

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

**FEBRUARY 2, 2023  
2:00 PM**

<b>Office</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Meeting</b>
Department of Education	2080 E. Flamingo	Las Vegas	Room 114
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St.	Carson City	Board Room
Department of Education	Virtual/Livestream	n/a	n/a

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dr. Summer Stephens, Chair  
Tim Hughes  
Dr. Rene Cantu

**DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT**

Kristofer Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer  
Peter Zutz, Director, Office of Assessment, Data and Accountability Management (ADAM)  
Michael Pacheco, Education Programs Supervisor, ADAM  
DuAne Young, Interim Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement  
Martha Warachowski, Administrative Assistant IV

**AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE**

None

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

Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Chief Strategy Officer (CSO) Kris Huffman as Interim Subcommittee Chair. Quorum was established. CSO Huffman led the Pledge of Allegiance and then went over housekeeping items.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

There was no public comment for this period.

**3. SELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR**

**Member Rene Cantu nominated Dr. Summer Stephens to be the Subcommittee Chair. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed, and Dr. Summer Stephens will serve as Subcommittee Chair.**

**4. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA**

**Member Tim Hughes made a motion to approve the use of a flexible agenda. Member René Cantú seconded. Motion passed.**

**5. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON DRAFT RFP SCOPE OF WORK**

Member Hughes noted that it might be helpful for the subcommittee to go section by section and compare against the stakeholder feedback.

Chair Stephens opened the floor for questions on Section 1, and there was none. The Chair opened the floor for questions on Section 2, and Member Hughes suggested the need for maximum flexibility during the initial four years, noting this might involve flagging for NDE to potentially make some suggested revisions.

Peter Zutz, Director of the Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM), explained that typical of Nevada contracts, procurement and approval processes may include both BOE and GFO overview, which includes four years plus two one-year renewals, and that the state is very well protected in its contracts. Mr. Zutz confirmed that this was a draft RFP and that the dates need to be adjusted and indicated that the approval is for a one-year ACT extension for administration for this school year and as such, the RFP would be in effect for SY 23-24, not FY 23-24.

Member Hughes indicated that Section 2.6 should be where alignment begins with community priorities and noted his uncertainty as to whether or not all pieces should be included but that this is the area where the intent of the top level goal and objective should be changed to be more about predictiveness, college, preparedness, and widely used acceptance mechanism.

Member Cantu concurred, but also indicated that there are different paths and that if financially feasible, different assessments for those paths should be used, whether the path is career or college.

Chair Stephens made note that part of the RFP should be looking for a tool that has some sort of industry recognized credential or indicator badge certificate and reiterated that the tool should be useful. She discussed the two things combine within the RFP: the federal requirements for ESSA are about reading and math and testing in high school; and that Nevada legislation requires a CCR assessment. She concurred with Member Cantu on the fact that the state requirement should include more.

Member Hughes indicated his understanding that 2.6.2 asks the vendor to provide more information, questioned if this falls under that, and suggested that the scoring criteria might actually address the area Member Cantu is suggesting.

Member Cantu questioned if 2.6 is clear and specific enough to convey that message, and Member Hughes indicated his belief that it is not and noted that this is likely intentional due to the large variety of vendors with a wide variety of products.

Chair Stephens indicated that in 2.6.2, they are encouraged to provide information, and noted her concern that encouraged is not a strong enough word as it does not convey requirement. Member Hughes suggested changing encouraged to should, and Chair Stephens and Member Cantu concurred.

Chair Stephens requested that Mr. Zutz or Mr. Pacheco read the list one more time for the subcommittee.

Mr. Zutz confirmed that all members were provided with the PDF of the top five responses and reiterated that those top five responses of most requested were as follows: align with widely accepted admission requirements for colleges and universities and/or scholarship requirements; predict student preparedness for college and career; reduce the total number of assessments given to high school students; provide consistent data to compare student progress year over year; provide data for schools and districts to make instructional decisions during a student's 12th grade year.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to discussion regarding missing language, and Member Hughes indicated the first line is where language should be added and noted the importance of vendors demonstrating how those top five things would be addressed.

Member Hughes conceded that some of those are outside of the control of a vendor, and the importance of cognizance of this, and Member Cantu concurred.

Chair Stephens noted her concern about the wording regarding academic strengths and weaknesses, noting that the language really lends itself more to the college preparedness component and should include career attributes that match with a student's performance. She noted that this is the piece that feels most necessary to her and indicated she would like to see career development added to the wording right after academic strengths and weaknesses. Member Hughes concurred, and Chair Stephens suggested taking the whole paragraph and formatting it as follows: have the starter sentence; list the five things; replace the remainder of the paragraph.

Member Cantu noted the importance of ensuring that this is as utilitarian as possible, concurred that having the career component is critical, and indicated that if listing the five bullets accomplishes this, then he concurs with Member Hughes' suggestion.

Chair Stephens summarized that the proposition would be around the wording and would say something along the lines of, "this college and career ready assessment must provide data and information, including, but not without limitation, those five things."

Member Hughes quoted the last line, which includes the words, "must allow teachers and other personnel to use results for interventions."

Member Cantu asked for confirmation that the word "must" would be removed or replaced, noting that it is not one of the top priorities.

Chair Stephens noted that the only thing missing in the top five that might be needed is providing the student who takes the assessment with this data, and Member Cantu concurred.

Chair Stephens questioned if a member of the Department was noting the changes proposed by the subcommittee, and Mr. Zutz explained that up to now, no members had been taking notes of the proposed changes but would begin to do so now.

Member Cantu questioned if the meeting was being recorded, and Martha Warachowski confirmed yes.

Chair Stephens reiterated the changes discussed thus far for the Department's documentation, and Mr. Zutz confirmed that the edits were now being made in real time on the Word document.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to further comments on Section 2.6.2, and there were no comments.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to comments on Section 2.6.3, and there were no comments.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to comments on Section 2.6.4, and Member Cantu noted he would like to see the same kind of interactive tool for parents and students, if possible, where they can see their information and interact with it. Chair Stephens concurred.

Member Hughes concurred and noted his belief that Section 2.6.7 addresses this to some degree with the individual reporting, and as such, suggested that 2.6.4 is more of rolled-up data that would not necessarily be appropriate for family because it could include sensitive data that is intended only for internal resources.

Mr. Zutz confirmed that Member Hughes had understood this correctly, noting that 2.6.4 is intended for educational personnel or professionals, whereas 2.6.7 is actionable for the wide variety of stakeholders.

Member Cantu questioned if there is an interactive tool that parents and families receive rather than a static paper report.

Mr. Zutz clarified that the RFP sometimes uses standardized industry language and indicated that an interactive tool can be something like MPOWER or the NWEA reporting platform, which may not be interactive in terms of longitudinal data or presentation but is considered an active reporting tool.

Member Cantu indicated that this makes sense as long as the rubric or evaluation would measure the utility to parents, families, and students.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to comments on Section 2.6.5, noting that this section is about the assessment required to be administered within a district at the same time but with districts having the option of selecting a different testing window. The Chair questioned whether or not this was accurate, noting that she was unaware that a different window from that provided by the state could be chosen.

Mr. Zutz explained that this pertains to makeup days for students unable to take the test at the scheduled times, and Chair Stephens indicated the need for clarity in this section as this is not the way it reads.

Member Cantu reminded the subcommittee that schools start at different times of the year, and so if the test is being administered to all the schools at the same time, the later a school starts, the more disadvantage they have.

Member Hughes confirmed he also read the section the way Chair Stephens had but questioned the ability of the organization to accommodate multiple districts on different windows and as such, wondered whether or not that section should be left in place.

Chair Stephens requested the wording be cleaner in that section, and Mr. Zutz replied this could be remedied with a few simple changes. Chair Stephens concurred with the suggested changes in language but noted her concern that if the state requires that all districts take the assessment in the defined window and make-ups in the defined window, this needs to be referenced in some way that clarifies that the testing window is not a choice that can be made by a school, and Mr. Zutz concurred and noted that the Department can work on some language and bring it back to the subcommittee for approval.

Member Cantu questioned if there is a reason that the window is set where it is, and Mr. Zutz explained that because the state administers the ACT, this is how the ACT approaches their assessment. Mr. Zutz further indicated that NRS very clearly lays out that all grade 11 students must test on the day prescribed.

Chair Stephens indicated that because schools receive the data from the March test in April, this gives schools time to re-setup testing for students who may have missed the testing window due to testing irregularity.

Chair Stephens opened the floor for discussion on section 2.6.6, and there was none. Chair Stephens opened the floor for discussion on section 2.6.7 and questioned if there was a state expectation that Spanish and English were the only two languages at a minimum that would be provided.

Mr. Zutz explained there are a few different ways that the Department learns what a native or preferred language might be, and through that process, the most spoken or used or identified languages in the state have been developed, with Spanish being number one. Mr. Zutz indicated for that reason, the sentence mentions minimally available in both English and Spanish, and then additionally, there is a rank-ordered list of the most identified languages in K-12 for referral.

Chair Stephens opened the floor for comment on the section on the general scope of work, and there was no commentary on item 1.

Chair Stephens questioned whether or not the executive summary in item 2 should outline the top five things previously discussed, noting that the people who need to do the scoring do not have significant time to read the many pages, and Mr. Zutz concurred that this could improve the process.

Chair Stephens requested that Mr. Zutz get some additional language into the draft and opened the floor for discussion on number 3 and noted this section should incorporate testing window and necessary services to complete the assessment. Member Cantu noted that the word grant is misspelled.

Chair Stephens opened the floor for discussion on number 4, and there were no comments from the members. Chair Stephens opened the floor for discussion on number 5 and noted her appreciation that only 28 calendar days from return of the assessment are allowed for return of the results.

Member Hughes noted that 5.1.1 contains some dissonance in terms of aligning content standards with some of the top five requirements and asked for recommendations from the Department to adjust this section to incorporate other core subject areas beyond simply math and ELA.

Member Cantu suggested replacing the word demonstrate with describe.

Member Hughes provided an example of the misalignment, noting that there is conflict between the Department saying should be acceptable by any national college or university but only be specific to Nevada standards.

Member Cantu questioned whether this piece could be removed entirely or if it is required by NRS, and Chair Stephens noted that taking the piece out altogether could be concerning because the test itself is supposed to be about those two items. Chair Stephens further indicated that the Nevada academic content standards are the common core standards that are in most places and as such, opined that there may not be much conflict as a result. Chair Stephens pointed out there is not a full set of defined career readiness components included, that the standards exist, but there is no mention of an assessment to measure any of those things.

Member Hughes suggested language that includes wording such as "demonstrate how the college and career readiness assessment aligns with the requirements described under the goals and objectives section," and Chair Stephens and Member Cantu supported this suggestion.

Michael Pacheco, from ADAM, explained that this is where the dual nature of the assessment does have some issues because if federally supported, the state must demonstrate how it aligns to state standards.

Member Hughes suggested changing the wording to say aligns to academic content standards in addition to the requirements laid out previously, or to rename the five areas in this place.

Chair Stephens requested that Mr. Zutz do some wordsmithing for item 5.1.1, and Mr. Zutz agreed to do so.

Member Cantu indicated his support for Member Hughes' suggestion of adding the other five bullets, and Chair Stephens concurred.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to discussion on Item 6, and there was no discussion. Chair Stephens opened the floor to discussion on cost schedule, and there was no discussion. Chair Stephens opened the floor for any additional discussion related to the scope of work item, and there was no additional discussion.

Member Cantu requested that when the final draft with the changes is presented to the subcommittee, that the changes be highlighted, and Mr. Zutz confirmed that changes will be tracked in the final draft document.

## **6. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RFP RUBRIC**

Chair Stephens questioned if this was the way the rubric looked the first time or if there was a more specific version, and Mr. Zutz confirmed that this was the rubric used for the last article.

Chair Stephens requested that Mr. Zutz have notes for the subcommittee on the rubric and indicated that she would like to take this in two parts, criteria and then weight, and have the subcommittee decide whether items should be added to criteria and/or re-weighted. The Chair noted her concern that learning in the rubric was very minimal, if at all represented.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to discussion in Section 1 of the rubric, and Member Hughes stated there was wide variance in how raters characterize the information and indicated his belief that this is because this is not a detailed rubric. Member Hughes indicated that in a traditional rubric, convincing evidence would be laid out so as to have maintain norm across all the raters, and questioned how this was applied.

Mr. Zutz indicated that this was provided by State Purchasing and that NDE is not currently clear to what extent changes can be made to the criteria if this is a pre-formatted document prescribed by State Purchasing.

Member Hughes suggested tabling this item until that is clarified, and Member Cantu and Chair Stephens concurred.

Member Cantu questioned if the vendors would be provided with the rubric, so they would know how they were being measured, and Mr. Zutz indicated that he would find out the answer for the subcommittee and suggested the subcommittee discuss the proposed changes to the rubric now so that the Department could take this to State Purchasing.

Mr. Zutz reminded the subcommittee that RFPs are to serve the benefit of the agency soliciting vendors, proposals, and solutions, and that's how the Department will approach this and as such, requested that the subcommittee move ahead while together right now and work through this.

Chair Stephens indicated that it seems one more section is needed that is about the assessment and suggested the entire section of item 2.6 be its own category and the highest weighted item.

Member Cantu concurred, noting that goals and objectives should be used as a framework for evaluating what's coming in rather than something else or, at the very least, should be a supplement to it and should have the greatest weight, and Chair Stephens concurred.

Member Hughes concurred and suggested that N3, conformance with the terms of this RFP, is probably the closest category to that and recommended that things be added alphabetically under conformant and then weighted accordingly by letter.

Chair Stephens concurred, noting that this makes a lot of sense and suggested that the subcommittee provide the Department with what each letter will stand for, whether that is constructed today or among subcommittee members in a shared document later.

Member Hughes concurred and indicated that if NDE is going to make adjustments to the language in the RFP, the subcommittee needs to ensure alignment, and Chair Stephens tasked the Department with making the adjustments to the RFP, noting that the subcommittee would look for another date to meet and finish this agenda item.

Mr. Zutz confirmed the suggestion that section 2.6 be moved up to the current section 3, conformance with the terms of the RFP, as well as include the top five survey requests, and Chair Stephens confirmed that was correct.

Member Hughes named some additional items in the evaluation criteria, noting his belief that some things would still be okay to include, but he would prefer more specificity that would provide guidance and requested that the District add some precision as to what is being looked for. He further noted his belief that the top weight should go to conformance of the RFP and requested there be fewer subjective questions, should this be allowed by state procurement. Chair Stephens concurred, noting that more specificity would help during the process of scoring.

Member Cantu shared a comment from a principal regarding the criteria, noting that one of the most important aspects is to choose an assessment with a probable score and indicated this is important.

Chair Stephens questioned whether Mr. Zutz felt he had enough information on that item for some drafting, and Mr. Zutz indicated that he did.

## **7. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RFP COMMITTEE ENTITY**

Chair Stephens asked Mike Pacheco if he could inform the subcommittee of the make-up of the committee that reviewed these RFPs, and how many members it included.

Mr. Pacheco indicated that a large number of members of the review committee were test directors, who are the personnel in districts who are in charge of assessments. He explained that by state law, there has to be an additional state entity on the committee and believed that the person was from DETR.

Chair Stephens indicated two points of discussion for this agenda item: do members feel like the concepts of what's listed are all important to this conversation; is the large number of members concerning and should the nomination procedure and acceptance be spelled out.

Member Hughes explained that he experienced similar confusion to the Chair and questioned whether or not a nominating process needs to be put in place or if this would add an extra step to the end goal of having a diverse group that represents diverse stakeholder interest.

Chair Stephens asked how the committee members were selected for the last committee, and Mr. Zutz indicated members were selected by the Department per the criteria provided by State Purchasing.

Chair Stephens questioned what that criteria were, and Mr. Zutz indicated the criteria included the CSA and the SPCS, among others, and noted that the initial evaluation committee was selected with their knowledge of assessments and their experience with administering, scoring, and reporting assessments to Nevada students.

Member Cantu indicated that the list is too long and it feels very clubby because of the inclusion of many public-sector education people and no members of business or industry to bring the career prospective.

Chair Stephens suggested the Nevada Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation.

Member Cantu noted that he was thinking that DETR industry sector councils would be a good place to start and suggested talking with DETR to have them provide that information for a good business and industry career perspective.

Member Hughes suggested that the Board name what stakeholders they would want represented on the committee, such as NSHE, and Chair Stephens concurred and added school counselors to the list.

Member Hughes questioned if it was doable for the Board to consolidate what voices they wished to be part of the committee, and Mr. Zutz indicated that this was the intent of this process, to provide to NASS the ability for them to nominate someone from the higher-level group that this work committee identified. Member Cantu questioned whether the piece about workforce, industry-sector, private-sector folks would be retained, and Chair Stephens confirmed that it would and questioned changing the language to include, workforce, public, and private sectors.

Member Cantu confirmed that this would help and indicated his desire for a larger proportion of private sector involved in this sort of decision making.

Mr. Zutz confirmed that the Board would like to request the committee to be formed from the following eight sectors: workforce, public/private sector; district representation; school level; parent; NSHE; DETR; school counselor; and students, in addition to someone from another state agency, bringing the number up to nine.

Member Hughes indicated that he is less worried about which organization is being represented or who nominated them, and more that all the voices are heard. Member Hughes further noted his belief that something should be added into the process around people being normed on the rubric and there being some sort of detailed training that happens for whomever is selected to represent those spots.

Chair Stephens concurred and wondered about the need to spell out the need for content experts. She noted her original thought included principals or internal school folks that would deal with assessment and data.

Member Hughes noted that this again goes to the training piece because if everybody is scoring and everybody's score has an equal weight in the final decision, they need to make sure that everybody is well-versed in content.

Member Cantu discussed the importance of including people from key industries that are the economic growth sectors of the state rather than just workforce in general.

Mr. Zutz confirmed that he is taking details notes, and that all of this is very helpful. He informed the subcommittee that he has reached out to state purchasing regarding some of today's outstanding questions and looks forward to sharing the responses with the subcommittee once he has them.

## **8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Chair Stephens questioned if the members of the subcommittee could find another time to get together and meet again.

Kristopher Huffman, Chief Strategy Officer, confirmed that this had been correct based off the criteria the members had originally submitted, but the Department could send out another set of requests to collaborate among the three members.

Chair Stephens questioned if there were any times that Members Hughes and Cantu had in common, noting that she would look at her calendar to see if she could match any of those times.

Mr. Pacheco noted that there were times during the second week that Members Cantu and Hughes were available: February 14 from noon to 2:00; and February 16 from 8:00 to 10:00 or 2:00 to 4:00.

Member Hughes expressed his willingness to present today's changes to the full Board with the caveat that there may be some additional comments or to do one more interim meeting prior to the meeting of the full Board.



Chair Stephens concurred and asked Members Cantu and Hughes to look at their calendars for dates between the 21st and the 24th of February, and all of the members provided their availability.

Mr. Zutz noted that the Assembly Committee on Education is on the 21st from 1:30 to 4:30, and that the Senate Committee on Education is on the 24th in the afternoon.

Mr. Pacheco indicated that the Department will listen to the recording of this meeting for thoroughness, make the edits, and provide the document to the subcommittee prior to the subcommittee's next meeting, and Chair Stephens concurred.

Mr. Huffman indicated that the Assembly Committee and the Senate Committee are meetings on NDE's calendar just in case they are called to speak to a specific bill, so they are unsure as to whether or not they will need to be present for those committee meetings.

Chair Stephens requested the next meeting be scheduled on February 21 from 1:00 to 3:00 or 1:30 to 3:30, and Members Hughes Cantu indicated that this would work for them.

**9. PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

There was no public comment for this period.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:46 p.m.