

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

**FEBRUARY 21, 2023
1:00 PM**

Office	Address	City	Meeting
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
Michael Pacheco, Education Programs Supervisor – Assessments (ADAM)
Peter Zutz, Director, Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM)
Martha Warachowski, Administrative Assistant IV

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT

David Gardner, Senior Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE

None

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

Chair Summer Stephens called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Quorum was established. Chair Stephens led the Pledge of Allegiance and went over housekeeping items.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT #1

There were no in-person public comments in Carson City or Las Vegas. The following individuals provided written-in statements:

- Eric Smith provided a written public comment.
- Jeanine Crane provided a written public comment.

(A complete copy of the statements above are available in Appendix A.)

3. APPROVAL OF FLEXIBLE AGENDA

Member Rene Cantu made a motion to approve the use of a flexible agenda. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed.

4. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REVISED DRAFT RFP SCOPE OF WORK

Chair Stephens stated that one thing she noted related to the draft scope is that it showed the changes a little bit better and offered other subcommittee members a quick review. She indicated the fiscal year piece had been updated in one location but not another.

Member Hughes indicated the need to clean up some language for goals and objectives, under 2.6.1 and noted that context needs to be added for the addition of the five criteria.

Chair Stephens indicated that it may behoove the subcommittee to take that list and state that based on the feedback from stakeholders, these are the items, and list them out with some enumeration, and Member Hughes concurred with this suggestion.

Chair Stephens asked for confirmation from NDE that they are taking notes on the subcommittee members' feedback, and Mike Pacheco confirmed that he is taking notes. Mr. Pacheco further indicated that NDE can change the language to reflect that this is the stakeholder survey information.

Member Hughes indicated that just naming the stakeholders' top priorities does not get to the point of how one will be evaluated.

Member Hughes made a motion to move the RFP Scope with 3 changes forward to the 3/16/23 Nevada State Board of Education meeting. Member Cantu seconded. Motion passed.

5. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REVISED RFP RUBRIC

Chair Stephens thanked NDE for their work with State Purchasing to ensure that the rubric could be adjusted and indicated the rubric is in great need of adjustment to the weight and importance of each item and factor.

Member Hughes questioned if the rubric could be more specific to mirror more of a traditional rubric, and Chair Stephens concurred that this equates to creating success criteria or a performance level description of something so as to accurately determine the weight. Member Hughes concurred and questioned if NDE had some clarity regarding this request.

Mr. Pacheco indicated NDE had received feedback from Purchasing, noting that changes could be made to the rubric, but because Member Hughes' suggestion was more of a redesign, permission was not granted for that. Mr. Pacheco did confirm that weights could be added, subtracted, and changed and that Purchasing would be willing to review those changes prior to the rubric moving forward to the full Board.

Chair Stephens discussed the importance of having clarity about what certain items mean prior to being able to discuss the training portion itself and questioned whether or not the subcommittee would be able to put together that training so as to run that interrater reliability piece and make sure everyone is on the same page in terms of scoring.

Mr. Pacheco indicated once the RFP leaves NDE and moves to State Purchasing, State Purchasing then runs the entire process. He confirmed that previous training was very RFP-focused and asked reviewers to use that document to rate each section. He conceded that beyond that, he did not know what State Purchasing might want to change about their process, but that it was outside of NDE's purview.

Member Hughes questioned if NDE could walk the subcommittee through the process of how a rater would get to a score from zero to 30 and indicated this is a terribly designed rubric approach and is not actually a rubric, adding that large financial decisions should not be made with this very broad and vague tool.

Mr. Pacheco indicated the evaluation criteria is part of the RFP that is sent out, and vendors tend to steer their language directly to some of those concerns and noted that educators' understanding of a rubric is very different from this design.

Member Hughes questioned how the answers to the questions translate into a numerical score, noting that it is not a one-for-one, and there is no guidance given about weighting.

Mr. Pacheco indicated the weighting is applied afterwards, noting each section is one to 10 and is then multiplied by that weighting. He explained the guidance received from Purchasing is to pay attention to the RFP and ensure the evidence provided by the vendor meets the criteria as spelled out within the scope of work. Member Cantu reiterated Member Hughes' point that there is no clear definition or guidance in terms of what demonstrated competence means and how it is weighed and questioned how that converts to a one-to-10 scale.

Chair Stephens concurred, indicating that she is also confused by the scoring and noted that because the subcommittee has determined the importance of getting this right, no stone can be left unturned. She suggested another meeting related to this rubric with a member of the Purchasing team present and indicated that in the meantime, the subcommittee could put together the working definitions of the performance level descriptions of these items. She indicated that number 3 should have a higher weight than everything else because that is the section that speaks to learning, reporting, and use and noted her feeling that people would be sent into failure to produce something of quality without any kind of description.

Member Cantu concurred that the current rubric is not well tailored to selecting a CCR tool, and Member Hughes concurred and noted that if the current rubric were used, it's likely that everyone would have a different number-one proposal, which would not be helpful. Member Hughes concurred with the Chair regarding the weighting of number 3.

Chair Stephens requested that NDE get some clarity from Purchasing regarding redesigning the rubric, noting that the subcommittee would like, at the very least, to create descriptions under the items of what it is that answers the provided questions.

Member Hughes indicated that if Purchasing's answer is that type of design cannot be done, then perhaps the right course of action would be to either add a description underneath or to build it into the question itself. He further noted that it would be easier to do something like a one-through-four scale for every question.

Member Cantu questioned whether the RFP is aligned enough with the rubric in terms of the content.

Chair Stephens indicated that the scope of work does address the items in number 3, and that cost is aligned to number 5 to some extent. She raised some concern regarding the section on the expertise of key personnel, noting that their job is to look at both the rubric and the scope of work and address that, but this should be in both places.

Member Cantu indicated that because the meat and potatoes of the RFP are in number 3, then number 3 should be worth significantly more points than the 20 it is currently allotted and more like 70 or 75.

Member Hughes concurred and reiterated the point that the section regarding key personnel is in need of clarity. He stated that if these questions can be answered, then the subcommittee can then add the necessary clarity; if not, the subcommittee then will need to go down the path of revising the questions.

Chair Stephens concurred, noting that until the subcommittee knows better how much clarification can be added, the weights cannot be changed, and Member Cantu concurred.

Chair Stephens asked Mr. Pacheco if this could be determined in a timely manner, and Mr. Pacheco replied that Purchasing is generally very quick to respond and suggested the subcommittee look at the weighting as currently designed in case the addition of layers is not approved by Purchasing.

Chair Stephens opened the floor to the members for comments regarding the adjusting of the weighting, and Member Cantu stated he was open to the process. Member Hughes stated he was open to the process but cautioned that the subcommittee may not want to spend significant time on this process as the specific questions might later alter the thinking about the weighting.

Chair Stephens questioned whether other members also believed 70 or 75 would be an appropriate weight to assign to number 3 and indicated the importance of keeping other pieces in mind when doing a large-scale assessment. She stated she is comfortable assigning a weight of 50 or higher to number 3.

Member Hughes indicated that given that there are currently five categories, he would be comfortable doing 50 for the conforms with the terms, and then assigning 10, 10, 10, and 20 to the other pieces, with the competence piece having a higher weight than the others.

Member Cantu concurred, noting that number 3 could be 50, number 1 at 25, and the other three each weighted at 10.

Chair Stephens indicated that she would be comfortable with the following weighting: number 1 at 25; number 2 at 10; number 3 at 50; number 4 at 5; and number 5 at 10 and further noted that in number 1, some things can be combined or eliminated.

Member Hughes concurred, noting that there is some overlap between Sections 1 and 2 and suggested the possibility of potentially collapsing those, whereas the full combined section would be the higher percentage, noting that there is some redundancy.

Chair Stephens concurred and noted that number 4 could lump in and make its way into a little cleaner document. She concluded that the subcommittee should meet again specific to this component once word comes back from the Department regarding the ability to alter the rubric. She requested that the Department try and schedule a member from Purchasing to join for the initial conversation at that meeting.

Peter Zutz, Director of the Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM), explained that the easiest way would be to get this in writing from State Purchasing.

6. INFORMATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REVISED RFP COMMITTEE ENTITY

Chair Stephens indicated that the list of committee entities is currently at 25 and that the Nevada Association of School Superintendents still has the ability to nominate up to eight individuals for this committee. The Chair requested that NDE remind the subcommittee of the exact number of people who scored the RFPs prior to the subcommittee determining whether things need to be narrowed down prior to presenting to the Board.

Mr. Pacheco indicated his belief that the number was nine.

Member Hughes indicated that the conversation last time was left noting that everything in red in the accompanying item would replace everything above and reiterated the different entities the subcommittee had listed out. He explained that he did not take this as expanding the list of 25 but rather providing a list of stakeholder categories the subcommittee would like to see represented.

Member Cantu concurred that this was his memory of the last conversation and noted that if content experts needed to be specifically delineated, guidance counselors, APs and others should be included.

Chair Stephens suggested that while the subcommittee determines the process, it does not, perhaps, determine how to get the people and requested input from NDE regarding the specification that the Superintendent's group and the people above the listed entities could suggest names for selection.

Mr. Zutz indicated that the names provided to State Purchasing are the final names, so the committee would be responsible for vetting and providing those names.

Chair Stephens asked for confirmation that 16 through 25 are the entities from whom the names will be tapped, then comes up with a process to collect names, and after figuring out the appropriate number of people, would provide the list to Purchasing.

Mr. Zutz confirmed that this is correct and cautioned that the individuals chosen must be able to commit the time to read the RFP and then go through the evaluation process.

Member Hughes stated that having a nominating process and certain number feels excessive versus the subcommittee stating that it wants at least one representative representing the voice from the stakeholder groups and indicated there has been significant public interest in this committee and expressed his concern regarding the nominating process. He suggested sending the requests to the stakeholder groups as well as including a process to bring in representatives from the interested public for purposes of equity.

Chair Stephens suggested getting the word through similar processes used to announce the survey, as well as including the approximate amount of time a committee member would need to plan to devote and suggested that the subcommittee use this time to ensure their satisfaction with the list and to determine whether or not additional descriptors are needed for clarity.

Member Cantu concurred that some clarification may be needed, particularly in the areas of content experts and workforce, and confirmed that the list of 16 to 25 would replace what is currently on top.

Member Hughes indicated his belief that the subcommittee does not actually know who is on the committee and suggested the subcommittee submit the list to NDE, who would then need to figure out its internal process and submit the list to Purchasing. He reiterated his concern regarding the integrity of the process of a public meeting and questioned whether or not the process is anonymous or confidential.

Mr. Zutz read NRS 333.335 into the record, noting that the committee must be a majority of state officers or employees, that includes NSHE, but can include persons who are not state officers or employees and possess expert knowledge or special expertise. He informed the subcommittee that State Purchasing does sign an NDA, so this process is taken quite seriously.

Member Hughes indicated that the subcommittee include 16 through 25 but noted the only potential people that would not be a majority state-affiliated entity would be student, parent, and workforce/private industry.

Chair Stephens explained that there should be a member from a state entity not related to this work, and Mr. Zutz confirmed that this is correct and could include NSHE. Chair Stephens stressed the importance of training.

Kristopher Huffman, NDE, suggested clarifying the number for each of the items because some of them do have plurals, such as students or content experts, and Chair Stephens concurred and suggested that the subcommittee go down the list to address this.

Member Hughes suggested that for each category, the wording specify at least one representative, which provides NDE with some discretion, including someone who can serve a dual purpose, such as a teacher who is also a content expert.

Chair Stephens questioned if this is something with which NDE would like to have latitude or would they prefer the subcommittee to delineate further.

Mr. Zutz noted that in terms of latitude, the evaluation committee is what NDE can devise itself. On a related note, Mr. Zutz voiced his concern about blanketing stakeholder groups through some of the mentioned methods given that these are very specific entities. He reminded the subcommittee of the limited amount of time left to complete the RFP, which still has to go through the review process at state purchasing. He cautioned that there has to be a contract in place by the end of August before the beginning of the school year and questioned if any one of these entities could be named now.

Member Hughes concurred that the subcommittee needs to get moving on this and reiterated his worry about the legitimacy of the process. He noted his comfort with spending the shortest amount of time the subcommittee finds reasonable to say they want on representative of each of the 10 groups, determine interest of the potential candidate, and provide the requirements of membership on the committee.

Member Hughes indicated this could be done in an expedited fashion through the use of a simple survey and provide latitude to NDE to create that member list without coming back to the subcommittee.

Chair Stephens noted that when reaching out to different potential members of this committee, they needed to be informed that this nomination was pending Board approval, and that this was a way that the names related to the positions could be collected now, and Member Hughes expressed his support for that suggestion.

Mr. Zutz questioned if the subcommittee would be comfortable with the entities receiving an email that would go out to not all members, but to the heads of those entities, and Chair Stephens indicated her comfort with this process. Member Cantu concurred and suggested that number 22 say NSHE member institutions to ensure that the nominated member be a two or four-year person rather than a central office individual.

Member Hughes concurred and noted the importance of clarification to ensure that all are interpreting what's written in the same way, and Chair Stephens confirmed that the plan is for the subcommittee to approve the list, following which the Department could move forward to collect parties interested in participation, which will then go to the Board for approval prior to moving to Purchasing.

Chair Stephens asked for a motion to move the RFP Committee Entity list with clarification on which entities should be added to the list to the Nevada State Board of Education to be considered at the 3/16/23 meeting.

Member Cantu made a motion to move the RFP Committee Entity list with clarification on which entities should be added to the list to the Nevada State Board of Education to be considered at the 3/16/23 meeting. Member Tim Hughes seconded. Motion passed.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Revisit College and Career Readiness Assessment Scoring Rubric

Member Hughes noted that this would need to be determined before the meeting on the 16th and asked about the requirement for postings.

Martha Warachowski indicated that Open Meeting Law requires three business days but suggested that something like this be done earlier, perhaps by the end of the first week of March, and Member Hughes concurred.

Chair Stephens suggested meeting on March 6 or 7, and Mr. Zutz indicated that this timeline would work.

The meeting was scheduled for March 6 from 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT #2

There was no public comment for this period.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS GIVEN DURING PUBLIC COMMENT

APPENDIX A, ITEM 1: ERIC SMITH – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

The currently proposed evaluation criteria for grading the test vendors shows the Nevada survey results as only one tiny part of the 20% section “Conformance with the terms of this RFP” segment. That would make all the results of the board discussions and surveying all Nevadans worth only about 6% of what the RFP is going to look for in a College & Career Readiness test. There are currently 39 questions listed on the scoring evaluation. Only 5 of which were Nevadan’s and the board’s priorities. Why are the other 34 questions taking up space? If left as currently written, the vast majority of the decision would now depend on questions that are subjective, redundant, and sometimes irrelevant. When school administrators encouraged their students and staff to voice their opinions on the surveys it was with the understanding that their collective voices would count for something and not just be a patronizing nod of participation. Please continue to revise the evaluation criteria according to what the board and the citizens of Nevada said they’re looking for in a test.

Thank you,
Erin Smith

APPENDIX A, ITEM 2: JEANINE CRANE – PUBLIC COMMENT #1

Dear board members,

During your last meeting you talked about wanting different groups of people to have a voice in selecting the next statewide test for all 11th graders. One of those included parents & members of the PTO. I'm a mother of 5 CCSD students and currently serve as our school's PTO president. I'm willing to volunteer if you need me. I'm certainly not a testing or curriculum expert, but I am willing to be trained and help add to the diversity of perspectives by representing things from a parent's/PTO point of view if that would help. I've included my contact information.

Jeanine Crane
JeanineCrane@yahoo.com
405-822-4504