MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Urban Education. Global Citizens.

Responses to Written Questions

RFP #27-01

Question 1: **Independent Review / State-Approved Lists:** The RFP requires vendors to have been independently reviewed by EdReports using review tool version 2.1, 2.0, or 1.5 and found to Meet Expectations in Gateways 2 and 3. Would MPS consider other independent evaluations that assess substantially similar criteria, including an independent third-party evaluation using the EdReports version 2.1 review tool or inclusion on a state-approved/adopted high-quality instructional materials list? If so, are there specific state review processes, approved lists, or independent evaluators that MPS will recognize as satisfying this requirement?

Answer 1: No. The RFP states that vendors must be reviewed by EdReports.

Question 2: **EdReports Review in Progress:** If a curriculum is currently pursuing an official EdReports review, may a vendor submit while that review is in progress? If so, by what point in the evaluation or procurement process must the official EdReports review be completed?

Answer 2: The official EdReports review must be completed by the proposal due date, 11/11/2026.

Question 3: **Third-Party Evaluator Requirements:** If an independent third-party evaluation using the EdReports review tool is acceptable, are there specific qualifications the evaluator must meet or specific documentation that must accompany the evaluation?

Answer 3: N/A

Question 4: **Gateway Requirements:** The RFP specifically identifies Meet Expectations in Gateways 2 and 3. Is a Gateway 1 rating required for eligibility or considered at any subsequent stage of the evaluation? The curriculum requirements similarly identify Gateways 2 and 3.

Answer 4: Gateway 1 is a prerequisite of EdReports prior to an evaluation using the Gateways 2 and 3.

Question 5: **Curriculum Resource Vetting Rubric:** The RFP indicates that Round One qualifiers will receive the 6–8 ELA Curriculum Resource Vetting Rubric. Would MPS be able to provide this rubric to prospective proposers prior to the proposal deadline so vendors can assess alignment with the curriculum requirements before submitting?

Answer 5: No. Due to the timeline and requirements of the steering committee, the rubric will not be finalized prior to the proposal deadline. Vendors should adhere to the EdReports Gateways 2 and 3 rubrics/descriptors.

Question 6: Our digital and hybrid materials feature a 2025 copyright, with our print materials carrying a 2019 copyright.
Could the district please clarify how the 2022 copyright requirement applies to programs with updated digital components?

Answer 6: Not all of our middle school students have access to devices or internet. As per the RFP, all student texts must be provided in a physical, print format as such the physical materials must have a copyright requirement of 2022..

Question 7: The RFP specifies that curricula must be reviewed by EdReports using review tools v2.1, 2.0, or 1.5 and found to meet expectations.
Because EdReports technically does not re-review the same program version, our program has not been re-evaluated using newer review tools, even though minimal updates have been made that do not impact standards coverage. Could the district clarify whether programs evaluated under EdReports Review Tool v1.0 remain eligible for submission, provided the curriculum meets standard alignment and rigor expectations?

Answer 7: All curriculum resources evaluated under EdReports Review Tool v1.0, who meet the expectations of Gateways 2 and 3, do not fulfill the requirement of a publishing date of 2022 or later stated on the RFP (Section II, B).

Question 8: The direction in Section V: Appendix Instructions (p. 17 of the RFP document) states that for Appendix D ELA Curriculum Specific Reports, publishers should refer to Section IV for more Information. Is the expectation that publishers respond to Section IV: Project Scope within Appendix D – ELA Curriculum Specific Reports? If not, can the district please clarify what is expected to be provided in Appendix D ELA Curriculum Specific Reports?

Answer 8: Please respond to the three questions in Project Scope within Section IV, Subsection B within Section IV.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Urban Education. Global Citizens.

Appendix D is for vendors to respond to the questions regarding Minneapolis Public Schools Mission and Values. We will use responses to those questions in case of a tie during Round One evaluation of proposals.

Question 9: Can the district please clarify in what section of publishers' RFP responses they would like to see responses to the bullet points under Section II: Scope of Services, subsection B: ELA Curriculum Product/Service Goals?

Answer 9: Vendors are requested to address the requirements outlined in Section II.B, ELA Curriculum Product/Service Goals, within Section IV: Project Scope of their proposal. Responses should clearly identify each requirement being addressed.

Question 10: What are the student and teacher numbers for each grade level 6,7,8 so we can show accurate pricing?

Answer 10:

Student and teacher numbers are approximate as there are shifts in enrollment throughout a school year.

6th grade: 1,965 students; 17 teachers

7th grade: 1,965 students; 17 teachers

8th grade: 1,860 students; 16 teachers

Question 11: What is the expectation around the use of technology in the middle school English language arts classroom for teachers and students?

Answer 11: Many of our middle schools no longer distribute devices to students. There is not an expectation that teachers deliver to content/assignments to students digitally.

Question 12: Would the district like to learn more about the Long Reads/novels we offer?

Answer 12: Yes, if the novels fall into the curriculum structured literacy scope and sequence and do not deter from standards instruction and completion.

Question 13: Could the District provide additional guidance regarding the pricing methodology requirement? Specifically, what information is expected to be included in this section and what level of detail should respondents provide? For example, are respondents expected to describe the factors and assumptions used to develop pricing, the pricing structure, and calculations, or simply provide a narrative explaining the rationale behind the proposed costs?

Answer 13: Please provide a narrative explaining the costs and the rationale behind the costs taking into consideration the approximate number of students and teachers at MPS.

6th grade: 1,965 students; 17 teachers

7th grade: 1,965 students; 17 teachers

8th grade: 1,860 students; 16 teachers

Question 14: Does the district accept a publisher's WCAG 2.1 AA compliance (with a VPAT/ACR) as a substitute for a formal NIMAS agreement, or is a NIMAS agreement a strict requirement regardless of WCAG compliance?

Answer 14: No. The District treats WCAG 2.1 Level AA and applicable NIMAS requirements as separate accessibility requirements. A VPAT/ACR demonstrating WCAG conformance does not replace the requirement to provide NIMAS-conformant files for materials subject to the NIMAS provision. Vendors are expected to comply with both requirements where applicable.

Question 15: Is the District seeking a standalone Spanish-language core ELA curriculum (e.g., for dual-language or bilingual program strands), Spanish-translated support materials paired with the English core curriculum, or both?

Answer 15: Currently the district is seeking a core ELA curriculum with multilingual support materials. A separate RFP for a standalone Spanish-language core curriculum for our dual-language schools will be posted at a later date.

Question 16: If Spanish Language Arts instruction is being provided as a distinct core program, approximately how many schools/programs and grades 6-8 students does this serve?

Answer 16: This does not apply to our RFP. Students take both English Language Arts and Spanish Language Arts in those programs. A separate RFP for a standalone Spanish-language core curriculum for our dual-language schools will be posted at a later date.

Question 17: For Multilingual Learners more broadly, is the District seeking a designated ELD-specific curriculum distinct from the general core ELA curriculum, or point-of-use scaffolding and supports embedded within the core curriculum to support MLL access to grade-level texts and tasks.

Answer 17: The District is seeking point-of-use scaffolding and supports embedded with the core curriculum to support MLL access to grade-level texts and tasks.

Question 18: Approximately how many grades 6-8 students are currently classified as English Learners, and are there specific proficiency levels (e.g., WIDA tiers) the District would like vendors to address in their response?

Answer 18: Please address WIDA tiers/proficiency levels when applicable to multilingual supports/scaffolding if possible.

Approximate EL learners by grade:

6th grade: 302 students

7th grade: 320 students

8th grade: 324 students

Question 19: Could you provide the approximate number of grade 6-8 students and ELA teachers, and the list of schools in scope (5 middle schools plus the K-8 schools, and any alternative or contract schools)? Do all students in grades 6-8 have 1:1 device access at school? This will help us provide accurate, right-sized pricing and balance digital and print materials.

Answer 19: Student and teacher numbers are approximate as there are shifts in enrollment throughout a school year.

6th grade: 1,965 students; 17 teachers

7th grade: 1,965 students; 17 teachers

8th grade: 1,860 students; 16 teachers

Schools:

Andersen Middle School

Anthony Middle School

Anwatin Middle School

Ella Baker School (PK-8)

Franklin Middle School

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Urban Education. Global Citizens.

Justice Page Middle School

MPS Online 6-12

Northeast Middle School

Olson Middle School

Sanford Middle School

Sullivan (PK-8)