



Grades 6-12 ELA Curriculum Adoption

RFP 25-004 Multi-Step Evaluation Process Results

Stage 2 - November 13 and 20, 2024

For this stage, the district selection committee evaluated the following sections: curricular/design; digital resources/tools sections; agency qualifications, experience, and support; and fee proposals. Based on the Committee's evaluation (Stage 2), two respondents advanced to Stage 3, which includes an oral presentation.

✓ Agencies Selected to Advance to Stage 3

- McGraw-Hill (85.5)
- CommonLit (83.3)

X Agencies Not Selected to Advance to Stage 3

- Savvas (67.7)
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (66.6)
- Amplify (63.8)

Stage 2

Category	Weight
Curricular/Design Requirements	40%
Digital Resources/Tools	25%
Agency Qualifications, Experience, and Support	5%
Fee Proposals	30%

✓ **Stage 2 Results:** Selected to Advance to Stage 3

McGraw-Hill		Overall Rating			Rating	Score	Possible	SCORE
Curricular/Design Requirements	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.9	38.6	40.0	85.5
Digital Resources/Tools	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.4	21.3	25.0	
Qualifications, Experience, and Support	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.9	4.9	5.0	
Fee Proposal	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.75	20.6	30.0	

CommonLit		Overall Rating			Rating	Score	Possible	SCORE
Curricular/Design Requirements	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.0	30.0	45.0	83.3
Digital Resources/Tools	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.0	18.5	20.0	
Qualifications, Experience, and Support	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.9	4.8	5.0	
Fee Proposal	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	4	30.0	30.0	

x Stage 2 Results: Not Selected to Advance to Stage 3

Savas		Overall Rating			Rating	Score	Possible	SCORE
Curricular/Design Requirements	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.2	31.8	40.0	67.7
Digital Resources/Tools	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.0	12.2	25.0	
Qualifications, Experience, and Support	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.9	4.9	5.0	
Fee Proposal	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.5	18.8	30.0	

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt		Overall Rating			Rating	Score	Possible	SCORE
Curricular/Design Requirements	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.7	26.8	40.0	66.6
Digital Resources/Tools	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.2	13.6	25.0	
Qualifications, Experience, and Support	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.0	3.7	5.0	
Fee Proposal	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.0	22.5	30.0	

Amplify		Overall Rating			Rating	Score	Possible	SCORE
Curricular/Design Requirements	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.1	21.4	40.0	63.8
Digital Resources/Tools	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.4	14.8	25.0	
Qualifications, Experience, and Support	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	2.6	3.2	5.0	
Fee Proposal	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	3.25	24.4	30.0	