

**OFFICE OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT**

A competitive selection process through a blind bid was utilized to award this contract. On October 1, 2018, the Request for Proposal Evaluation Committee reviewed proposals for the Mississippi Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) (RFP #3180000430).

The following potential offerors submitted proposals for evaluation:

- Assessment Solutions Group
- Buros Center for Testing
- The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc.

Scoring Criteria:

A. Technical Factors	33 Total Points
B. Management Factors	32 Total Points
C. Cost Factor	35 Total Points

Recommendation: Approval

Back-up material: None

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**Office of Student Assessment**  
**The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc.**  
**Executive Summary**

The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. will provide the services related to the facilitation and management of the Mississippi Technical Advisory Committee for Statewide Assessment and Accountability (TAC). The TAC will provide guidance on technical assessment matters pertaining to validity and reliability, accuracy, and fairness. Members of the TAC are highly regarded national experts who have been widely published in their fields. Areas of expertise include: assessment design; computer adaptive testing (CAT); fixed form assessments; assessment accommodations; uses of tests; mathematics, English language arts/literacy, science, U.S. History, and English learners. The initial term of this contract will be from November 7, 2018 to November 6, 2019. Contract renewal for years two (2) through five (5) will be determined annually.

## **AWARDED VENDOR REPORT**

The submission of this report is in partial fulfillment of the transparency requirement as set forth by the Public Procurement Review Board in Section 3-204.04 of the ***Office of Personal Service Contract Review Rules and Regulations***. On October 1, 2018, we evaluated proposals for the Mississippi Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for Statewide Assessment and Accountability. The following potential offerors submitted proposals for evaluation:

- Assessment Solutions Group
- Buross Center for Testing
- The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc.

The award recommendation decision was based on information provided in each proposal. The information below supports our decision for this recommendation. Our comments on the strengths and weaknesses were expounded upon in the individual rubrics. After thorough evaluation and great consideration, we recommend that **The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc.** be awarded the contract for the Mississippi Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for Statewide Assessment and Accountability RFP Number #3180000430.

### **AWARDED VENDOR**

**Vendor Name: The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc.** **Total Score: 81.8**

- **Overall**
  - Very detailed and informative
  - Covered most, if not all, aspects required by the RFP
  - Substantial evidence of past performance of similar work
  - Qualifications and experiences of personnel are exemplary
  - Managed large-scale work

Below are additional strengths, provided by rubric areas, that resulted in The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. being chosen.

- **Technical Factors:**
  - Plan for performing the required services
  - Ability to perform the services as reflected by technical training and education, general experience, specific experience in providing the required services, and the qualifications and abilities of personnel proposed to be assigned to perform the services
  - Innovative technology and techniques provided
- **Management Factors:**
  - Qualification and experience of personnel

- Record of past performance of similar work
- Personnel, equipment, facilities, to perform the services currently available or demonstrated to be made available at the time of contracting
- Project management
- **Cost:**
  - Budget

**Vendor Name: Buros Center for Testing**

**Total Score: 45.4**

- **Overall**
  - Limited in scope
  - Did not cover all aspects required by the RFP
  - Minimal details provided
  - Plan focused too heavily on recruiting TAC members and not on offerer's experience in the work.

The following reason was also given as one of the overall reasons the Buros Center for Testing was not chosen: The proposal provided limited information necessary to determine if services would meet the needs of the agency.

Below are additional weaknesses, provided by rubric areas, that resulted in Buros Center for Testing not being chosen.

- **Technical Factors:**
  - Limited information on personnel
  - Plan lacked detail.
  - Innovative technology and techniques were not mentioned.
- **Management Factors:**
  - Qualification and experience of personnel did not match the demands of the scope of work.
  - Record of performance is questionable.
  - Details lacking regarding the personnel, equipment, facilities, to perform the services
  - Limited information on project management experience
- **Cost:**
  - Budget

**Vendor Name: Assessment Solutions Group**

**Total Score: 38.0**

- **Overall**
  - Minimal plan for implementation
  - Limited information provided

- Proposal lacked a distinct view of the process
- Lacked personnel capacity to complete the work

The following reason was also given as one of the overall reasons Assessment Solutions Group was not chosen: The plan provided was too minimal to determine whether the services would meet the needs of the agency.

Below are additional weaknesses, provided by rubric areas, that resulted in Assessment Solutions Group not being chosen.

- **Technical Factors:**

- Minimal details provided about project plan
- Lacks the ability to perform the services as reflected by technical training and education, general experience, specific experience in providing the required services, and the qualifications and abilities of personnel proposed to be assigned.
- Lacks information on innovative technology and techniques.

- **Management Factors:**

- Questionable number of experienced personnel to do the work
- Limited information provided on record of past performance of similar work
- Limited personnel, equipment, facilities, to perform the services
- Lacked information on project management

- **Cost:**

- Budget