



**International
Credentialing
Associates**

**ICA eBRIEF #3
ITEM EXPOSURE COUNTERMEASURES
USING CLASSICAL TEST THEORY**

www.intlcred.com



November 2014

Disclaimer. These guidelines are generalizations that are supported with evidence and do not represent an exhaustive list of supporting literature. Credentialing organizations should consult with a measurement professional since unique situations may require other acceptable evidenced based approaches and/or industry best practices. ICA believes this is a working document and any feedback is highly encouraged. Please send your feedback to manny@intlcred.com.

Factors to Consider	Summary	Supporting Literature
Use Multiple Forms	Use more than one form of the exam. This addresses test security, which in turn, addresses validity.	Cohen, A. S., & Wollack, J. A. (2006). Test administration, security, scoring, and reporting. In Brennan, R. L. (Ed.), <i>Educational measurement (4th ed.)</i> . Westport, CT: Praeger. – Pages 363-364; 366-367
Minimize Overlap Between Forms	This is usually the case if you plan to post-equate, then you will need some intentional overlap, and the equating block will need to meet very specific parameters (see Kolen and Brennan, 2004).	Cohen, A. S., & Wollack, J. A. (2006). Test administration, security, scoring, and reporting. In Brennan, R. L. (Ed.), <i>Educational measurement (4th ed.)</i> . Westport, CT: Praeger. – Pages 363-364; 366-367 Kolen, M. J., & Brennan, R. L. (2004). <i>Test equating, scaling, and linking: Methods and practices</i> (2nd ed.). New York: Springer-Verlag.
Testing Windows	Use narrow testing windows Using narrow testing windows serves several purposes. First, it provides a level of security that continuous testing cannot provide. Second, it allows time to run non-standard analyses, such as data forensics.	Cohen, A. S., & Wollack, J. A. (2006). Test administration, security, scoring, and reporting. In Brennan, R. L. (Ed.), <i>Educational measurement (4th ed.)</i> . Westport, CT: Praeger. – Pages 363-364; 366-367

Factors to Consider	Summary	Supporting Literature
Replace/Dock Items	<p>1) Monitor exposure rates and determine if item is no longer discriminating and many candidates have seen the item, it may need to be retired and/or replaced</p> <p>2) “Replacing a large percentage [of items] between testing windows” p. 366</p> <p>3) Retire items “Any times exposed to more than 15,000 examines must be retired (Way et al., 2002)</p> <p>On the other hand, docking items is another option where you temporarily restrict the use of the item for a certain amount of time.</p>	<p>1 / 2) Cohen, A. S., & Wollack, J. A. (2006). Test administration, security, scoring, and reporting. In Brennan, R. L. (Ed.), <i>Educational measurement (4th ed.)</i>. Westport, CT: Praeger.- Pages 363-364; 366-367</p> <p>3) Way, W. D., Steffen, M., & Anderson, G. S. (2002). Developing, maintaining, and renewing inventory to support CBT. In C.N. Mills, M.T. Potenza, J.J., Fremer, & W.C. Ward (Eds.), <i>Computer-based testing: Building the foundation for future assessments</i>. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. - Page 78</p>
Restrict Most Frequently Selected Items When Updating/Building New Forms	See “Replace/Dock Items” above to determine if items should be replaced or docked that are used very frequently.	Davey, T. & Pitoniak, M. J. (2006). Designing computerized adaptive tests. In Downing, S. M. & Haladyna, T. M. (Eds), <i>Handbook of test development</i> . Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates . - Page 553

Factors to Consider	Summary	Supporting Literature
Use an exposure control parameter (more common on IRT/CAT exams)	Value is between 0 and 1, and determines when an item would be used. For instance, an item that has an exposure control parameter of .10 is only selected 10% of the time to be on that exam form. A CTT guideline (or PIA under CAT) is to cap exposure at 0.2 to 0.25 . Items that have exposure >0.25 should be removed from the bank before they become over-exposed. Any item over 0.4 should be retired from the bank.	1) Sympson, J. B., & Hetter, R. D. (1985). Controlling item-exposure rates in computerized adaptive testing. <i>Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the Military Testing Association</i> (pp. 973-977). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center. 2) Georgiadou, E., Triantafillou, E., & Economides, A. A. (2007). A review of item exposure control strategies for computerized adaptive testing developed from 1983 to 2005. <i>The Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment</i> , 5, 5-37. 3) Davey, T. & Pitoniak, M. J. (2006). Designing computerized adaptive tests. In Downing, S. M. & Haladyna, T. M. (Eds.), <i>Handbook of Test Development</i> . Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates . - Page 554 4) http://www.caveon.com/articles/df_article1.htm

Thank you. ICA would like to thank the individuals who provided feedback on this document, especially ICA's Technical Advisory Board (www.intlcred.com/advisory.html).