms; see, for example, *Former charter school principal sentenced in connection with MCAS cheating scheme*[4] or *8 of 10 Atlanta educators in cheating scandal sentenced to prison*[5]. To prevent such educator misconduct, TPPC made the following recommendations:

28. MDE to develop policy defining the qualifications of who may be present in testing rooms and LEAs to limit access to testing rooms to only those who are authorized.

29. MDE to strongly recommend that LEAs use assigned seating or complete seating charts.

30. MDE to develop policy requiring that test monitors be linked to students testing under their supervision via the test management interface or other documentation.

31. MDE to work with testing contractor to timestamp all student and staff access to online tests and the test management system.

32. MDE to work with testing contractor to restrict access to online tests to the hours of a typical school day on days when school is in session.

Recommendations 28 and 29 require policy amendments to the *Procedures Manual*, updates to DAC and test monitor trainings, and implementation by the LEAs. MDE will seek input from DACs and revise the *Procedures Manual* and trainings. For online tests, MDE will explore with the testing contractor how a student's data can be linked to a particular device and whether or not the connection of student to device provides a practical source of information about physical location of students during testing. For desktop computers in fixed locations, student-to-computer information could be helpful if MDE and LEAs need to follow up on unexpected response patterns. When portable devices such as laptops and tablets are used for testing, their physical location may vary and this information may not be capturable or usable in a practical way. MDE should provide recommendations related to seating when portable devices are used. For example, a device is associated with a specific seat at a

---

[4] Available at http://www.fbi.gov/boston/press-releases/2015/former-charter-school-principal-sentenced-in-connection-with-mcas-cheating-scheme

[5] Available at http://www.ajc.com/news/news/education/sentencing-resumes-tuesday-convicted-aps-educators/nktD6/

desk or table and students are not free to move devices without permission during testing. A DAC on TPPC commented that their district currently uses seating charts because it is helpful in case of testing disruptions such as loss of connectivity. Student response files for upload are most easily located if a student resumes testing on the same computer.

It is currently possible to link a person to the tested group of students in the online test management system if session identifiers include the name of the test monitor, but it is very possible that people other than the person indicated in the test management system actually serve as monitors for the test. MDE will investigate recommendation 30 with the testing contractor to determine cost and timelines for enhancing the test management interface to allow for the entry of names of test monitors and other non-students present during a test session.

Recommendations 31 and 32 are likely already possible within the current test delivery system. MDE will investigate with the testing contractor the cost and timelines to run reports on access times and durations and will determine parameters for reasonable and anomalous results. Stakeholder input will be sought before moving forward with recommendation 32; it is possible that LEAs need access to the test management system outside of school hours for session setup and data entry for accommodated materials. It may be feasible to restrict access to student-facing applications only.

Reporting and Investigating Testing Irregularities

MDE outlines in the *Procedures Manual* steps for LEAs and individuals to follow when reporting testing irregularities. Individuals may report irregularities directly to MDE by phone, email or by using a web-based tip line. Individuals may remain anonymous if they choose to do so. The majority of reports received by MDE are initiated by DACs based on observations by SACs, test monitors and others in the schools. MDE immediately follows up on reports of irregularities and requires DACs to investigate and report their findings so that appropriate corrective action can be taken or recommended. MDE will invalidate—or require LEAs to invalidate—test scores in cases where the findings support a conclusion that the integrity of the scores cannot be assured. Disciplinary action against educators found to have violated test policy and procedures is generally enacted by the LEAs.

TPPC made the following recommendations to strengthen MDE's policies and procedures for the reporting and resolution of testing irregularities:

33. MDE to broadly disseminate information about how to report to the State observed instances of testing irregularities (email address, tip line URL, phone number).
34. LEAs to disseminate information to staff and students about how to report to the State (anonymously or not) observed instances of testing irregularities (email address, tip line URL, phone number).
35. MDE to develop investigative procedures with stakeholder input; such procedures may include the use of external, independent investigators to follow up on suspected misconduct and compile converging evidence.
36. LEAs to participate in the development of investigative procedures, including use of external, independent investigators to follow up on suspected misconduct and compile converging evidence.
37. MDE and LEAs to establish protocols for using external investigative resources when warranted.

38. MDE to research investigative resources within MN state government (e.g., Board of Teaching, Attorney General's office) and in the private sector. Determine projected costs.
39. MDE to convene a cross-divisional team including legal advisors and the Board of Teaching to review evidence of misconduct and determine best course of action. Involve LEAs when appropriate.
40. LEAs to participate in resolution of cases of educator misconduct when appropriate. Report educator misconduct to the Board of Teaching as required.
41. MDE and LEAs to determine sanctions for misconduct of varying severity and how they will be applied.
42. MDE and LEAs to develop appeals process for LEAs, educators and students.

It was noted in TPPC discussions that MDE does not have specific legal authority to enact sanctions in cases of violations of test security policies and procedures. However, MDE interprets Minnesota Statute 122A.20 related to the ethical conduct of educators to include a requirement to uphold these policies and procedures. TPPC recommended that MDE write policy requiring consequences for individuals found to have engaged in conduct that threatens the integrity of test administration and results. It was further recommended that these consequences be shared in test administration and security trainings for LEA staff and test monitors. Test monitors, students and others involved with statewide test administration should be required to confirm their understanding that there are consequences for misconduct that threatens the integrity of the administration and the results.

To accomplish recommendations 33 and 34 MDE will convene existing advisory committees to identify appropriate avenues for the dissemination of procedures for reporting testing irregularities to the State. For information provided by MDE to LEAs, amendments to the *Procedures Manual*, DAC trainings, test monitor directions, and test administration manuals can likely be accomplished in the short term. Following stakeholder input, information for students may be added to the description of integrity and expected behavior outlined in recommendations 2 and 6 in the "Culture of Academic Integrity" section of this report. For information disseminated by the LEAs (34), a small work group of DACs and MDE staff will meet to identify various means by which the reporting information can be shared with staff and students. The link for the Tip Line along with MDE contact name(s) and email address, phone number and fax number will be provided for inclusion in such materials as staff and student handbooks, local training documents and test preparation information provided to students and families.

Recommendations 35, 36, 37 and 38 represent the need to develop investigative resources and procedures within MDE and LEAs. MDE Statewide Testing will identify the support required to accomplish these goals. Specific legal authority and funding to accomplish these recommendations should be sought in future legislation.

Recommendations 39, 40, 41 and 42 require internal, cross-divisional collaboration with LEAs. MDE Statewide Testing will identify the support required to accomplish these goals. Specific legal authority would provide support for the imposition of sanctions in cases of educator misconduct related to testing.

Policies and Procedures to Detect Testing Irregularities

The Secretary's 2011 letter and the reports from the 2013 symposium and 2014 OIG audit all include recommendations that SEAs use forensic analyses to identify LEAs and schools where test data suggest that irregularities may have occurred. To date, erasure analysis has been the most commonly

used method to detect possible tampering with student responses, but it cannot be applied in online testing programs. Minnesota statewide tests are administered nearly entirely online, with the exception of paper materials for students with disabilities who need accommodations, an alternate assessment administered one-on-one, and an English language proficiency assessment. The English language proficiency assessment will be administered online beginning in the 2015-2016 school year.

Other approaches to forensic analysis include examination of test scores for common response patterns across students testing at the same place and time, and for unusually large gains or losses across years for cohorts of students in a school or district. Computer test delivery makes it possible to gather additional data that may aid in the detection of irregularities, such as time spent viewing and responding to individual test questions, times when tests are accessed, and the sequence in which test items are accessed.

TPPC discussed the emerging field of forensic analysis in the testing arena and made the following recommendations for MDE:

43. Identify and prioritize the possible security threats to the assessment program and align data collection and analyses to likelihood of threats. Consider differences between paper and computer-based testing and focus efforts where most needed.
44. Determine baselines, possibly based on an analysis of statewide test data, for investigating district, school or class-level test data.
45. Determine thresholds for flagging test results which merit further investigation.
46. Determine protocol for random selection of districts/schools to include in annual forensic analyses.
47. Share information about data forensics conducted by the State with LEAs, in part for deterrent effect. LEAs, in turn, share with staff and students.
48. Work with online testing contractor to identify other data that can aid in the detection of misconduct (e.g., response patterns, response latency, etc.) if identified threats to test score integrity so warrant.

Recommendations 44–48 depend upon MDE's conducting an analysis of threats to its online and paper testing programs in order to determine the types of data forensics to implement. Thus, recommendation 43 is a necessary condition for the recommendations that follow it in this section. MDE would benefit from the counsel of experts in forensic analysis as well as legal advisors in pursuing this set of recommendations. If funding and resources are available, MDE will begin the process of identifying and prioritizing the possible threats to its programs and the data analyses needed to detect their potential occurrence. This group of recommendations represents an evolving process spanning multiple years.

Outcomes and Next Steps

In addition to developing the recommendations contained in this report, TPPC reviewed various documents drafted by MDE. Where appropriate, these documents will be incorporated in future revisions of the *Procedures Manual*, test security trainings, test administration manuals, test monitor and student directions. The revised *Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure* will be implemented for the 2015-2016 school year. The documents approved by TPPC are in Appendix B.

TPPC frequently noted that it would serve MDE well to seek legal authority to enforce test security and data integrity policy and to impose sanctions for violations. In an ACT research report examining state statutes and regulations related to test security, Michelle Croft summarized the importance of a legal foundation for policy:

> The presence of the test security information in statutes and regulations provides a clear message to educators about the importance of test security. Moreover, by examining statutes and regulations, one can obtain a better understanding of states' approaches to test security, because the statutes and regulations provide a stable foundation for the more detailed test security manuals developed by the state department of education.[6]

The Statewide Testing Division at MDE will work with the Commissioner's office and Government Relations group to draft test security language for a future legislative session.

In addition to a legal foundation, many of the initiatives proposed by TPPC require funding beyond current allocations. This document has attempted to identify which TPPC recommendations MDE can implement with current resources and which recommendations require additional financial investment. MDE can amend policies in the *Procedures Manual* with current resources. MDE cannot increase unannounced site visits to schools during test administrations or develop and implement a data forensics plan without additional funding.

The LEAs would also incur costs to implement some of the Committee's recommendations. Developing local policies and enforcing them requires resources. In discussions of possible local measures to enhance test security, DAC members noted that some cannot be implemented without support from the State and should not be recommended at this time. For example, districts could provide better test security if there were two test administrators in all testing sessions, but without support from the State it would be very difficult for districts to implement this practice.

DACs noted that MDE has turned to webinars and other technology-based solutions for training in an effort to reduce MDE staff time and expense. DACs expressed the opinion that face-to-face regional trainings are much more effective in preparing them for all facets of test administration, including maintaining test and data integrity.

In addition to reviewing Minnesota's policies and test security guidelines from external sources, TPPC was initially charged with the tasks below:

- Review current Minnesota policy and statute and propose specific language to strengthen test policies and procedures in Minnesota. Incorporate policy language into *Procedures Manual*.
- Review current Minnesota test security procedures (*Procedures Manual*, trainings, Test Security Notification process, unannounced site visits, sanctions for security breaches, data forensics, etc.) and propose specific procedures for MDE and its testing contractor to implement to strengthen test integrity in Minnesota.

---

[6] Croft, M. (2014). A review of state test security laws in 2013. (ACT Research Report Series 2014-1). Retrieved June 26, 2014 from https://www.act.org/research/researchers/reports/pdf/ACT_RR2014-1.pdf.

- Identify data collection and analyses to be conducted by Minnesota's testing contractor and quality control contractor; identify appropriate timeframes within which to analyze data and report findings.
- Identify MDE internal workflow and staffing needs to successfully implement strengthened test security measures.

Although the Committee noted that it was not possible to complete all tasks within the time allotted to it, TPPC did make significant progress in addressing the first two bullets above. Policy language and new or revised procedures were developed, and short and long-term goals for MDE to accomplish other tasks were set. TPPC acknowledged that developing a comprehensive data forensics plan is an essential element of a test integrity program and that additional resources are needed to incorporate data forensics and other Committee recommendations at MDE and in the LEAs.

Appendix A

Test Policies and Procedures Committee Members
and Meeting Agenda

Test Policies and Procedures Committee Members, 2014-2015

Name	Title and affiliation
Cheryl Alcaya	Supervisor of Test Development, MDE
Margarita Alvarez	Supervisor of Test Development, MDE
Jim Bartholomew	Education Policy Director, Minnesota Business Partnership
Jill Bemis	Fiscal Compliance Monitor, MDE
Sharon Borgert	Minnesota Rural Education Association and District Assessment and Curriculum Coordinator, Eden Valley-Watkins Public Schools
Gretchen Chilkott	District Assessment Coordinator, South Washington County Schools
Gregory Cizek	Minnesota Technical Advisory Committee
Josh Collins	Director of Communications, MDE
Erin Doan	Executive Director, Board of Teaching, MDE
Jennifer Dugan	Director of Statewide Testing, MDE
Claudia Flowers	Minnesota Technical Advisory Committee
Holly Garnell	Charter Center Coordinator, MDE
Andrea Hansen Bishop	Test Integrity Specialist, MDE
George Henly	Supervisor of Data and Reporting, MDE
Steven Huser	Legislative Coordinator, MDE
Darcy Josephson	District Assessment Coordinator, Redwood Area Schools
Bill Kautt	Associate Director of Management Services, Minnesota School Boards Association
Jen Kohan	Education Minnesota
Daron Korte	Director of Government Relations, MDE
Robin Lane	District Assessment Coordinator, St. Paul Public Schools
Kevin McHenry	Assistant Commissioner, MDE
Lynn Moore	Supervisor, Office of Title I Federal Programs, St. Paul Public Schools
Cindy Murphy	Charter Center Director, MDE
Kathryn Olson	Data Practices Officer, MDE
Susan Phillips	Minnesota Technical Advisory Committee
Mark Reckase	Minnesota Technical Advisory Committee
Chris Richardson	Minnesota Association of School Administrators
Mary Roden	District Assessment Coordinator, Mounds View Public Schools
Linda Sams	Manager of Program Management, MDE
Roger Trent	Minnesota Technical Advisory Committee
Richard Wassen	Director of Educator Licensing, MDE

Test Policies and Procedures Committee

October 24, 2014, 1:00-4:00 pm

Minnesota Department of Education, Conference Center B, Room 18*

Agenda

1. Welcome and purpose for the committee

2. Logistics and introductions by committee members

3. Overview: Why test integrity efforts now?

4. Validity--what it is, why it's important and how it's threatened

5. Current Minnesota statutes, policies and procedures to deter testing misconduct--intentional or unintentional

6. Discuss goals for November meeting and distribute materials for review

Minnesota Department of **Education**

Test Policies and Procedures Committee

November 19, 2014, 9:00 am–5:00 pm

Minnesota Department of Education, Conference Center A, Room 14

Agenda

1. Welcome, logistics and introductions by committee members

2. Brief summary of October 24 kick-off meeting

3. A holistic view of test security: Dr. Wayne Camara, ACT

4. Preventing and responding to educator misconduct: Monica Rasmussen, Board of Teaching, and Phillip Trobaugh, Compliance and Assistance

5. Lunch

6. Test security training: Tracy Cerda, Statewide Testing; Gretchen Chilkott, DAC at South Washington County Public Schools; and Mary Roden, DAC at Mounds View Public Schools

7. Review of current policy and identification of areas in need of improvement

8. Discuss goals for January meeting and distribute materials for review

Minnesota Department of

Education

Test Policies and Procedures Committee

January 7, 2015, 9:00-5:00 pm

Minnesota Department of Education, Conference Center B, Room 16

Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Overview of the Minnesota assessment program

3. Review recommendations from November meeting

4. Detection: data forensic analysis; presentation by Dr. Steve Ferrara, Pearson

5. Lunch

6. Data forensic analysis, continued

7. Investigation and Enforcement: Review checklist

8. Investigation and Enforcement: presentation/facilitated discussion

9. Discuss goals for April meeting and distribute materials for review

Minnesota Department of
Education

Test Policies and Procedures Committee

April 8, 2015, 9:00 am–5:00 pm

Minnesota Department of Education, Conference Center B, Room 15

Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Review Non-Disclosure Agreement and FAQ

3. Academic Honesty: Culture, Pledges, Codes of Conduct

4. Copyrighting Minnesota test items

5. Lunch

6. Training Plan

7. Investigative Process: Committee Recommendations

8. Prioritizing threats to the Minnesota assessment program

Minnesota Department of **Education**

Test Policies and Procedures Committee

June 3, 2015, 9:00 am–1:00 pm

Minnesota Department of Education, Conference Center B, Room 16

Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Review edits to documents from April meeting

3. Review draft of final report

4. Discussion of TPPC outcomes and recommended next steps during working lunch

5. Closing comments

Appendix B

Documents Created by the Test Policies and Procedures Committee

FAQ: Why Statewide Test Results Matter

What are statewide tests?

Statewide tests are annual, summative measurements of student achievement that are used, along with many other school and classroom assessments, to evaluate student learning and skills. Specifically, the Minnesota statewide tests assess achievement of the Minnesota Academic Standards in mathematics, reading and science and language proficiency development for English learners. Some forms of assessment occur on a daily basis, others occur at the end of a unit of instruction, and others at the end of a semester or course. Schools use objective, standardized assessments to validly measure students' learning against benchmarks of academic achievement. The Minnesota statewide tests function as one part of a comprehensive system for evaluating student learning.

How are statewide testing data used?

Information from statewide tests is used in a number of ways. The State uses the aggregated test scores to report to the public and the U.S. Department of Education how Minnesota students are performing in school. Statewide test data help the State evaluate the progress schools are making in reducing achievement gaps among student groups. Schools and districts use the assessment results to measure their progress in improving student learning over time. Educators use individual scores to gauge students' relative strengths and areas of need, and they use aggregated results to adjust curriculum and instruction. Parents use the scores in their decision-making process when choosing schools for their children. Parents, students, and educators may also use test results to determine whether or not students are on-track for success in future grade levels, college and careers. For these reasons, ensuring the integrity of statewide testing data is an important and shared responsibility.

What is test score validity and why is it important?

Test score validity has both a technical and a common sense meaning. A set of professional guidelines accepted by the testing profession defines validity as "the degree to which evidence…support[s] the interpretations of test scores for proposed uses of tests" (p. 11).[7] In everyday terms, one might think of test score validity as answering the question, "Can I trust that this test score tells me what it claims to tell me?" Test scores are considered valid if it is possible to draw accurate conclusions about student achievement from them. For example, if students achieve a score on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA) that indicates they "Meet the Standards," it is reasonable to conclude that students have mastered sufficient content and skills in grade level reading, math or science to be adequately prepared for content in the next grade level or for postsecondary college or careers. The knowledge and skills they have mastered can be accurately described, and students, parents and educators can use the information to chart the next steps for academic progress. Valid test scores can help identify areas of relative strength and weakness for follow up by educators and parents.

---

[7] American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.* Washington, DC: Author.

What are examples of actions that threaten test score validity?

To use test results in meaningful ways, a test score must represent the individual, unassisted achievement of each student. Cheating threatens test score validity. A short list of ways people cheat or engage in misconduct includes:

- Students receive help or answers from other students
- Students receive help or answers from educators or staff
- Students view or practice actual test items prior to the test
- Educators use actual test items for practice with students
- Educators change students' answers or otherwise tamper with tests
- Educators fail to secure materials or configure testing environments to prevent cheating

What are the consequences of cheating?

There are consequences to reporting scores to students, families and schools that do not represent individual achievement. Some of the most important consequences include:

- Students are misled about their learning.
- False results are reported to parents and others who use the test scores to make decisions.
- Students may be placed into academic programs for which they are not prepared and miss opportunities to receive needed interventions.
- Achievement gaps may not be identified and school resources may be inappropriately allocated.
- Inaccurate information is reported to the public about the quality of its schools.
- Public confidence in an assessment program's ability to accurately measure student achievement is eroded.

How can cheating be prevented?

Establishing and maintaining a culture of academic integrity within Minnesota schools is the key to preventing cheating. Definitions of academic integrity are often found in school or district codes of conduct or student handbooks and, although they may differ slightly, generally share a few key points:

- Academic integrity is honest and responsible scholarship.
- All academic work should result from an individual's own efforts.

Just as schools and districts require academic integrity from students in their coursework, they should also expect students to act with integrity when taking statewide or other standardized assessments. Districts can support academic and test score integrity by:

- Communicating how assessment data are used and why test score validity is important.
- Making expectations for integrity explicit.
- Ensuring that students and staff know the consequences for misconduct.

- Applying consequences for misconduct consistently.
- Requiring students and staff to sign assurances that they will honor test security policies.

Although agreeing to a code of conduct may not deter the small number of people who are determined to cheat, it is an effective method for communicating to students and educators the expectations for behavior and conduct that support academic integrity.

Policies and procedures for administering Minnesota's statewide assessments are included in the *Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments*, test administration manuals, and in trainings and tutorials. Districts and schools must ensure that students, educators and staff understand the requirements for test security. **Security protocol violations can occur simply because people do not know or understand the policies and procedures.** Educators can jeopardize test score integrity without intending to do so when their purpose may be to help or to take advantage of a "teachable moment." However, telling a student to take another look at an incorrectly answered test item or providing any other clues to the correct answer is misconduct and requires that the student's test score be invalidated and a report of the suspected misconduct be provided to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE).

What happens when educator misconduct on statewide tests is suspected or confirmed?

Allegations and evidence of educator misconduct must be reported to MDE, and MDE subsequently requires district administrators to determine the facts of the reported misconduct. If district administrators are implicated or if other circumstances so warrant, external investigators may be hired to conduct an independent investigation. Complaints of misconduct made to the Minnesota Board of Teaching or Board of School Administrators are referred to the Attorney General's office for evaluation and investigation. Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 122A.20 Subd. 1(a), the Board of Teaching or Board of School Administrators, whichever has jurisdiction, may conduct an inquiry to determine whether disciplinary action against a license is warranted for confirmed reports involving educator misconduct. Educators found to have engaged in misconduct are subject to sanctions that may include censure, license placed on probationary status, suspended or revoked. School districts that terminate the employment of an educator for a violation of the code of ethics are required to report the termination to the appropriate Board.

What is the process for reporting suspected violations of test security protocols?

The usual course of action is to report the violation of test security policies to the School Assessment Coordinator or District Assessment Coordinator who will then submit a Test Security Notification to MDE for appropriate action. Reports of violations can be reported directly and anonymously to MDE by providing information via the Minnesota Statewide Test Security Tip Line (MDE > School Support > Test Administration).

ASSURANCE OF TEST SECURITY AND NON-DISCLOSURE

Effective for school year: _____

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) is required by state statute to implement statewide testing programs. Test security must be maintained to provide an equal opportunity to all students to demonstrate their academic achievement and to ensure the validity of test scores and the integrity of state assessments. Failure to maintain test security jeopardizes district and state accountability requirements and the accuracy of student, school, district, and state data. Test scores are included in important decisions about students' future success, and it is essential that they reflect the truth about what students know and can do. This form must be signed prior to access to any secure test content or restricted material(s).

All test content and restricted material(s), whether in draft or final form, are considered secure and only authorized persons are permitted to have access to them. Authorized persons:

- Are administrators, educators, staff, or other persons designated by the district who have a role in storing, distributing, coordinating, or administering tests.
- Have received appropriate training to fulfill their assigned roles.
- Have signed this agreement.

Responsibilities of authorized persons who may potentially interact with secure test content and data are outlined in the *Procedures Manual of the Minnesota Assessments* (hereafter *Procedures Manual)*. By signing this form, you agree to the following assurances:

- As required for my role in the administration of the statewide testing program, I am responsible for understanding relevant information contained in the current year's *Procedures Manual* and directions for test administration. I will abide by policies and procedures detailed in the manuals for statewide test administration.
- As required for my role, I am or will be trained in the administration policies and procedures for statewide tests before participating in any part of statewide test administration.
- As required for my role, I will instruct staff on state and district procedures for maintaining test security and will not allow unauthorized persons to distribute, coordinate or administer tests, or have access to secure test content and materials.
- As required for my role, I will follow the procedures in the *Procedures Manual* to investigate and notify the appropriate school and district staff or the Minnesota Department of Education immediately upon learning of potential misconduct or irregularities, whether intentional or unintentional.
- I understand that MDE has the responsibility to oversee the administration of the statewide tests, and I will cooperate fully with MDE representatives conducting site visits.
- I understand that test data and documents that contain student-level information are considered confidential and secure. I will follow all applicable federal and state data privacy laws related to student educational data, including data within reports and data accessible in electronic systems provided by MDE or its service provider(s).
- I understand my responsibility to enforce proper testing procedures and to ensure the security and confidential integrity of the test(s). I will apply and follow procedures designed to keep test content secure and to ensure the validity of test results, including but not limited to:
  - Recognizing the rights of students and families to accurate test results that reflect students' individual, unassisted achievement.
  - Protecting the confidentiality of statewide assessments and ensuring the validity of students' results by safeguarding secure test content, keeping test materials in a secure area, and adhering to chain of custody requirements.

- Never retaining secure test materials in my custody beyond the allowed times to process, distribute, coordinate, administer, and return them, as appropriate for my role.
- Ensuring that no part of the paper or online tests are outlined, summarized, paraphrased, discussed, released, distributed to unauthorized personnel, printed, reproduced, copied, photographed, recorded, or retained in original or duplicated format, without the explicit permission of MDE or as authorized in the *Procedures Manual*.
- Never permitting or engaging in the unauthorized use of a student's MARSS or Secure Student Identification Number (SSID) to log in to the online testing system or access an online test.
- Never engaging in, or allowing others to engage in, unauthorized viewing, discussion, or analysis of test items before, during, or after testing.
- Actively monitoring students during test administration for prohibited behavior.
- Never leaving students unattended during test administration or under the supervision of unauthorized staff or volunteers.
- Never providing students with answers to secure test items, suggesting how to respond to secure test items, or influencing student responses to secure test items. Prohibited actions include but are not limited to providing clues or hints; providing reminders of content or testing strategies; prompting students to correct or check/recheck specific responses; permitting access to curricular materials (e.g., textbooks, notes, review materials, bulletin boards, posters, charts, maps, timelines, etc.); or using voice inflection, facial gestures, pointing, gesturing, tapping, or other actions to indicate a response or accuracy of a student's response.
- Never formally or informally scoring secure tests or individual test items except as required by the test-specific manuals and directions. Prohibited actions include but are not limited to creating an answer key; reviewing or scoring a student's item response or responses unless items are designed to be scored by the test administrator using a rubric or script; retaining, reviewing, or scoring student scratch paper or accommodated test materials; or tracking student performance on test items.
- Never altering or engaging in other prohibited involvement with student responses.
- Never inducing or encouraging others to violate the procedures outlined above or to engage in any conduct that jeopardizes test security or the validity of test scores.

By accepting the terms of this agreement, you name yourself as an employee of the School District (District) or as an authorized person selected by the District, and affirm that you are authorized by the District during the current academic school year to have access to secure test materials or student data related to statewide test administrations and hereby agree to be bound by the terms of this agreement.

Failure to follow procedures can lead to the invalidation of students' tests. Consequences for violating the terms of this agreement may result in a complaint filed with the local School Board, the Board of Teaching or the Board of School Administrators for evaluation and investigation. The findings of the appropriate Board may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination and/or loss of license.

Signature	Date
Name (printed)	Work Telephone
School Name	Email address
District Name	

Definitions of Test Score Integrity and Pledge

For LEA Staff and Administration (for inclusion in trainings about the *Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure*)

Test score integrity refers to the truthfulness and accuracy of the scores that students receive on tests. It is closely related to test score validity. When we say test scores are valid, we mean that it is possible to draw appropriate inferences from the scores students receive on a test. For instance, we expect that students who receive high scores on a standardized math test have learned the skills evaluated by the test. If their high scores were achieved dishonestly, however, our interpretation that the students learned the content would be incorrect. Test scores are included in important decisions about students' future success, and it is essential that they reflect the truth about what students know and can do. We all share responsibility for ensuring the integrity of test scores.

For Students (to include in Test Monitor and Student Directions and possibly at the front of the test on an initial screen or page)

Middle and High School Students

The MCAs and other statewide tests are designed to measure the grade level content and skills you have learned. Test results show areas where you are performing well and areas where you may need more instruction and practice. Test scores based on your effort—and your effort alone—allow teachers and others at your school to form an accurate picture of your current academic standing and to plan for your future success in school. Test scores that are obtained by cheating create an incorrect picture of your abilities, which may have consequences such as placing you in a course you are not prepared for or excluding you from opportunities to receive support in areas that are challenging for you. Your responsibility is to show honestly what you, and you alone, know and can do. It is expected that:

- You will accept no help answering test questions.
- You will not tell others what is on the test or give them answers.
- You understand there may be consequences if you fail to follow directions or engage in dishonest behavior.

Elementary School Students

The tests you take in school measure what you have learned. They also show where you may have room to grow and learn. Teachers and principals expect your answers to test questions to honestly show what you know without any help from others. They use the results of these tests to make important decisions about your future learning. Your responsibility is to do your own best work on the test to show what you know and can do without any help. It is expected that:

- You will accept no help answering test questions.
- You will not tell others what is on the test or give them answers.
- You understand there may be consequences if you do not follow directions or if you act dishonestly.

Active Monitoring: Addition to the *Procedures Manual*

Test Monitor's Responsibilities on Testing Day(s) — During the Test

. . .

Actively monitor students during all test sessions.

- o Active test monitors do the following:
    - Circulate repeatedly around the entire room to ensure students are following directions and making progress in the test.
    - Make sure students are focused only on their tests.
    - Watch for any unusual behavior or signs of cheating.
    - Adhere to time limits, if applicable.
    - Ensure that students who have finished their tests are engaged in allowable activities that do not distract students still testing.
- o Active test monitors **DO NOT**:
    - Leave the room unattended or under the supervision of untrained personnel at any time.
    - Stand or sit in one place for more than a few minutes.
    - Grade papers or perform other work.
    - Read material unrelated to administering the test.
    - Engage in behavior that is potentially distracting to test-takers.
    - Use, or allow students to use, cell phones and other prohibited electronic devices.
    - Make or receive phone calls or text messages.
    - Engage in any other tasks unrelated to test administration and monitoring.

Recommended Informational and Training Modules for Targeted Audiences

Topics	MDE Staff	DACs/ SACs	Educators	Students
Culture of academic honesty		x	x	x
Honor codes			x	x
Test score integrity: What it is, why it matters (also general public and media for an audience)		x	x	x
The SEA's role in preventing threats to test score integrity	x	x		
The LEA's role in preventing threats to test score integrity		x	x	
Specific preventive measures to ensure test score integrity, e.g.:		x	x	
• Active monitoring		x	x	
• Chain of custody for paper materials, student login information and scratch paper		x	x	
• Following Test Monitor and Student Directions		x	x	
• Etc.		x	x	
Forensic analysis to detect possible cheating	x	x		
How to report misconduct		x	x	x
Investigation of suspected/reported misconduct	x	x	x	x
Consequences for misconduct (resolution)	x	x	x	x
Continuous improvement of policies and procedures	x			