



Proposed Rubric for Nevada State Summative Assessments

Reviewer Guidance

Reviewers should score each criterion independently using the definitions provided. Scores should reflect evidence presented in the proposal. Avoid awarding high scores based on intent without clear implementation detail.

Scoring Scale

Exceeds (3): Exceeds expectations for this criterion—demonstrates a high level of capacity, innovation, and creativity and shares numerous examples of evidence or data.

Meets (2): Meets expectations for this criterion—demonstrates consistency with industry standards and practices with some examples of evidence or data.

Developing (1): Meets some but not all of the expectations for this criterion. Meets the lowest acceptable levels for the particular criterion and may or may not have examples of evidence or data.

Inadequate (0): Does not meet the expectations for this criterion—does not demonstrate examples of evidence or data and/or does not demonstrate sufficient capacity to reach criterion’s objective.

Each criterion below will be scored 3, 2, 1, or 0 and then totaled for each section and that total will be weighted as listed.

Criteria	E	M	D	I
Project Management – 20%				
Vendor provides sufficient evidence, including data and artifacts, to describe their credentials, performance history, their processes, their skills and knowledge, and their deliverables.				
Vendor’s resources are adequate to meet the state educational needs, including flexibility and ability to solve challenges in creative ways.				
Vendor has prior experience with the type of assessment being sought and provides adequate references.				
Vendor has capacity to host a web-based assessment delivery system as well as a paper-pencil system with technical				

DRAFT

Criteria	E	M	D	I
assistance to support users and implement quality assurance protocols.				
Vendor has capacity and procedures to ensure that all project activities and deliverables adhere to high standards of integrity and confidentiality of student information.				
Sufficient evidence exists regarding vendor’s ability to plan and execute the entire assessment process, including, but not limited to staff capacity, organizational resources and expertise, and project management.				
The plan has dedicated Nevada representatives or contacts.				
Project Management Total × 20%				
Functional and Technical Requirements – 50%				
The proposed solution clearly demonstrates alignment to the rigorous criteria of the Federal Peer Review process.				
The proposed solution accurately measures student mastery of grade-level standards.				
The proposed solution provides the ability to reduce the number of assessments administered to students.				
The proposed solution provides consistent data to compare student progress year over year.				
The proposed solution provides data for teachers, schools, and districts to make instructional decisions for the improvement of school and student outcomes.				
The proposed solution provides an individual student report so each student and guardian can identify areas of academic strengths and weaknesses.				
The proposed solution provides supports and accommodations to meet the needs of all students, including, but not limited to, English Learners and students with disabilities.				
The proposed solution provides communication tools applicable and accessible to all stakeholders groups including, but not limited to, SEA, LEA, site administrators, counselors, teachers, and all personnel involved with the assessment and families and students.				
The proposed solution demonstrates clear alignment to Nevada Academic Content Standards and provides evidence that item development is standards-based.				
Functional and Technical Requirements Total × 50%				
Equity – 10%				
Vendor provides examples of how equity is integrated into products, services, and operational processes.				
Equity Total × 10%				
Cost Schedule – 20%				
Vendor submits clear, itemized pricing for all services outlined in the RFP.				
Cost Schedule Total × 20%				