



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 that are weighted as yes or no have been grayed to limit responses to 0 or 3

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 assistance to support users and implement quality assurance protocols.				

Criteria	E	M	D	I
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.				
Evidence of verifiable system architecture vendor platform can maintain 100% operational stability and sub-second response times at a capacity matching or exceeding Nevada's total statewide student testing population				
Evidence the vendor will maintain documented backup policies to ensure data reliability and accessibility.				
The plan has dedicated Nevada representatives or contacts.				
Project Management Total × 20%				
Functional and Technical Requirements – 60%				
The proposed solution clearly demonstrates alignment to the rigorous criteria of the Federal Peer Review process.				
Statewide System of Standards and Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of standards alignment (see last item in this section) Evidence of student inclusion including necessary supports and accommodations 				
Assessment System operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of thoughtful and intentional test design and development Evidence that items are developed to align to standards, be accessible to all students, and are developed to serve the overall test design Bias and Sensitivity Review Panels 				
Technical Quality – Validity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of assessments validity 				
Technical Quality – Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of assessment reliability Evidence the assessment is fair and accessible Evidence of Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analysis Evidence that the assessment maintains an acceptable standard of reliability within smaller demographic subgroups Additional evidence of technical quality 				
Inclusion of all students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that item development is approached through a lens of Universal Design Evidence that item development is approached with equity in mind Evidence of supports and accommodations for students with disabilities Evidence of supports for students learning English Verification that accommodations specified in a student’s IEP or 504 plan function seamlessly on the digital testing platform without causing system lags or format breakages. 				

DRAFT

Criteria	E	M	D	I
Achievement Standards and Reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of standard setting practices Evidence of reporting procedures and accessibility of reports 				
The proposed solution accurately measures student mastery of grade-level standards.				
The proposed solution provides consistent data to compare student progress year over year via assessment consistency or concordance analysis.				
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 embedded and non-embedded 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 stakeholder 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, thoughtfully designed to assess the content and the intent of the standards while aligning with learning trajectories.				
Functional and Technical Requirements Total × 60%				
Cost Schedule – 20%				
Vendor submits clear, itemized pricing for all services outlined in the RFP.				
Cost Schedule Total × 20%				