

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS ASSESSMENT  
SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
July 6, 2023  
2:00 PM**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting Room</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo Rd.	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	Virtual	<a href="#">Lifesize</a>

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SBE CCR SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Tim Hughes, Chair  
Felicia Ortiz  
Mike Walker

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT**

Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer  
Christy McGill, Deputy Superintendent of Educator Licensure...  
Peter Zutz, Director, Office of Assessment, Data and Accountability Management (ADAM)  
Martha Warachowski, Administrative Assistant IV, Office of the Superintendent

**LEGAL STAFF PRESENT**

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE**

Gideon Davis, Administrator, State Purchasing

**1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Meeting called to order at 2:01 P.M. by Chair Tim Hughes. Quorum was established. Member Hughes led the Pledge of Allegiance and provided a land acknowledgement.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

There were no public comments in Las Vegas or Carson City and no written-in public statements.

**3. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ON RFP RUBRIC**

Peter Zutz, Director of the Office of Assessment, Data and Accountability Management (ADAM), introduced himself and reminded everyone that the meeting materials were posted on the NDE website. He stated they are looking specifically at the rubric, and the Department has a couple of questions for resolution and discussion so they can move on. He stated the RFP will close on 7/12, and they would ideally like to complete the training with the subcommittee by then. He stated State Purchasing will convene and send out the invite to all of the evaluation committee members for that training and the Department will lead per conversations they've had to date with the subcommittee.

President Ortiz asked if they would be on the review committee as well, and Mr. Zutz replied no and stated the subcommittee made it very clear months ago when they began their work together, clarifying the criteria for selecting the evaluation committee members, which has been finalized.

President Ortiz asked if Mr. Zutz meant to say training for the evaluation committee, not the subcommittee, and Mr. Zutz replied if he said subcommittee, then he apologizes because he meant to say training of the evaluation committee members.

Member Walker stated he had couple of questions. He stated that looking at the first part that's worth 20%, some of those questions seem as better yes/no questions, such as yes, they've had ligation and been censored or not. He stated he does not know how they rate that as exceeding, so those questions really could be either they did it or they didn't. He stated that in part two, in talking it over with one of their curriculum directors in Lyon County, he was concerned that the way number one is written, it really leaves out those CTE students, and so he's wondering if they can add in the requirements for higher education scholarship as well as certification for career readiness so that it's not just assessing students who are college-bound. He stated that the director from Lyon County was hoping they could capture that in some way to reflect their diverse population.

Member Walker asked if they could also call it the assessment instead of the proposed solution because to him, they should call it what it is, the career and college readiness assessment. He stated those are his suggestions and thoughts which may have already been discussed, but this is his first meeting on the subcommittee.

Chair Hughes asked since this has been published already, can they make any final tweaks.

Mr. Zutz stated that is a great question and replied part of the process requires them to provide all documents to State Purchasing for dissemination, and they are there today because they are seeking clarification on scoring, so he's hesitant to address Member Walker's comments. He stated that Member Hughes has been a part of the subcommittee meetings and conversations to date, and the things that have just been mentioned were discussed in detailed the last few months and the language that the subcommittee agreed upon is posted with today's meeting materials.

Mr. Zutz stated the posted materials are missing two elements that he wanted to call to the attention of the members. He stated it was the unanimous decision of the subcommittee that on page 1, number 3, Vendor's History of Service be free of ligation or censure; columns M and D will be blacked out. He stated the evaluation committee members will either select E-Exceeds or I-Inadequate. He stated that the same scoring will be applied to the top of page 2, number 8 for "the plan has dedicated Nevada representatives or contacts." He stated this will be scored the same, using only E-Exceeds or I-Inadequate, and black out Meets and Developing.

Chair Hughes stated he can confirm that was the conversation they had at the subcommittee and when they brought it to the full board. He stated Member Walker addresses that second comment he had that some of them weren't on a scale but just sort of existed or didn't exist, so they would want to limit those so that they align to previous conversations.

Chair Hughes stated there was one other thing he wanted to call out in the rubric, and he thinks this might be a version control situation, so they will have to go back, and hopefully, the right one got out in the packet of materials. He stated the one that posted for today has the wrong percentages, so at the Board meeting when they approved this, they did move the cost schedule down to 10%, but the one that was posted for today's meeting materials still had them at 20%. He asked Mr. Zutz if he could confirm that might have just been a version control misprint on what was posted today.

Mr. Zutz stated he can confirm that if there is an error on the draft copy that was provided in today's materials because they're here to finalize this. He stated the correct high-level weight that he just mentioned were provided to State Purchasing with the packet of RFP materials. He asked if he could confirm the weights with Member Hughes, and the following was confirmed to be correct: Project Management-20, Functional/Technical Requirements-60, Equity-10, and Cost-10.

Chair Hughes stated he thinks this may be an older version that got posted and what Mr. Zutz just named was approved by the Board last time.

Mr. Zutz stated their last query is on page one, numbers 1, 2, 4, and 7, and comes with the responsibility they opened this meeting up with which is training the evaluation committee members on rating these proposals. He stated their specific questions pertain to the words, sufficient and adequate, which they want to norm with them today and leave in 100% in agreement on how they're providing this training and

information to the evaluation committee members next week. He stated for example, beginning with number one: Vendor provides sufficient evidence including data and artifacts to describe their credentials, performance history, their processes, their skills and knowledge and their deliverables. He stated they're asking the evaluation committee members to rate E-Exceeds, 3 points, M-Meets, 2 points, D-Developing, 1 point, and I-Inadequate, 0 points. He asked what does the subcommittee believe would be sufficient evidence for any one of those score levels because someone might say sufficient evidence is a Meets, but they are scoring on a range, so they are asking the subcommittee for clarity on what that range might look like with the current wording.

President Ortiz stated in her opinion, if a vendor supplied evidence that's clearly listed and complete, such as data, artifacts, credentials, performance history, processes, skills and knowledge, that shows this vendor has been around for a while and they have all the skills and knowledge to do this work, then they would be an Exceeds. She stated if it were okay, and they didn't have a ton of performance history that's in the 3 to 5-year range, that would be a Meets. She stated if they're brand new and their credentials and staff doesn't have a lot of longevity with them or they haven't been doing this for a long time, then that's Developing. She stated if they don't provide any evidence of this, that's insufficient. She stated evidence has to be provided and it's the quality of the evidence that exceeds, meets or is developing.

Chair Hughes replied he would like to add that the Meets expectation is the baseline, so when they're talking about sufficient, they can try to say consistent with industry standards without spelling it all out. He stated for above and beyond, they would have multiple examples and then be bumped up to the 3, and then below that if they didn't have the bare essentials, then that would go down to Developing. He stated one of the flaws he's seeing as Mr. Zutz brought that up is that sufficient is probably the word he would equate to Meets, but then in number 2, they would switch to the word Adequate, which then gets trickier, so he doesn't know if there's an ability to make that consistent so that they put number 2 as sufficient as well because then that is sort of saying that's the base level.

President Ortiz stated for number 4 on Adequate References, with any RFP, they want at least three references, so Meets would be three, and that's pretty simple to explain to the evaluation committee. She stated if they have at least three good references, then they meet the criteria, but if they gave them more than that, then that would be an exceeds. She stated if they only gave them two, then that's Developing, but if they only gave them one, then that's probably insufficient, so she thinks number 4 is a pretty simple one. She stated she agrees with Member Hughes on the rest of them that 1 and 2 should probably say sufficient as well, but the scoring and evaluation should be based on the quality of their evidence.

Member Walker stated when Member Hughes talked about industry standards, he's not sure all the people on the committee are going to have the same background, so he thinks what President Ortiz was saying is at least easy to train. He stated they need something that's quantifiable and objective because they can't assume that they're all going to have that background is his fear.

President Ortiz replied that Member Walker had a good point.

Chair Hughes stated that he's not sure if Mr. Zutz could speak to this, but he just wanted to rewind and remind people that when they started this process, the criteria they looked at was much broader than what they're seeing now, so their concern was what's the interrelated reliability across all these evaluators. He stated they tried to add some precision to the language and get a little bit more clear knowing that it also didn't feel possible to go to the far extreme end of that and map out every single detail, so he thinks what Member Walker is speaking to is that one of the challenges they have is if they have an eclectic group of folks representing different voices and perspectives, there is a risk, which is why they try to pair this with making sure they had solid training for everybody, and they felt like there was some sort of norming conversation practice happening ahead of time to work out. He asked Mr. Zutz if he could speak to that and answer how in the training are they all thinking about that is related to the rubric that they're looking at right now.

Mr. Zutz replied normally and traditionally, this is handled by state processing because they are using the word, eclectic, and they're looking at stakeholders who want to do this but are coming from varied backgrounds with some coming from education and have been exposed to the types of materials required in

proposals and in this case, an assessment proposal which will have close to 100 or more pages of very technical material describing what they do and how they do it, and they want to see that. He stated the larger question of how do they norm the group, which is they are counting on each individual evaluation committee member to bring expertise to this. He stated that in the first round of the RFP, they had many of their test directors participating and bringing knowledge of assessments, knowledge of what assessments should go, what it looks like on the back end and front end, what it looks like to stakeholders, and what it provides, so when they meet next week with 25, they are going to go over each one of these criteria and read them out loud and talk about them to make sure every evaluation committee member understands what they're being asked to do and understands how the rubric should be applied.

Chair Hughes asked Mr. Zutz if he feels from this quick conversation they've had around the numbers he's lifted up, does he feel like he has the direction he needs in terms of providing that level of specificity in the training or is there more that they should discuss now to make sure that he feels like he's equipped to have those conversations during the trainings.

Mr. Zutz thanked Chair Hughes and stated that was their goal coming there today, which is to seek clarity from the subcommittee. He stated that on page one, number one, he believes they understand how to norm the group and explain number one with sufficient evidence. He stated there was a suggestion that was made that perhaps sufficient and adequate are synonyms for numbers 1, 2, 4, and 7 and do they want to make them all read sufficient.

President Ortiz replied it was number two and stated seven was fine because they said adequate equals three, which would equal an M for Meets.

Mr. Zutz stated if the language is staying the same, he's going to look at his colleagues around the room because he believes they have what they came there to resolve and asked for one moment.

President Ortiz asked Chair Hughes if they know if there's someone on the training team that is well-versed in technology given that one of their challenges in previous assessments has been a failure of technology. She stated that should be something that evaluators are looking for, whether it's their load testing or methodology.

Chair Hughes replied that's a good question and stated they did not name that as a specific criteria. He stated they listed the perspectives of stakeholder groups who wanted it represented, and he suspects that based upon who is on that group, there are some folks that have that technology lens, but he cannot say with certainty. He stated he does not know if Mr. Zutz or others in the room feel good about that being represented somewhere in the evaluation committee as it stands now.

President Ortiz stated she thinks it will come out based on who they've done work with before. She stated if they've done work with bigger states, then that should be non-issue, but if they haven't, then it's a different thing.

Member Walked stated he thinks where they are now, there are so many online assessments, and it's not like when they started the SBAC or some of these other tools. He stated he thinks there are some experience and background knowledge that their team has as well as their members on the team and these companies.

Mr. Zutz reminded the members that the identity of the evaluation committee members can't be shared at this time, and he thinks everybody knows that, but just to say it and a reminder to themselves as well.

Mr. Zutz stated he believes they're ready for next week and looking forward to this process and bringing forward to the entire State Board of Education in the near future the recommendation brought by the evaluation committee members.

Chair Hughes stated he had one more final question and asked if DAG Gardner was available to answer. He stated he had a question about the process for selecting of the committee. He stated that he knows the agenda item was not worded exactly that way and asked if that was allowable since it's related to the rubric in the training.

Deputy Attorney General David Gardner asked if he was talking about the committee that will be evaluating these, and Chair Hughes replied yes. DAG Gardner stated as long as it's through that angle, he thinks they can, but they have to touch it lightly, specifically through how are they going to be evaluating the RFP rubric, which is what the agenda item is about.

Chair Hughes stated he thinks he will hold off then because his question might be going a different direction and asked if anyone had any questions and/or comments, and there was none.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

There were no public comments in Las Vegas or Carson City and no written-in public statements.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Hughes adjourned the meeting at 2:33 p.m.