Tab I – Title Page

Part I A – Technical Proposal	
RFP Title:	***Educator Licensure Study***
RFP:	***2101***
Vendor Name:	***ACS Ventures, LLC***
Address:	***11035 Lavender Hill Dr., Ste. 160-433*** ***Las Vegas, NV 89135***
Opening Date:	***February 9, 2016***
Opening Time:	***2:00 PM***

This page intentionally left blank

Tab II - Table of Contents

TAB I – TITLE PAGE **1**
TAB II - TABLE OF CONTENTS **3**
TAB III – VENDOR INFORMATION SHEET **5**
TAB IV – STATE DOCUMENTS **7**
TAB V – ATTACHMENT B **11**
TAB VI – SECTION 3 - SCOPE OF WORK **13**
OVERVIEW 13
EVALUATION DESIGN 13
3.1 ALIGN NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE AND NEVADA REVISED STATUTE 15
3.2 COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE LICENSES AND ENDORSEMENTS 15
3.3 ALIGNMENT WITH THE NEVADA EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK 16
3.4 EFFICIENCY 17
3.5 SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION 17
3.6 DELIVERABLES 18
3.7 DELIVERABLE SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCESS 19
TAB VII – SECTION 4 – COMPANY BACKGROUND AND REFERENCES **23**
4.1 VENDOR INFORMATION 23
4.2 SUBCONTRACTOR INFORMATION 29
4.3 BUSINESS REFERENCES 37
TAB VIII – ATTACHMENT G – PROPOSED STAFF RESUMES **43**
TAB IX – PROJECT PLAN AND PROJECT TIMELINE **53**
TAB X - OTHER INFORMATIONAL MATERIAL **55**

This page intentionally left blank

Tab III – Vendor Information Sheet

V1	Company Name	***ACS Ventures, LLC***

V2	Street Address	***11035 Lavender Hill Dr., Ste. 160-433***

V3	City, State, ZIP	***Las Vegas, NV 89135***

V4	Telephone Number		
	Area Code: ***702***	Number: ***586-7386***	Extension:

V5	Facsimile Number		
	Area Code: ***702***	Number: ***586-7386***	Extension:

V6	Toll Free Number		
	Area Code: ***N/A***	Number:	Extension:

V7	***Contact Person for Questions / Contract Negotiations, including address if different than above***
	Name: ***Chad W. Buckendahl, Ph.D.***
	Title: ***Partner***
	Address: ***2467 Cordoba Bluff Ct.***
	Email Address: ***drcbuck@gmail.com***

V8	Telephone Number for Contact Person		
	Area Code: ***402***	Number: ***770-0085***	Extension:

V9	Facsimile Number for Contact Person		
	Area Code: ***702***	Number: ***586-7386***	Extension:

V10	***Name of Individual Authorized to Bind the Organization***	
	Name: ***Chad W. Buckendahl***	Title: ***Partner***

V11	Signature ***(Individual must be legally authorized to bind the vendor per NRS 333.337)***	
	Signature:	Date:

This page intentionally left blank

Tab IV – State Documents

ATTACHMENT A – CONFIDENTIALITY AND CERTIFICATION OF INDEMNIFICATION

Submitted proposals, which are marked "confidential" in their entirety, or those in which a significant portion of the submitted proposal is marked "confidential" **will not** be accepted by the State of Nevada. Pursuant to NRS 333.333, only specific parts of the proposal may be labeled a "trade secret" as defined in NRS 600A.030(5). All proposals are confidential until the contract is awarded; at which time, both successful and unsuccessful vendors' technical and cost proposals become public information.

In accordance with the Submittal Instructions of this RFP, vendors are requested to submit confidential information in separate binders marked "**Part I B Confidential Technical**" and "**Part III Confidential Financial**".

The State will not be responsible for any information contained within the proposal. Should vendors not comply with the labeling and packing requirements, proposals will be released as submitted. In the event a governing board acts as the final authority, there may be public discussion regarding the submitted proposals that will be in an open meeting format, the proposals will remain confidential.

By signing below, I understand it is my responsibility as the vendor to act in protection of the labeled information and agree to defend and indemnify the State of Nevada for honoring such designation. I duly realize failure to so act will constitute a complete waiver and all submitted information will become public information; additionally, failure to label any information that is released by the State shall constitute a complete waiver of any and all claims for damages caused by the release of the information.

This proposal contains Confidential Information, Trade Secrets and/or Proprietary information as defined in ***Section 2 "ACRONYMS/DEFINITIONS."***

Please initial the appropriate response in the boxes below and provide the justification for confidential status.

Part I B – Confidential Technical Information			
YES		NO	X
Justification for Confidential Status			

A Public Records CD has been included for the Technical and Cost Proposal			
YES	X	NO (See note below)	
Note: By marking "NO" for Public Record CD included, you are authorizing the State to use the "Master CD" for Public Records requests.			

Part III – Confidential Financial Information			
YES		NO	X
Justification for Confidential Status			

ACS VENTURES, LLC

Company Name

Signature

Chad W. Buckendahl **Feb. 8, 2016**

Print Name Date

This document must be submitted in Tab IV of vendor's technical proposal

ATTACHMENT C – VENDOR CERTIFICATIONS

Vendor agrees and will comply with the following:

(1) Any and all prices that may be charged under the terms of the contract do not and will not violate any existing federal, State or municipal laws or regulations concerning discrimination and/or price fixing. The vendor agrees to indemnify, exonerate and hold the State harmless from liability for any such violation now and throughout the term of the contract.

(2) All proposed capabilities can be demonstrated by the vendor.

(3) The price(s) and amount of this proposal have been arrived at independently and without consultation, communication, agreement or disclosure with or to any other contractor, vendor or potential vendor.

(4) All proposal terms, including prices, will remain in effect for a minimum of 180 days after the proposal due date. In the case of the awarded vendor, all proposal terms, including prices, will remain in effect throughout the contract negotiation process.

(5) No attempt has been made at any time to induce any firm or person to refrain from proposing or to submit a proposal higher than this proposal, or to submit any intentionally high or noncompetitive proposal. All proposals must be made in good faith and without collusion.

(6) All conditions and provisions of this RFP are deemed to be accepted by the vendor and incorporated by reference in the proposal, except such conditions and provisions that the vendor expressly excludes in the proposal. Any exclusion must be in writing and included in the proposal at the time of submission.

(7) Each vendor must disclose any existing or potential conflict of interest relative to the performance of the contractual services resulting from this RFP. Any such relationship that might be perceived or represented as a conflict should be disclosed. By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, vendors affirm that they have not given, nor intend to give at any time hereafter, any economic opportunity, future employment, gift, loan, gratuity, special discount, trip, favor, or service to a public servant or any employee or representative of same, in connection with this procurement. Any attempt to intentionally or unintentionally conceal or obfuscate a conflict of interest will automatically result in the disqualification of a vendor's proposal. An award will not be made where a conflict of interest exists. The State will determine whether a conflict of interest exists and whether it may reflect negatively on the State's selection of a vendor. The State reserves the right to disqualify any vendor on the grounds of actual or apparent conflict of interest.

(8) All employees assigned to the project are authorized to work in this country.

(9) The company has a written equal opportunity policy that does not discriminate in employment practices with regard to race, color, national origin, physical condition, creed, religion, age, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, developmental disability or handicap.

(10) The company has a written policy regarding compliance for maintaining a drug-free workplace.

(11) Vendor understands and acknowledges that the representations within their proposal are material and important, and will be relied on by the State in evaluation of the proposal. Any vendor misrepresentations shall be treated as fraudulent concealment from the State of the true facts relating to the proposal.

(12) Vendor must certify that any and all subcontractors comply with Sections 7, 8, 9, and 10, above.

(13) The proposal must be signed by the individual(s) legally authorized to bind the vendor per NRS 333.337.

ACS Ventures, LLC

Vendor Company Name

Vendor Signature

Chad W. Buckendahl | **Feb. 8, 2016**

Print Name | Date

This document must be submitted in Tab IV of vendor's technical proposal

State of Nevada
Department of Administration
Purchasing Division
515 E. Musser Street, Suite 300
Carson City, NV 89701

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Jeffrey Haag
Administrator

SUBJECT:	Amendment 1 to Request for Proposal 2101
RFP TITLE:	Educator Licensure Study
DATE OF AMENDMENT:	January 29, 2016
DATE OF RFP RELEASE:	January 13, 2016
OPENING DATE:	February 09, 2016
OPENING TIME:	2:00 PM
CONTACT:	Colleen G. Janes, Procurement Staff Member

The following shall be a part of RFP ***2101.*** If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

---

1. The deliverable outlined in Section 3.6.3 requires "[d]ocumentation that best practices have been reviewed in each jurisdiction to assist the State in aligning/modernizing licensure requirements." Does the term "jurisdiction" refer to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in Nevada or to other states in the United States?

   The term jurisdiction refers to "other states in the United States".

2. If the deliverable in Section 3.6.3 refers to LEAs, is the expectation that the vendor have direct engagement with every LEA in the State to learn about their practices as they relate to teachers' licenses, endorsements and preparation (e.g. conversations with central office personnel or school leaders about which licenses, endorsements or preparation techniques they seek out in teachers)?

   The scope of work for section 3.6.3 will be determined in consult with the selected vendor.

3. Alternatively, if the deliverable in Section 3.6.3 refers to LEAs, would a review of relevant licensure, endorsement and preparation data and information provided by the State suffice as a review of practices (e.g. review of the number of licenses and endorsements hired by each LEA)?

   The scope of work for section 3.6.3 will be determined in consult with the selected vendor.

4. If the deliverable in Section 3.6.3 instead refers to other states and not Nevada LEAs, is the expectation that the vendor review the relevant licensure, endorsement and preparation policies and practices in every state and assess their effectiveness?

   The scope of work for section 3.6.3 will be determined in consult with the selected vendor.

5. What is the position or title of the person who will be the primary client point of contact for the work?

   The points of contact will be both the Licensure Program Officer and Licensure Director.

6. The deliverable outlined in Section 3.6.4 states that the vendor will "work in consult with the State to draft the legislative changes." Is it the expectation that the vendor will: a) be the lead for drafting, b) provide information to be included with the State leading the drafting and vendor providing feedback, or c) a combination or other?

   The expectation is for the deliverable to be a collective effort, but the needs for drafting will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 2101.

Vendor must sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.

Vendor Name:	**ACS Ventures, LLC**		
Authorized Signature:			
Title:	**Partner**	Date:	**Feb. 8, 2016**

This document must be submitted in the "State Documents" section/tab of vendors' technical proposal.

Tab V – Attachment B

ATTACHMENT B – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF RFP

I have read, understand and agree to comply with ***all*** the terms and conditions specified in this Request for Proposal.

YES **X** I agree to comply with the terms and conditions specified in this RFP.

NO _____ I do not agree to comply with the terms and conditions specified in this RFP.

If the exception and/or assumption require a change in the terms in any section of the RFP, the contract, or any incorporated documents, vendors ***must*** provide the specific language that is being proposed in the tables below. If vendors do not specify in detail any exceptions and/or assumptions at time of proposal submission, the State will not consider any additional exceptions and/or assumptions during negotiations.

ACS VENTURES, LLC
Company Name

Signature

Chad W. Buckendahl — Print Name

Feb. 8, 2016 — Date

Vendors MUST use the following format. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

EXCEPTION SUMMARY FORM

EXCEPTION #	RFP SECTION NUMBER	RFP PAGE NUMBER	EXCEPTION (Complete detail regarding exceptions must be identified)

ASSUMPTION SUMMARY FORM

ASSUMPTION #	RFP SECTION NUMBER	RFP PAGE NUMBER	ASSUMPTION (Complete detail regarding assumptions must be identified)

This document must be submitted in Tab V of vendor's technical proposal

This page intentionally left blank

Tab VI – Section 3 - Scope of Work

OVERVIEW

ACS Ventures, LLC (ACS) and MYS Management (MYS) appreciate the opportunity to propose its collaborative evaluation services to Nevada Department of Education (NDE). Our team's collective experience with legislation, policies, and practices for credentialing programs, and specifically for educator licensure programs makes us uniquely qualified to assist the state with a review of the state's educator licensing requirements. We are prepared to provide services that include a comprehensive report with actionable recommendations about how the requirements can best be aligned with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework and, by doing so, be more current, cohesive, and provide evidence to support legal defensibility.

In this section we describe our proposed evaluation design incorporating multiple approaches to collect and analyze evidence for a series of factors important to the topic of educator licensure. Findings from these sources of evidence will be synthesized into cohesive summary of key issues, conclusions, and recommendations that will inform the state's needs to potentially revise and maintain educator licensure laws, rules, and regulations.

EVALUATION DESIGN

Our proposed evaluation design includes multiple components which involve collecting and analyzing various sources of information about the current requirements, policies, and practices for educator licensure. Across these components, ACS will evaluate the expectations and processes designated by the state and organize our findings and recommendations by key area. To extract key areas, we have organized the specific elements of review into the three themes:

1. ***Pathways to obtain and maintain educator licenses***
    - ***Educator preparation program reviews;***
    - ***Licensure fee structures;***
    - ***Alternative and adult education requirements;***
    - ***Renewal requirements for standard and professional licenses; and***
    - ***Suspension and revocation grounds and processes.***
2. ***Type of licenses and endorsements***
    - ***Special Education;***
    - ***Non-renewable/provisional/conditional licensure;***
    - ***National reciprocity;***
    - ***Career/technical and business/industry endorsements; and***
    - ***Deletion of endorsements no longer taught in Nevada, as well as the addition of new endorsement areas.***
3. ***Related considerations for educator licensure***
    - ***The Nevada Academic Content Standards;***
    - ***No Child Left Behind (or current Elementary and Secondary Education Act) requirements; and***
    - ***Alignment with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework.***

These themes are organized by related elements of the educator licensure system and range from eligibility to license acquisition to maintenance and enforcement. Within this design, each of the sub-bullets aligns with an element of the scope of work. We begin the first theme with the components of Nevada's pathways to obtain and maintain educator licenses. These elements are inclusive of eligibility requirements, maintenance requirements, and licensure enforcement and disciplinary expectations. In the second theme, we focus on the types of licenses and endorsements that are offered in Nevada. Within this theme, we begin to also explore considerations of reciprocity for educators from other jurisdictions seeking to obtain a license in Nevada. Finally, within the third theme, the focus is on related considerations such as Nevada's student level expectations for academic achievement, federal legislation or policies for educator quality or qualifications, and frameworks defining and evaluating educator performance.

The results from this comprehensive evaluation will include a summary technical report with designated sections for each of the three core themes of the study that address each of the specific elements requested by NDE. In the next sections of the proposal, we discuss how we will approach evidence collection and evaluation for each element of the Scope of Work. A detailed Project Plan and Timeline can be found in Tab IX of this proposal.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

Based on the proposed evaluation design described above, we highlight how we will approach each specific element of the scope in this section. The general methodology that we will apply to each section begins with identification of sources of evidence, collection of these relevant sources, analysis, synthesis with related evidence, evaluation, and development of actionable recommendations for the educator licensure program.

3.1 Align Nevada Administrative Code and Nevada Revised Statute:

Develop a comprehensive set of recommendations to align Nevada Administrative Code 391 with Nevada Revised Statute 391.

The first step in the proposed scope will be to review the Nevada Administrative Code 391 with the Nevada Revised Statute 391 that encompass the rules and regulations of the state educator licensing requirements. The purpose of this alignment review will be to determine where the two documents differ in terms of their requirements for educator licensure requirements, distinction among types of licenses, and maintenance of licenses within the state of Nevada. This alignment review parallels alignment activities that key staff have designed and led for other licensure, certification, and educational programs. In addition to conducting alignment activities within these contexts, key staff within this proposal have developed frameworks for evaluating alignment activities and the results from these activities (Davis-Becker & Buckendahl, 2013). This alignment process will be similar to other alignment studies that have focused on comparison of sets of academic content standards, educator competencies, and the results will include identification of specific differences in how requirements are expressed or larger differences in the overall requirements. The elements of the alignment review include consideration of knowledge, skills, abilities, and judgments associated with the role of an educator.

3.2 Comprehensive Analysis of Available Licenses and Endorsements:

Review all licenses and endorsements available in Nevada, pursuant to NRS and NAC 391, and make recommendations for the deletion or addition of licenses and/or endorsements that match national trends and best accepted practice, while meeting the needs of both the metropolitan school districts, rural schools districts, and charter schools in Nevada.

For the comparative analysis, ACS will collaborate with staff at NDE to identify a sample of states to serve as a peer group for purposes of comparison. Based on previous experience conducting similar studies, we propose that this peer group include a combination of states that represent large jurisdictions (e.g., California, New York, Illinois, Texas, Ohio, Florida) and jurisdictions that may be proximate and similar to Nevada in terms of some demographic characteristics (e.g., Arizona, Utah, Oregon, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina). The selection of jurisdictions for the peer

group will be guided by a goal to maximize variability among systems to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the educator licensure system? For each of these jurisdictions, several aspects of their educator licensure programs will be reviewed:

- ***Types/Diversity of licenses available in the within the educator profession (e.g., permanent, temporary, provisional);***
- ***Eligibility requirements for educator license (e.g., education, experience, assessment, background checks);***
- ***Expectations for maintenance of the license (e.g., professional development, practice expectations, evaluation); and***
- ***Enforcement and disciplinary policies and procedures (e.g., complaint processes, professional conduct).***

In the consideration of recent changes to federal legislation, the trends observed across the peer group will be compared to Nevada's requirements. The section of the report on this part of the analysis will include a summary of the observed trends ad identification as to where the state's current requirements align with or diverge from national trends; and where the requirements may be more or less stringent.

3.3 Alignment with the Nevada Educator Performance Framework:

Provide recommendations to ensure policy and procedures leading to initial and renewal of licensed personnel, pursuant to NRS and NAC 391, align with and support the effective use of the Nevada Educator Performance Framework.

The Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) is the statewide performance evaluation systems for teachers and building administrators that results in a performance-level rating for each individual. As a part of this study, it is important that the expectations for obtaining and maintaining licensure be aligned with the expectations for on-the-job performance. Therefore, ACS will conduct an alignment study that focuses on the knowledge, skills, abilities, judgments, and relevant job-related characteristics to compare the expectations set forth in the Nevada legislation (NRS and NAC 391) and the NEPF. Similar to the activities proposed for section 3.1 of the scope, the results from this study will include a description of the process and a summary of the results including the linkages between the sets of expectations, noting where differences in the purposes of the systems may be necessary.

3.4 Efficiency:

Provide a thorough and complete series of recommendations for modifications to NRS and NAC 391 that consider all aspects of the licensure process to provide qualified applicants and the State with the most efficient path to licensure. A thorough review must consider, at a minimum, the following areas:

3.4.1 Federal requirements;

3.4.2 All available licenses and/or endorsements;

3.4.3. National reciprocity;

3.4.4. Renewal requirements; and

3.4.5. Fee structure.

As a part of the comprehensive technical report provided to NDE, ACS will include recommendations for potential modifications to the licensure requirements, process, and maintenance based on the findings from the components of the study described above. With the goal of an efficient path to licensure which may include consideration of multiple pathways, recommendations will be made to ensure a straight forward and defensible process for stakeholders that remain focused on the purpose of licensure – protection of the public. These recommendations will be based on our evaluation of evidence related to recent changes in federal requirements for educators, aligning expectations with those of systems in the identified peer group, expectations for reciprocity with other jurisdictions, license maintenance and renewal processes, and fees and costs associated with the licensure process.

3.5 Suspension and Revocation:

Provide a series of recommendations for modifications to NRS and NAC 391 to ensure the ongoing legal defensibility of action taken against licensees. Such action includes, but is not limited to, disciplinary action such as suspension and revocation.

As a part of the technical report provided to NDE for this study, ACS will include an evaluation of the enforcement and disciplinary policies and procedures including current suspension and revocation requirements. The result of this evaluation will include recommendations for any modifications to these processes. Some of the factors that we will be able to include in this review will be legal considerations of adequate notice for any changes as well as elements of substantive and procedural due process.

3.6 Deliverables

Awarded vendor will provide the following documents to the State according to the negotiated Timeline:

3.6.1. Synopsis of the review of NAC 391;

3.6.2. Report on the identification of specific regulations that need to be modified;

3.6.3. Documentation that best practices have been reviewed in each jurisdiction to assist the State in aligning/modernizing licensure requirements; and

3.6.4. Draft legislative Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) and/or NAC revisions. (After the State has approved the identified changes, awarded vendor will work in consult with the State to draft the legislative changes. The submission of draft legislative Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) and/or NAC revisions will constitute the final deliverable.)

As a part of the technical report provided to NDE as part of this study, ACS will include a synopsis of our review of NAC 391 in comparison with the statute and expectations from the peer group. This summary document will include information about the sources of evidence considered and the evaluation processes we used to develop our conclusions and any recommendations. As part of this report, we will identify specific regulations that need to be modified to ensure alignment with the purpose of licensure and other elements of the system.

ACS will also provide documentation that summarizes the results of our comparative analysis of Nevada's educator licensure system with jurisdictions identified in the peer group. The goal of this comparison is to ensure that contemporary practices are being utilized to assist with responding to the dynamic workforce needs within the education sector.

As a final responsibility of the study, ACS will provide assistance, as requested, to Bill Draft Requests or NAC revisions. This assistance is intended to provide a bridge between the conclusions and recommendations from the technical reports and the needs of NDE and legislators to appropriately characterize any desired changes to the system.

3.7 Deliverable Submission and Review Process

The following sections detail the process for submission and review of deliverables during the life of the project/contract.

3.7.1. General

3.7.1.1. The contractor must provide one (1) master (both hard and soft copies) and three (3) additional hard copies of each written deliverable to the appropriate State Project Manager.

3.7.1.2. Once a deliverable is approved and accepted by the State, the contractor must provide an electronic copy. The State may, at its discretion, waive this requirement for a particular deliverable.

3.7.1.3. The electronic copy must be provided in software currently utilized by the agency or provided by the contractor.

ACS acknowledges the requirements for submission and review of deliverables for the project. Specifically, dedicated project management staff will ensure a master version of the report is delivered in hard and soft copy formats as well as three additional hard copies of the deliverable. Following approval of any deliverable for the project, ACS will provide an electronic (soft) copy in a current version of Microsoft Word, Adobe PDF, or NDE-preferred software.

3.7.2. Deliverable Submission

At a mutually agreed to meeting, on or before the time of delivery to the State, the contractor must provide a walkthrough of the deliverable. At the contractor's discretion, the meeting may be in person or via teleconference or videoconference.

The project manager will work with project stakeholders to schedule a debriefing meeting to walk through the final report, specifically the process, conclusions, and recommendations. We propose to conduct the meeting through videoconference (e.g., Skype, WebEx) with the State to facilitate cost-effective face-to-face interaction.

3.7.3. Deliverable Review

3.7.3.1 General

A. The State's review time begins on the next business day following receipt of the deliverable.

B. The State has up to sixty (60) calendar days to accept a deliverable.

C. Any subsequent deliverable dependent upon the State's acceptance of a prior deliverable will not be accepted for review until all issues related to the previous deliverable have been resolved.

D. Deliverables determined to be incomplete and/or unacceptable will be rejected, not considered delivered and returned to the contractor.

3.7.3.2. Accepted

A. If the deliverable is accepted, the State shall notify the contractor in writing.

B. Once the contractor receives the written acceptance, the State can then be invoiced for the deliverable ***(refer to Section 6, Financial).***

3.7.3.3. Comments/Revisions Requested by the State

ACS acknowledges that once the review period begins, the State will have up to 60 calendar days to accept a deliverable. Further, any dependent deliverables or ones that are determined to be incomplete or unacceptable will not be considered delivered for purposes of this study. Similarly, we acknowledge that any invoicing that occurs for the project will be conditional on receiving written acceptance of a given deliverable.

We anticipate comments and requests for revision by the State as an outcome of the review process and will collaborate with the State to ensure that we respond to these requests in a way that preserves the independence of the study while ensuring that the report provides value to stakeholders.

3.7.4. Rejected, Not Considered Delivered

3.7.4.1. If the State considers a deliverable not acceptable, the State will provide a written explanation as to why the deliverable is being rejected, not considered delivered.

3.7.4.2. Resubmission of the deliverable must occur within a mutually agreed upon time frame.

3.7.4.3. Upon resubmission of the completed deliverable, the State will follow the steps outlined in ***Section 3.7.3.2***.

ACS acknowledges that if a deliverable is rejected that the State will provide written feedback regarding the reason(s) for the rejection. Further, resubmission of the deliverable will occur based on a mutually agreed upon time frame that considers the nature of the revisions necessary to respond to the feedback.

This page intentionally left blank

Tab VII – Section 4 – Company Background and References

4.1 VENDOR INFORMATION

4.1.1

Vendors must provide a company profile in the table format below.

Question	Response
Company name:	***ACS Ventures, LLC***
Ownership (sole proprietor, partnership, etc.):	***Limited Liability Company***
State of incorporation:	***Nevada***
Date of incorporation:	***December 2015***
# of years in business:	***1***
List of top officers:	***Chad W. Buckendahl***
Location of company headquarters:	***Las Vegas, NV***
Location(s) of the company offices:	***Las Vegas, NV; Lincoln, NE***
Location(s) of the office that will provide the services described in this RFP:	***Las Vegas, NV; Lincoln, NE***
Number of employees locally with the expertise to support the requirements identified in this RFP:	***1***
Number of employees nationally with the expertise to support the requirements in this RFP:	***2***
Location(s) from which employees will be assigned for this project:	***Las Vegas, NV; Lincoln, NE***

4.1.2

Please be advised, pursuant to NRS 80.010, a corporation organized pursuant to the laws of another state must register with the State of Nevada, Secretary of State's Office as a foreign corporation before a contract can be executed between the State of Nevada and the awarded vendor, unless specifically exempted by NRS 80.015.

ACS Ventures, LLC is registered in Nevada.

4.1.3

The selected vendor, prior to doing business in the State of Nevada, must be appropriately licensed by the State of Nevada, Secretary of State's Office pursuant to NRS76. Information regarding the Nevada Business License can be located at http://nvsos.gov.

Question	Response
Nevada Business License Number:	***NV20151757910***
Legal Entity Name:	***ACS Ventures, LLC***

Is "Legal Entity Name" the same name as vendor is doing business as?

Yes	X	No	

If "No", provide explanation.

4.1.4

Vendors are cautioned that some services may contain licensing requirement(s). Vendors shall be proactive in verification of these requirements prior to proposal submittal. Proposals that do not contain the requisite licensure may be deemed non-responsive.

ACS Ventures, LLC acknowledge the expectations and is properly licensed to perform the proposed services.

4.1.5

Has the vendor ever been engaged under contract by any State of Nevada agency?

Yes		No	✗

If "Yes", complete the following table for each State agency for whom the work was performed. Table can be duplicated for each contract being identified.

Question	Response
Name of State agency:	
State agency contact name:	
Dates when services were performed:	
Type of duties performed:	
Total dollar value of the contract:	

4.1.6

Are you now or have you been within the last two (2) years an employee of the State of Nevada, or any of its agencies, departments, or divisions?

Yes		No	✗

If "Yes", please explain when the employee is planning to render services, while on annual leave, compensatory time, or on their own time?

If you employ (a) any person who is a current employee of an agency of the State of Nevada, or (b) any person who has been an employee of an agency of the State of Nevada within the past two (2) years, and if such person will be performing or producing the services which you will be contracted to provide under this contract, you must disclose the identity of each such person in your response to this RFP, and specify the services that each person will be expected to perform.

4.1.7

Disclosure of any significant prior or ongoing contract failures, contract breaches, civil or criminal litigation in which the vendor has been alleged to be liable or held liable in a matter involving a contract with the State of Nevada or any other governmental entity. Any pending claim or litigation occurring within the past six (6) years which may adversely affect the vendor's ability to perform or fulfill its obligations if a contract is awarded as a result of this RFP must also be disclosed.

Does any of the above apply to your company?

Yes		No	✗

If "Yes", please provide the following information. Table can be duplicated for each issue being identified.

Question	Response	
Date of alleged contract failure or breach:		
Parties involved:		
Description of the contract failure, contract breach, or litigation, including the products or services involved:		
Amount in controversy:		
Resolution or current status of the dispute:		
If the matter has resulted in a court case:	Court	Case Number
Status of the litigation:		

4.1.8

Vendors must review the insurance requirements specified in ***Attachment E, Insurance Schedule for RFP 2101***. Does your organization currently have or will your organization be able to provide the insurance requirements as specified in ***Attachment E***?

Yes	✗	No	

Any exceptions and/or assumptions to the insurance requirements ***must*** be identified on ***Attachment B, Technical Proposal Certification of Compliance with Terms and Conditions of RFP.*** Exceptions and/or assumptions will be taken into consideration as part of the evaluation process; however, vendors must be specific. If vendors do not specify any exceptions and/or assumptions at time of proposal submission, the State will not consider any additional exceptions and/or assumptions during negotiations.

Upon contract award, the successful vendor ***must*** provide the Certificate of Insurance identifying the coverages as specified in ***Attachment E, Insurance Schedule for RFP 2101.***

4.1.9

Company background/history and why vendor is qualified to provide the services described in this RFP. Limit response to no more than five (5) pages.

ACS Ventures, LLC (ACS) is a Nevada based, national firm that that focuses on evaluation, quality assurance, and operational support within the education and credentialing sectors. Our staff has considerable expertise in programs that involve measurement of student outcomes. We work with agencies that span the education and learning continuum (i.e., early childhood, PK-12, admissions, adult education, language testing, workforce).

ACS staff members' collective understanding of the interrelated elements of program development, policy, and assessment, coupled with their ability to apply those principles in the context of each specific program, sets us apart from other organizations in the field. Key staff members have provided a range of services to small and large scale programs including general program design and consultation within the context of applicable policy; evaluating and auditing programs; developing validation frameworks; and conducting test development and validation projects. Senior staff have particularly relevant experience with educator licensure programs having served as advisers and evaluators for state programs. In addition, Dr. Buckendahl recently served as an expert witness for the City of New York in a long running challenge to its educator licensure testing program. Because the use of temporary or provisional licenses were part of the fact pattern in this case, the legal implications will lend valuable insight to this project, particularly in light of the state's recent endorsement (February 2016) of an emergency regulation to permit issuance of temporary licenses to educators in response to changes in federal legislation.

Our team has also designed and implemented a number of evaluation studies for credentialing programs focusing on collecting validity evidence for the making program decisions and continual improvement. These studies have been conducted for national (e.g., National Commission for Certification of Physician Assistants, National Council of Architectural Registration Boards) and state level programs (e.g., Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability). Senior staff members proposed to lead this project have contributed to the professional community specifically on the topic of testing program evaluation (e.g., Buckendahl, 2015; Buckendahl, Plake, & Davis, 2009; Buckendahl & Plake, 2006). As a result, the ACS team is uniquely qualified to lead this project.

Our proposed design represents methods and sources of evidence that we believe are an appropriate strategy for independently evaluating the seven programs within the scope of work. Successful execution of the evaluation design will permit us to support the delivery of summary reports that highlight strengths and weaknesses of each program while also providing actionable recommendations for policymakers.

Our proposed solution emphasizes collaboration among the complementary expertise of ACS and MYS with each organization taking leadership roles within the project to focus on its respective strengths. Throughout the development and implementation of the evaluation design, leadership from each organization will work collaboratively to

conduct the evaluation, discuss the results, create reports, and produce meaningful and actionable deliverables for NDE and policymakers.

In addition to our expertise in program management, evaluation, assessment design, implementation, and related policy, customer service remains a top priority. We believe that the following components will invaluable contributors to the success of this process:

1) Senior staff at ACS and MYS are dedicated to consistent and close contact with NDE stakeholders throughout the design, implementation, and reporting activities of the evaluation.

2) ACS and MYS believe in full transparency and open communication throughout the evaluation process, ensuring that NDE will never be caught off-guard upon receipt of project deliverables. All information gathered during the project and the evaluation process will be visible to NDE and its stakeholders.

4.1.10

Length of time vendor has been providing services described in this RFP to the public and/or private sector. Please provide a brief description.

Although the company itself is newly formed, ACS's staff members have considerable experience. Our partners have conducted independent evaluations and psychometric audits for more than 15 years which includes providing independent evaluation and quality control services for Oklahoma's educator licensure program (1998-present), Massachusetts Tests of Educator Licensure (2011-present), conducting a psychometric audit of the National Commission for the Certification of Physician Assistants (2013), and conducting semi-annual evaluations of the Florida Bar Exam for the Florida Board of Bar Examiners (2002-present). In In addition to these larger-scale and ongoing evaluations, the proposed team members have conducted numerous validity studies for state and national credentialing programs focused on evaluating policy and procedural elements of the program through alignment with the intended use of test scores and comparison with policies and procedural practices (e.g., evaluation of content frameworks, review of retake policies) of similar programs (other state and national certification or licensure programs).

4.1.11

Financial information and documentation to be included in ***Part III, Confidential Financial Information*** of vendor's response in accordance with **Section 9.5, Part III – Confidential Financial Information**.

Dun and Bradstreet Numbers and Federal Tax Identification Numbers have been included in PART III-Confidential Financial Information for all proposed contractors.

4.2 SUBCONTRACTOR INFORMATION

4.2.1

Does this proposal include the use of subcontractors?

Yes	X	No	

If "Yes", vendor must:

4.2.1.1 Identify specific subcontractors and the specific requirements of this RFP for which each proposed subcontractor will perform services.

MYS Management (MYS) specializes in providing project management services within technical environments and has been identified as the ideal subcontractor to provide oversight of contract compliance for the educator licensure study. MYS will provide direct support to ACS by spearheading organized and documented communication between teams and will act as the main point of contact for all state resources. Upon contract award, MYS will collaborate with program stakeholders to ensure that agreeable project schedules are solidified and will ensure that project milestones and budgets are followed as agreed. MYS will be responsible for tracking the progress of project milestones, requesting and storing relevant documentation and data, and ensuring deliverables are distributed as expected. A letter of support indicating MYS's commitment to the project is included in Tab X of this proposal.

4.2.1.2 If any tasks are to be completed by subcontractor(s), vendors must:

A. Describe the relevant contractual arrangements;

ACS will issue and manage the proposed subcontract.

B. Describe how the work of any subcontractor(s) will be supervised, channels of communication will be maintained and compliance with contract terms assured; and

Dr. Davis-Becker (ACS) will serve as Principal Investigator (PI) for the project with Dr. Buckendahl (ACS) providing technical assistance, and Ms. Myisha Williams serving as Project Manager. Each of these members of the study team will be responsible for supervising and managing its respective staffing. However, ACS will serve as the prime contract and Dr. Davis-Becker will serve as the point of escalation for decisions related to the evaluation and be responsible for the overall success of the project. While Ms. Williams will be responsible for day-to-day contract management and compliance for the project including coordinating communication, she will regularly

report project progress, needs, and milestones to Dr. Davis-Becker to maintain internal communication, ensuring contract compliance. ACS and MYS will schedule regular meetings both in-person and virtually. Because key members of the study team are located in Las Vegas, facilitating in-person meetings can be easily accommodated, if requested by NDE.

C. Describe your previous experience with subcontractor(s).

ACS staff has collaborated for more than seven years with key staff at MYS Management on projects of similar scope, duration, and budget.

4.2.1.3 Vendors must describe the methodology, processes and tools utilized for:

A. Selecting and qualifying appropriate subcontractors for the project/contract;

As the lead vendor in this collaborative bid, ACS will be ultimately responsible for compliance with the contractual terms, its performance, and out subcontractor-partners' performance. In identifying prospective subcontractors for this project, ACS prioritized organizations that could demonstrate a complementary fit with respect to the services we offer in addition to an organizational philosophy about providing client service for these types of projects. We have worked closely with staff at MYS in the past, so we are familiar with working styles, competencies, and responsiveness to client needs. However, prior work alone does not necessarily mean that it would apply to this project. Therefore, we also evaluated the specific needs for this evaluation. With respect to complementary abilities, MYS brings considerable project management and contract compliance experience from its work in the public and private sector. When combined with the assessment literacy and national experiences of ACS, each contributor to the partnership provides skills that will be necessary for the project to succeed.

B. Ensuring subcontractor compliance with the overall performance objectives for the project;

Oversight of the project and each subcontractors' roles will be the responsibility of Dr. Davis-Becker (ACS). As the project manager for the project, Ms. Williams will collect and provide regular documentation about project activity progress, milestones, challenges, and appropriate risk mitigation strategies that will ensure that each partner on the project is fulfilling its responsibilities with respect to the project as a whole.

C. Ensuring that subcontractor deliverables meet the quality objectives of the project/contract; and

Although quality control will be a shared responsibility across the partners, overall responsibility for meeting quality objectives will be under Dr. Davis-Becker's purview. A multistage review process will be employed to evaluate quality of deliverables for

the project. At the first stage of review, a peer within the organization assigned to the task will conduct an interview review. Second, one of the key staff members for the project as a whole will be assigned as a substantive reviewer of the deliverable. By implementing this review process, we strive to substantially reduce potential errors that could threaten the credibility of the deliverable produced under this project. As the project manager for the project, Ms. Williams will be responsible for coordinating the review processes to ensure that appropriate team members are engaging in the critical feedback necessary to produce a high quality product.

D. Provide proof of payment to any subcontractor(s) used for this project/contract, if requested by the State. Proposal should include a plan by which, at the State's request, the State will be notified of such payments.

ACS uses QuickBooks for its accounting software and contracts with an external small business services firm, Padgett Small Business Services, to provide its payroll, tax compliance, and accounting services. Upon request, ACS will be able to provide reports about any payments to subcontractors. In addition, upon request, automatic alerts can be set up to address any such payments to subcontractors that are part of this project.

4.2.1.4 Provide the same information for any proposed subcontractors as requested in Section 4.1, Vendor Information.

4.1.1(B)

Vendors must provide a company profile in the table format below.

Question	Response
Company name:	***MYS Management***
Ownership (sole proprietor, partnership, etc.):	***LLC***
State of incorporation:	***Nevada***
Date of incorporation:	***2014***
# of years in business:	***2***
List of top officers:	***Myisha Williams***
Location of company headquarters:	***Henderson, NV***
Location(s) of the company offices:	***Henderson, NV***
Location(s) of the office that will provide the services described in this RFP:	***Henderson, NV***

Question	Response
Number of employees locally with the expertise to support the requirements identified in this RFP:	***1***
Number of employees nationally with the expertise to support the requirements in this RFP:	***1***
Location(s) from which employees will be assigned for this project:	***Henderson, NV***

4.1.2(B)

Please be advised, pursuant to NRS 80.010, a corporation organized pursuant to the laws of another state must register with the State of Nevada, Secretary of State's Office as a foreign corporation before a contract can be executed between the State of Nevada and the awarded vendor, unless specifically exempted by NRS 80.015.

Acknowledged by MYS Management.

4.1.3(B)

The selected vendor, prior to doing business in the State of Nevada, must be appropriately licensed by the State of Nevada, Secretary of State's Office pursuant to NRS76. Information regarding the Nevada Business License can be located at http://nvsos.gov.

Question	Response
Nevada Business License Number:	***NV20151607284***
Legal Entity Name:	***MYS LLC***

Is "Legal Entity Name" the same name as vendor is doing business as?

Yes		No	***X***

If "No", provide explanation.

In order to reduce client confusion during the entity's switch from a sole proprietorship to an LLC in 2015, the company's DBA, "MYS Management", was retained, however the company legally operates under its LLC designation, "MYS LLC".

4.1.4(B)

Vendors are cautioned that some services may contain licensing requirement(s). Vendors shall be proactive in verification of these requirements prior to proposal submittal. Proposals that do not contain the requisite licensure may be deemed non-responsive.

Acknowledged by MYS Management.

4.1.5(B)

Has the vendor ever been engaged under contract by any State of Nevada agency?

Yes		No	✗

If "Yes", complete the following table for each State agency for whom the work was performed. Table can be duplicated for each contract being identified.

Question	Response
Name of State agency:	
State agency contact name:	
Dates when services were performed:	
Type of duties performed:	
Total dollar value of the contract:	

4.1.6(B)

Are you now or have you been within the last two (2) years an employee of the State of Nevada, or any of its agencies, departments, or divisions?

Yes		No	✗

If "Yes", please explain when the employee is planning to render services, while on annual leave, compensatory time, or on their own time?

If you employ (a) any person who is a current employee of an agency of the State of Nevada, or (b) any person who has been an employee of an agency of the State of Nevada within the past two (2) years, and if such person will be performing or producing the services which you will be contracted to provide under this contract, you must disclose the identity of each such person in your response to this RFP, and specify the services that each person will be expected to perform.

4.1.7(B)

Disclosure of any significant prior or ongoing contract failures, contract breaches, civil or criminal litigation in which the vendor has been alleged to be liable or held liable in a matter involving a contract with the State of Nevada or any other governmental entity. Any pending claim or litigation occurring within the past six (6) years which may adversely affect the vendor's ability to perform or fulfill its obligations if a contract is awarded as a result of this RFP must also be disclosed.

Does any of the above apply to your company?

Yes		No	✗

If "Yes", please provide the following information. Table can be duplicated for each issue being identified.

Question	Response	
Date of alleged contract failure or breach:		
Parties involved:		
Description of the contract failure, contract breach, or litigation, including the products or services involved:		
Amount in controversy:		
Resolution or current status of the dispute:		
If the matter has resulted in a court case:	Court	Case Number
Status of the litigation:		

4.1.8(B)

Vendors must review the insurance requirements specified in ***Attachment E, Insurance Schedule for RFP 2101***. Does your organization currently have or will your organization be able to provide the insurance requirements as specified in ***Attachment E***?

Yes	✗	No	

Any exceptions and/or assumptions to the insurance requirements ***must*** be identified on ***Attachment B, Technical Proposal Certification of Compliance with Terms and Conditions of RFP.*** Exceptions and/or assumptions will be taken into consideration as part of the evaluation process; however, vendors must be specific. If vendors do not specify any exceptions and/or assumptions at time of proposal submission, the State will not consider any additional exceptions and/or assumptions during negotiations.

Upon contract award, the successful vendor ***must*** provide the Certificate of Insurance identifying the coverages as specified in ***Attachment E, Insurance Schedule for RFP 2101.***

4.1.9(B)

Company background/history and why vendor is qualified to provide the services described in this RFP. Limit response to no more than five (5) pages.

MYS was formed in 2014 when company founder, Ms. Myisha Williams, recognized a global demand for project management professionals who can author innovative, yet realistic and efficient management strategies within technical and civil business environments. During the formation of this professional management firm, it was quickly established that company values would center on continuous improvement of systems, individual growth, as well as a commitment to provide improved and sustainable systems for all clients.

As a local entity specializing in the oversight of scope, schedule, and budget of high-stakes evaluations and programs, MYS Management (MYS) is uniquely qualified to collaborate with ACS to provide project and contract management services. MYS understands the importance of providing exceptional customer service across various stakeholder groups and accommodates staggered security levels around documentation, data, and reporting to project resources, as appropriate. MYS also recognizes the necessity of checks and balances, redundancy, and risk mitigation and therefore provides documentation for all project milestones and communication during regular intervals to appropriate stakeholders. As experienced government contractors, key staff are exclusively positioned to anticipate and prepare for state-specific requirements around confidentiality, public relations, billing, and policy. Our ability to function as an unobtrusive extension of existing process while practically growing process and suggesting improvements make us the ideal partner for the state.

The firm believes in continuous education of its employees and contributes to professional management organizations, and in turn, will be excited to offer recommendations around current practices, technology, and strategies that will increase efficiency and reduce internal workload for NDE staff.

MYS staff bring a decade of experience working closely with respected organizations on both low- and high-stakes projects, including:

- ***American Board of Emergency Medicine***
- ***American Board of Dental Examiners***
- ***Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment Systems***

- ***Cisco Systems***
- ***Diagnostic Mathematics Assessments for Middle School Teachers***
- ***Geometry Assessment for Secondary Teachers***
- ***International Hearing Society***
- ***Millard Public Schools***
- ***National Board of Examiners in Optometry***
- ***National Commission on Certification of Physician Assistants***
- ***North Carolina Department of Public Instruction***
- ***National Dental Examining Board of Canada***
- ***Nebraska Department of Education***
- ***North East Regional Board of Dental Examiners***
- ***Operating Engineers Certification Program***
- ***Southern Regional Testing Agency***
- ***South Dakota Department of Education***
- ***Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction***
- ***Wyoming State Board of Education***

MYS operates out of the Las Vegas, Nevada area and is proud to employ staff with active Project Management Institute (PMI) membership and affiliation with the Southern Nevada PMI Chapter. MYS is a certified Disadvantaged Business (DBE) and Small Business Entity (SBE) in the State of Nevada and holds Emerging Small Business Certification (ESB) with the Nevada Governor's Office of Economic Development.

4.1.10(B)

Length of time vendor has been providing services described in this RFP to the public and/or private sector. Please provide a brief description.

Staff at MYS Management have ten years of concentrated experience providing project and contract management services within the government, private, and public sectors. Key staff have managed high-stakes projects for the Wyoming State Board of Education, Nebraska Department of Education, South Dakota Department of Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction as well as the Geometry Assessment for Secondary Teachers (GAST) and Diagnostic Science Assessment for Middle School Teachers (DTAMS) federally funded projects through the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) and the National Science Foundation (NSF), respectively, in partnership with the University of Louisville.

4.2.1.5 Business references as specified in ***Section 4. 3, Business References*** must be provided for any proposed subcontractors.

Acknowledged by ACS Ventures, LLC.

4.2.1.6 Vendor shall not allow any subcontractor to commence work until all insurance required of the subcontractor is provided to the vendor.

Prior to commencement of any work, ACS Ventures, LLC will ensure that each subcontractor provides requisite insurance documentation to comply with contract terms.

4.2.1.7 Vendor must notify the using agency of the intended use of any subcontractors not identified within their original proposal and provide the information originally requested in the RFP in ***Section 4.2, Subcontractor Information***. The vendor must receive agency approval prior to subcontractor commencing work.

ACS Ventures, LLC acknowledges that it will seek and receive approval prior to engaging with any subcontractors not identified within this proposal.

4.3 BUSINESS REFERENCES

4.3.1

Vendors should provide a minimum of three (3) business references from similar projects performed for private, state and/or large local government clients within the last three (3) years.

Three business references have been provided below for the vendor and subcontractor.

4.3.2

Vendors must provide the following information for **every** business reference provided by the vendor and/or subcontractor:

The "Company Name" must be the name of the proposing vendor or the vendor's proposed subcontractor.

Reference #:	***1***		
Company Name:	***Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Accountability***		
Identify role company will have for this RFP project (Check appropriate role below):			
X	***VENDOR***		***SUBCONTRACTOR***
Project Name:	Evaluation of OGET Score Concordance with ACT		
Primary Contact Information			
Name:	***Ms. Renee Launey-Rodolf***		
Street Address:	***840 Research Parkway, Suite 445***		
City, State, Zip:	***Oklahoma City, OK 73104***		
Phone, including area code:	***(405) 522-5399***		
Facsimile, including area code:	***(405) 525-0373***		
Email address:	***Renee.Launey-Rodolf@oeqa.ok.gov***		
Alternate Contact Information			
Name:	***N/A***		
Street Address:			
City, State, Zip:			
Phone, including area code:			
Facsimile, including area code:			
Email address:			
Project Information			
Brief description of the project/contract and description of services performed, including technical environment (i.e., software applications, data communications, etc.) if applicable:	***As part of an ongoing evaluation contract with the department, this project was designed to evaluate potential compliance with the outcomes requirements of an educator accreditation program. For the project, staff from ACS collected data from a number of educator training programs in Oklahoma and conducted analyses that resulted in a score concordance table. The intent of the study was to***		

	evaluate whether the scores from one assessment program in the state that was used for admission and credentialing purposes could be used to satisfy the outcomes expectations of a national accreditation body.
Original Project/Contract Start Date:	***July 1, 2013***
Original Project/Contract End Date:	***June 30, 2018***
Original Project/Contract Value:	***Approximately $525,000***
Final Project/Contract Date:	***In progress***
Was project/contract completed in time originally allotted, and if not, why not?	***Yes***
Was project/contract completed within or under the original budget/ cost proposal, and if not, why not?	***Yes***

Reference #:	***2***		
Company Name:	***ACS Ventures, LLC***		
Identify role company will have for this RFP project (Check appropriate role below):			
X	***VENDOR***		***SUBCONTRACTOR***
Project Name:	***Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure***		
Primary Contact Information			
Name:		***Ms. Judith Sohn-White***	
Street Address:		***75 Pleasant Street***	
City, State, Zip:		***Malden, MA***	
Phone, including area code:		***(781) 338-3244***	
Facsimile, including area code:			
Email address:		***JSohn-White@doe.umass.edu***	
Alternate Contact Information			
Name:		***N/A***	
Street Address:			
City, State, Zip:			
Phone, including area code:			
Facsimile, including area code:			
Email address:			
Project Information			
Brief description of the project/contract and description of services performed, including		***Dr. Buckendahl currently serves as chair of the national Technical Advisory Committee***	

technical environment (i.e., software applications, data communications, etc.) if applicable:	***for the Massachusetts Tests of Educator Licensure (MTEL) program for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. His responsibilities are to serve as an external evaluator of the vendor's compliance with state and professional expectations; and to advise the state on issues that impact educator licensure policies and practices.***
Original Project/Contract Start Date:	***May 2011***
Original Project/Contract End Date:	***Ongoing***
Original Project/Contract Value:	***Approximately $35,000***
Final Project/Contract Date:	***In progress***
Was project/contract completed in time originally allotted, and if not, why not?	***Yes***
Was project/contract completed within or under the original budget/ cost proposal, and if not, why not?	***Yes***

Reference #:	***3***		
Company Name:	***University of Louisville, KY***		
Identify role company will have for this RFP project (Check appropriate role below):			
	VENDOR	***X***	***SUBCONTRACTOR***
Project Name:	Geometry Assessment for Secondary Teachers		
Primary Contact Information			
Name:	***Ms. Sue Peters***		
Street Address:	***201 S 3rd Street***		
City, State, Zip:	***Louisville, KY 40292***		
Phone, including area code:	***(502) 852-0579***		
Facsimile, including area code:	***N/A***		
Email address:	***s.peters@louisville.edu***		
Alternate Contact Information			
Name:	***N/A***		
Street Address:			
City, State, Zip:			
Phone, including area code:			

Facsimile, including area code:	
Email address:	
Project Information	
Brief description of the project/contract and description of services performed, including technical environment (i.e., software applications, data communications, etc.) if applicable:	***Funding for this project was granted by the National Science Foundation in order to evaluate the impact of teacher knowledge on student achievement. Survey, exam, and observational data was collected and analyzed for both students and instructors. Staff from MYS was responsible for organizing and documenting all communication between participants, stakeholders, and internal staff as well as ensuring data was properly collected and remained secure within IRB and industry standards. Systems were developed to handle expense and billable hour tracking. Staff at MYS assisted with the presentation of results to various stakeholder groups and at professional conferences.***
Original Project/Contract Start Date:	***Dec 2008***
Original Project/Contract End Date:	***Aug 2014***
Original Project/Contract Value:	***$444,750***
Final Project/Contract Date:	***Nov 2013 (total project $546,418)***
Was project/contract completed in time originally allotted, and if not, why not?	***No, the University requested a project extension through NSF in order to allow time to collect more data.***
Was project/contract completed within or under the original budget/ cost proposal, and if not, why not?	***No, scope changes were initiated to extend services for additional time. The project was completed within the adjusted budget.***

4.3.3

Vendors must also submit ***Attachment F, Reference Questionnaire*** to the business references that are identified in ***Section 4.3.2***.

Acknowledged by ACS Ventures, LLC

4.3.4

The company identified as the business references must submit the Reference Questionnaire directly to the Purchasing Division.

ACS Ventures, LLC and its proposed subcontractor communicated to its Business References that their responses should be submitted directly to the Purchasing Division.

4.3.5

It is the vendor's responsibility to ensure that completed forms are received by the Purchasing Division on or before the deadline as specified in Section 8, RFP Timeline for inclusion in the evaluation process. Reference Questionnaires not received, or not complete, may adversely affect the vendor's score in the evaluation process.

Acknowledged by ACS Ventures, LLC.

4.3.6

The State reserves the right to contact and verify any and all references listed regarding the quality and degree of satisfaction for such performance.

Acknowledged by ACS Ventures, LLC

Tab VIII – Attachment G – Proposed Staff Resumes

PROPOSED STAFF RESUME FOR RFP 2101

A resume must be completed for all proposed prime contractor staff and proposed subcontractor staff.

Company Name Submitting Proposal:	***ACS Ventures, LLC***

Check the appropriate box as to whether the proposed individual is prime contractor staff or subcontractor staff.

Contractor:	***X***	**Subcontractor:**	

The following information requested pertains to the individual being proposed for this project.

Name:	***Susan Davis-Becker***	**Key Personnel: (Yes/No)**	***Yes***
Individual's Title:	***Founding Partner***		
# of Years in the Field:	***11***	**# of Years with Firm:**	***1***

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Information should include a brief summary of the proposed individual's professional experience.

Dr. Davis-Becker has over ten years of experience providing psychometric consultation to a variety of educational and credentialing testing programs. Prior to joining ACS, she was the Director of Professional Credentialing at Alpine Testing Solutions. Her specific areas of expertise include test content development, standard setting and validity research. Susan received her doctoral degree in assessment and measurement from James Madison University. She has published numerous journal articles, book chapters and presented research at regional, national, and international conferences. Susan currently serves on the editorial boards for the NCME Newsletter and the ICE Digest, and is the lead editor of a forthcoming volume about applied work in the testing industry.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Information required should include: timeframe, company name, company location, position title held during the term of the contract/project and details of contract/project.

2016 – pres. Founding Partner, ACS Ventures [Lincoln, NE]. Responsibilities include providing psychometric consultation, conducting program evaluation, conducting psychometric analyses, leading applied research for testing programs in education and credentialing, and developing and maintaining client relationships.

2007 – 2016 Senior Psychometrician and Director of Professional Credentialing, Alpine Testing Solutions [Lincoln, NE]. Responsibilities included leading and managing client relationships, providing psychometric consultation, conducting program evaluation, managing psychometric staff, conducting applied research for testing programs in education and credentialing, and contributing to business development efforts.

2004 – 2007 Assistant Director, Project Coordinator, Buros Institute for Assessment Consultation and Outreach, University of Nebraska, Lincoln [Lincoln, NE]. Responsibilities included providing psychometric services to education and credentialing programs including test development and validity research. Supervised other staff conducting research or various assessment programs.

EDUCATION

Information required should include: institution name, city, state, degree and/or Achievement and date completed/received.

Ph.D. 2005, Assessment and Measurement, James Madison University [Harrisonburg, VA]

M.A. 2002, Psychology, James Madison University [Harrisonburg, VA]

B.A. 2000, Psychology, Salisbury State University [Salisbury, MD]

CERTIFICATIONS

Information required should include: type of certification and date completed/received.

Insert here any certifications proposed individual has received.

REFERENCES

A minimum of three (3) references are required, including name, title, organization, phone number, fax number and email address.

Ms. Renee Launey-Rodolf

Director of Educational Quality, Oklahoma Office of Educational Quality and Assurance

Phone: 405.522.5399

Fax: 405.525.0373

Email: Renee.Launey-Rodolf@oeqa.ok.gov

Dr. Pat Crum

Research Associate, Millard Public Schools

Phone: 402.715.8315

Fax: 402.715.8448

Email: pacrum@mpsomaha.org

Dr. Stephen Sireci

Professor, Department of Educational Policy, Research & Administration (UMASS)

Phone: 413.545.0564

Fax: N/A

Email: sireci@acad.umass.edu

PROPOSED STAFF RESUME FOR RFP 2101

A resume must be completed for all proposed prime contractor staff and proposed subcontractor staff.

Company Name Submitting Proposal:	***ACS Ventures***

Check the appropriate box as to whether the proposed individual is prime contractor staff or subcontractor staff.

Contractor:	***X***	**Subcontractor:**	

The following information requested pertains to the individual being proposed for this project.

Name:	***Chad W. Buckendahl***	**Key Personnel: (Yes/No)**	***Yes***
Individual's Title:	***Founding Partner***		
# of Years in the Field:	***17***	**# of Years with Firm:**	***1***

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Information should include a brief summary of the proposed individual's professional experience.

Dr. Buckendahl has worked with a number of state student educational assessment programs in a number of states (e.g., FL, IN, MT, NC, NE, NV, SD, WA, WY) and credentialing programs including architecture, education, emergency medicine, law, nursing, dentistry, and dental hygiene. In addition to providing consultation, he has conducted a number of program evaluations, led validation research, and served as an expert witness on assessment issues in legal challenges. He currently serves as a psychometric reviewer and past chair of the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA) and as a co-editor for a forthcoming book on licensure and certification testing in the professions sponsored by the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). Chad maintains an office in Las Vegas, NV.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Information required should include: timeframe, company name, company location, position title held during the term of the contract/project and details of contract/project.

2016 – pres. Founding Partner, ACS Ventures [Las Vegas, NV]. Responsibilities include developing and maintaining client relationships, providing psychometric consultation, conducting program evaluation, and managing and conducting applied research for testing programs in education and credentialing.

2007 – 2015 Senior Psychometrician (2007-2014) and Director of Strategic Partnerships (2014-2015), Alpine Testing Solutions [Las Vegas, NV]. Responsibilities included developing and maintaining client relationships, providing psychometric consultation, conducting program evaluations, managing applied research projects, managing psychometric and operations staff, and conducting applied research for testing programs in education and credentialing.

1998 – 2007 Director (2002-2007), Assistant Director (2000-2002), Research Associate (1998-2000), Buros Institute for Assessment Consultation and Outreach, University of Nebraska, Lincoln [Lincoln, NE]. Responsibilities included securing external funding, conducting program evaluations, directing applied research and providing measurement consultation for proprietary, non-commercial testing programs in education and credentialing.

EDUCATION

Information required should include: institution name, city, state, degree and/or Achievement and date completed/received.

Ph.D. 2000, Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Education, University of Nebraska, Lincoln [Lincoln, NE]

M.L.S. 1996, Legal Studies, University of Nebraska College of Law [Lincoln, NE]

B.A. 1994, Political Science, University of Nebraska, Lincoln [Lincoln, NE]

CERTIFICATIONS

Information required should include: type of certification and date completed/received.

Insert here any certifications proposed individual has received.

REFERENCES

A minimum of three (3) references are required, including name, title, organization, phone number, fax number and email address.

Dr. Valorie Foy

Director, Nebraska Department of Education - Assessment Team

Phone: 402.471.2495

Fax: 402.471.4311

Email: Valorie.Foy@nebraska.gov

Mr. E.W. Looney

C.E.O., BrightLink Technology, LLC

Phone: 678.392.3321

Fax: N/A

Email: ewlooney@thebrightlink.com

Dr. William Ellis MS, RPh

Executive Director, Board of Pharmacy Specialties

Phone: 202.429.7591

Fax: 202.429.6304

Email: wellis@aphanet.org

PROPOSED STAFF RESUME FOR RFP 2101

A resume must be completed for all proposed prime contractor staff and proposed subcontractor staff.

Company Name Submitting Proposal:	***MYS LLC dba MYS Management***

Check the appropriate box as to whether the proposed individual is prime contractor staff or subcontractor staff.

Contractor:		**Subcontractor:**	***X***

The following information requested pertains to the individual being proposed for this project.

Name:	***Myisha Williams***	**Key Personnel: (Yes/No)**	***Yes***
Individual's Title:	***Managing Member***		
# of Years in the Field:	***10***	**# of Years with Firm:**	***2***

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Information should include a brief summary of the proposed individual's professional experience.

Ms. Williams has spent over a decade leading programs and teams across various technical industries. She has co-presented at national conference with numerous professional organizations on project outcomes and strategies. She actively participates in membership activities through the Project Management Institute, Association for Talent Development, and Organizational Development Network. Myisha's academic focus centered on equitable educational practices through her post-secondary coursework at the University of California, San Diego.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Information required should include: timeframe, company name, company location, position title held during the term of the contract/project and details of contract/project.

2014 – pres. Managing Member, MYS LLC [Las Vegas, NV]. Responsibilities include providing project management services, consultation, and training, as well as marketing strategy and evaluation services for small business, corporate, and government entities.

2008 – 2015 Lead Program Manager, Alpine Testing Solutions [Las Vegas, NV]. Responsibilities included oversight, implementation, and tracking of client programs, training and development of internal project team, internal/external resource organization and communication, and implementation of risk management strategies.

1998 – 2000 Assistant Researcher/Project Manager, HIV Neurobehavioral Research Center, University of California, San Diego [La Jolla, CA]. Responsibilities included interfacing with terminally-ill clients to collect qualitative and quantitative data, exercising strict confidentiality and compassionate customer service, data parsing, and oral and written presentation of research findings.

EDUCATION

Information required should include: institution name, city, state, degree and/or Achievement and date completed/received.

M.Ed. (Coursework)

2004, Education, University of California, San Diego [La Jolla, CA]

B.A. 2002, Human Development, University of California, San Diego [La Jolla, CA]

CERTIFICATIONS

Information required should include: type of certification and date completed/received.

Insert here any certifications proposed individual has received.

REFERENCES

A minimum of three (3) references are required, including name, title, organization, phone number, fax number and email address.

Dr. Sue Peters

Associate Professor, College of Education & Human Development, University of Louisville, Kentucky

Phone: 502.852.0579

Fax: N/A

Email: s.peters@louisville.edu

Dr. Mica Estrada

Assistant Professor, Institute for Health & Aging, University of California, San Francisco

Phone: 415.476.5685

Fax: N/A

Email: mica.estrada@ucsf.edu

Dr. Carol Cunningham

State Medical Director, Ohio Department of Public Safety, Emergency Medical Services

Phone: 614.466.9447

Fax: 614.466.9461

Email: cacunningham@dps.ohio.gov

This page intentionally left blank

Tab IX – Project Plan and Project Timeline

The specific elements of the scope are address through our plans for accomplishing each of the goals set forth by the NDE in Tab VI –Section 3 – Scope of Work. As outlined in the scope of work, the overall project plan will include three specific studies, summary reports will be provide following each study, and a comprehensive technical report will be provided that summarizes the findings across the three studies and include specific recommendations for modifications to the licensure process.

PROJECT MILESTONE	*PROPOSED TIMEFRAME**
Project Initiation and Kick off • *Tele- or video conference meeting with NDE Stakeholders and Project Staff (ACS/MYS)* • *Project Schedule finalization*	***April 2016***
Research and Analysis (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5) • *Review Nevada Administrative Code 391* • *Review licenses and endorsements available in Nevada* • *Identify peer group states for use in comparison study* • *Compare multiple aspects of state licensure programs* • *Conduct alignment study of NRS/NAC 391 with NEPF*	***May-July 2016***
Summary Report (3.6.1) Submitted to NDE • *Synopsis of the review of NAC 391*	***June 2016***
Summary Report (3.6.2) Submitted to NDE • *Alignment of licensure requirements* – *comparative analysis process* – *summary of sources of evidence* – *details of evaluation process*	***July 2016***
Summary Report (3.6.3) Submitted to NDE • *Process overview for evaluation of regulations, disciplinary policies, and legal considerations*	***August 2016***
Summary Reports Reviewed by NDE (3.7)	***June - August 2016***
Final Technical Report (3.6.4) Submitted to NDE • *Alignment results* • *Recommend regulation modifications to NRS and NAC 391* • *Recommended changes to enforcement and disciplinary policies, highlighting legal considerations* • *Assistance with Bill Draft Requests and/or NAC Revisions*	***September 2016***

****The finalized project plan and timeline will be negotiated with input and approval from NDE.***

This page intentionally left blank

Tab X - Other Informational Material

February 6, 2016

Susan Davis-Becker, Ph.D.
Partner
ACS Ventures, LLC
11035 Lavender Hill Dr., Ste. 160-433
Las Vegas, NV 89135

Dr. Davis-Becker,

On behalf of MYS Management, LLC, I am writing to confirm our intent to collaborate with ACS Ventures, LLC in support of its proposal for RFP 2101 Educator Licensure Study. We appreciate the consideration and are excited for the opportunity to work with you and your team to implement the evaluation design for the State of Nevada.

MYS has extensive experience and a successful track record of providing program management and contract compliance services for public, private, and government organizations. Over the past decade, staff have overseen multi-million dollar projects, worked within various high stakes environments, and managed grant, state and federal funds. We believe this uniquely positions us to be strong contributions to this collaboration.

I look forward to a working with ACS to provide the necessary level of support through the program evaluation activities described in the RFP. Thank you for the opportunity to partner with you and your team, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Myisha Williams
Managing Member
MYS Management, LLC
702.330.2449
myisha@mysbiz.com