

**Office of Finance  
Division of Procurement  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
45 W. Gude Drive, Suite 3100  
Rockville, Maryland 20850**

**February 7, 2025**

**NOTICE TO OFFERORS**

**The following are questions and responses regarding  
RFP No. 4374.2, Grant Evaluator for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning  
Center Program**

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Questions</b>   | <b>Answers</b>   |
|------------|--|--|
| 1.         | The RFP (section 9.0) mentions that no faxes or electronic submission of proposals will be accepted. It also states that offerors may request via e-mail to Angela McIntosh Davis via email at <a href="mailto:angela_s_mcintosh-davis@mcpsmd.org">angela_s_mcintosh-davis@mcpsmd.org</a> . May you confirm that offers must submit their proposals for services by mail, courier or hand-delivery or is it possible to email the submissions? Additionally, the RFP mentions that offerors are to submit One (1) original and one (1) copy, as well as one (1) electronic version of the original and a redacted version on a flash drive. Is this necessary if electronic submissions are allowed? | The revised language can be found in the attached Erratum #1 indicating that offerors may request a Microsoft version of the RFP. No electronic submissions will be accepted.  |
| 2.         | The RFP states that each offeror must submit a complete proposal including all required information and attachments. The response shall address each paragraph in the <b>same order as the RFP</b> and provide an individual response to each RFP specification. Which specific sections is the RFP referring to? Section 9.0 provides a bulleted list of responses to include but it still seems unclear on what point-by-point responses to each section is referring to. Are there templates or examples you can provide?   | This is referring to each section of the RFP. If there is no detail response needed (such as the Intent, or Background), just reply "Understand and Comply". The Scope of Work section will require a detailed response. |
| 3.         | We understand that the awarded contractor will be responsible for evaluating all 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC grant activities for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Can you provide the total number of sites that are participating in the grant? Number of students expected to be served?  | It will be for 3 grants serving 7 schools. The total student number is about 400.  |
| 4.         | Of the total number of participating sites being served, is there an expected number of sites in which MCPS would like the evaluator to conduct data collection (i.e., site visits for interviews and focus groups, surveys etc.) activities?  | 7  |
| 5.         | What administrative and/or grant-related data are participating sites expected to report on to MCPS?   | There will be a data sharing agreement. The evaluator will observe, and collect data from schools.   |
| 6.         | Is there budget range in which offerors must stay within when submitting the cost proposal?  | Yes. Less than or equal to \$75,000  |
| 7.         | Are there specific outcome measures you would like all proposals to  | A team of staff will evaluate each   |

|     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
|     | include in the evaluation plan?   | bid using a form with scales. We are looking for experience with grants, evaluating schools' programs including tutoring or academics, and recreation. |
| 8.  | Are there any notable non-English speaking languages in MCPS communities that we should account for in our evaluation (i.e., translation services)?   | No   |
| 9.  | In the RFP, it states, " <i>the evaluator will be responsible for having staff, partners, parents, and other stakeholders complete an evaluation form at the end of scheduled meetings</i> ". Can more detail be provided around the nature of these meetings? What is the cadence? Are they the same as the mentioned advisory meetings or different? In person/virtual? | They would be in person and the evaluator would set the cadence. They are in addition to advisor meetings which are virtual.                           |
| 10. | What are the key performance indicators (KPIs) that MCPS considers most critical for evaluating program success?  | At the end of the grant cycle, an evaluation report would need to be submitted with data about the program at each site.                               |
| 11. | Is there an IRB to support data collection review? Or is MCPS expecting the evaluator to provide an IRB?  | Evaluators will provide the IRB.   |
| 12. | In the first sentence of the second paragraph under 3.0 Scope of Work, it states, " <i>The evaluator will also help with the evaluation of the impact of the tutoring, arts, and recreation.</i> " This seems like a typo, or is missing information, as " <i>help</i> " is non-specific. Can MCPS provide more context for this task?                                    | The evaluator will complete an evaluation of the program. It is a tutoring, arts, and recreation program.  |
| 13. | Is it possible for MCPS to extend the deadline of the final proposal?   | No   |
| 14. | What is the amount of annual funding available for the evaluation?  | \$75,000   |
| 15. | Does MCPS have existing data that will be made available to the evaluator?  | Academic data will be provided upon completion of the data sharing agreement.  |
| 16. | Does MCPS have existing or preferred data collection tools for the evaluation?  | No   |
| 17. | What is the frequency of the partner and advisory council meetings?   | The seven sites will have meetings a few times a year.   |
| 18. | What is the anticipated due date for the final evaluation report?   | Summer 2025 and yearly for 3 years   |
| 19. | Are there any events or pieces of the evaluation that MCPS anticipates  | Yes  |

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
|     | will occur in person?  |   |
| 20. | Should the evaluator plan to provide incentives for participating in focus groups/surveys or is that prohibited by MCPS?   | This can be determined by the evaluator.  |
| 21. | If awards are made to multiple evaluation firms, would the contracted firms be required to communicate, coordinate, or collaborate with each other to ensure a consistent evaluation approach and the ability to interpret results across programs?          | No  |
| 22. | Does the “contract number” requested in the references section refer to the customer’s grant/project number, or the purchase order(s) for the evaluation firm’s contracted work?   | That is a typo, we are requesting the contact number.                             |
| 23. | In section 3.1, the RFP states that the evaluator's duties may include "cooperating with MCPS staff to obtain required review and approval of the evaluation instrument." Does this mean that evaluation instruments will require formal IRB review by MCPS? | MCPS will give you academic data for the report.                                  |
| 24. | Can meetings be attended on-line or is there a preference for in-person?   | Observations are in person and meetings are generally virtual                     |
| 25. | How many meetings are planned and what is the frequency and schedule of meetings, by type?   | Expect 2 observations or more per site and meetings a few times a year virtually. |
| 26. | Does MCPS have a system that identifies which students participated in the 21st CCLC, which activities they participated in and link those records to MCPS achievement data?   | Yes   |
| 27. | Does MCPS currently collect data from parents that participate in 21st CCLC activities? If so, what data is collected, and will the evaluators have access to that data?   | The evaluator will need to collect it.  |
| 28. | Does MCPS have a logic or process model for grant activities?  | Yes   |
| 29. | What is the expected budget for this evaluation?   | See question 14 above   |
| 30. | Did MCPS receive assistance from an external evaluator in developing the grant proposal for this program, and if so, is that organization or individual eligible to bid on this RFP?   | No  |
| 31. | Can MCPS provide a copy of the grant proposal/grant narrative or detailed project description that will inform evaluation proposals?   | No  |
| 32. | Will answers to questions submitted by other interested vendors be made available to us?   | Yes, this list is a compilation of all questions submitted by the due date.       |
| 33. | When did this project officially begin and what project activities have been conducted thus far?   | They began in January. The programs are fully operating.                          |
| 34. | Has an evaluation budget been established for this evaluation? If so, what are the total and annual not to exceed evaluation budget  | See question 14 above   |

|     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
|     | amounts?  |  |
| 35. | The title of Attachment E (List of Data Elements) includes RFP number 4974.2, but not 4374.2; is this attachment required to be submitted for RFP 4374.2? If our organization does not own a product that collects confidential student information, is completion of Attachment E still required?  | Please see Erratum #1 with the corrected RFP number.<br><br>This form is still required to inform us of any information to be collected. |
| 36. | RFP Section 3.4 (Performance) states that “MCPS will consider the offeror’s record and performance of any prior contracts with MCPS, federal departments or agencies, or other public bodies, including but not limited to the offeror’s record providing online digital curriculum services to MCPS or other schools or school districts.” If prospective vendors have not conducted business with MCPS nor provided online digital curriculum services to MCPS, will this count against a proposal in any way in the scoring process? | No. If you have not done business with us previously, that does not count against you.   |
| 37. | What is MCPS’s scoring criteria for respondents? Section 3.4 of the RFP states that the evaluation criteria of respondents to this opportunity are in Section 12 of the RFP but Section 12 only contains the proposal schedule.   | See Erratum #1 for this clarification.   |
| 38. | Is IRB required for this study? If required, will this need to be obtained for each institution?  | Yes  |
| 39. | What are the primary stakeholder groups you most want insights from during this evaluation?   | Students, School staff, Caregivers   |
| 40. | What sample size or how many participants does MCPS want for the surveys, focus groups, and interviews?   | That can be up to the evaluator  |
| 41. | For the administration of surveys, will MCPS provide the selected vendor with email addresses for program stakeholders?   | Yes  |
| 42. | For data collection efforts with students in grades 7-12, will MCPS require active or passive consent from parents of participating students?   | Neither  |
| 43. | In what ways will MCPS help connect the selected vendor to stakeholders, like elementary school and high school students and families participating in the project?   | Each site has a project lead that will be in contact with the evaluator.   |
| 44. | What types of data will be made available to the selected team (e.g., academic outcomes)?   | Academic data will be provided.  |
| 45. | Will student and campus data be available at the student-level (linked or linkable to student administrative and academic) or as reports at some higher level of aggregation (e.g., campus or building-level)?  | Yes  |
| 46. | What will be required for a Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) for student-level data sharing?  | Yes  |

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 47. | Will the vendor need to request student-level data? If so, from whom? Each entity separately?   | The evaluator will have a data sharing agreement with MCPS  |
| 48. | How will MCPS support the selected vendor in establishing data sharing agreements (DSA)?  | MCPS will give the vendor the contract with a data sharing agreement.   |
| 49. | In RFP Section 3.0 (Scope of Work), it is stated that the “evaluator for this grant will attend all meetings of both the partners and the advisory council”. Does MCPS require attendance of these meetings in person, or can the evaluator attend remotely through an online videoconference platform like Zoom or Microsoft Teams? Can presentations be provided to the partners, project steering committee, and Maryland State Department of Education via videoconference? | Yes-these meetings are online. Observations are in person.  |
| 50. | Will the evaluator have an opportunity to provide input into the content of post-meeting evaluation forms?  | Yes   |
| 51. | Can the evaluation form provided for meeting attendees be an online or web-based form, that attendees can access via a QR code or URL distributed at each meeting?  | Yes   |
| 52. | When is the annual report due to MCPS and what time periods will it report cover?   | It will cover the evaluation of the program. Data from January will be provided. The grant is three years with a summer report due each year. |
| 53. | How many separate grants are included in the current round of funding?  | 3   |
| 54. | When is the expected start and end dates for the work?  | Upon contract completion through summer 2025. The grant will renew for 3 years.   |
| 55. | What is the budget or budget range for the evaluation?  | See response to 14 above.   |
| 56. | Are there any budget restrictions such as a cap on indirect costs?  | Yes   |
| 57. | Are incentives for survey and/or focus group participants allowed? If so, are there any restrictions (e.g., amount and type)?   | Yes. No restrictions  |
| 58. | Will there be a preference for evaluators who have worked with Montgomery County Public Schools previously?   | No  |
| 59. | Does the evaluator need to have a Maryland business license?  | The evaluator will be need to be registered to do business in the state of Maryland.  |
| 60. | Can all evaluation activities occur virtually?  | No, observations are in person.   |
| 61. | Should evaluation materials (e.g., surveys) be made available in languages other than English?  | Yes   |
| 62. | Has an organization been conducting the external evaluation of your   | Yes, an evaluator has been doing  |

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
|     | 21st CCLC sites? If so, will preference be given to that organization(s)?   | these evaluations in the past. No preferences will be given.  |
| 63. | Will the evaluation criteria be weighed equally or will some criterion be weighed more heavily than others?   | Equally   |
| 64. | Are all three references required to be current school district clients? (Can they be current clients who are not with school districts and/or former school district clients?)   | The references do not have to all be school districts.  |
| 65. | Can you specify what needs to be included in the “point-by-point responses to each section of the RFP”? Which section numbers specifically do we need to respond to? What is the correct numbering sequence and order?  | Include all the information in the response. The numbering will not be scored. The response should demonstrate experience with evaluating school programs, and a plan to evaluate this program. |
| 66. | Are there any formatting requirements for the proposal (e.g., page limit, font, font size, margins, paragraph spacing, etc.)?   | No  |
| 67. | Can we see questions and answers from other proposing organizations?  | Yes   |
| 68. | While the document asks that proposals include a point-by-point response to each section of the RFP, it's unclear what that refers to.<br><br>It also requires: Each offeror must submit a complete proposal including all required information and attachments. The response shall address each paragraph in the same order as the RFP and provide an individual response to each RFP specification. | See response 65 above   |
| 69. | The RFP specifies that the evaluation will include programs at multiple schools. How many schools? Will each school be expected to do the exact same evaluation activities?   | 7, yes  |
| 70. | Has MCPS worked with an evaluator in the past?  | Yes   |
| 71. | How does MCPS anticipate measuring “learning gains” and will the evaluator have access to school records or test scores, if necessary, or will data sharing agreements need to be negotiated with each participating school?  | Yes   |
| 72. | Regarding the term of the contract, when do you anticipate the first year starting?   | As soon as the contract is awarded  |
| 73. | What is your budget for this project?   | See response 14 above   |
| 74. | You mention various data collection approaches you would like used. Are there any existing surveys, focus groups or interview protocols you would like used or will the contracted evaluator be designing all necessary tools?  | The evaluator will provide the tools.   |
| 75. | Can you provide more information on how to complete attachment E? We would determine which data elements to collect in consultation with MCPS and do not have a pre-designed data base for housing MCPS data elements.  | You should indicate on the form what information you anticipate may need to be collected. If awarded, the form may be revised.  |

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 76. | Is there an incumbent for this work?   | Yes  |
| 77. | Does MCPS have a budget ceiling for this work?   | See response 14 above  |
| 78. | Would MCPS consider a week extension to allow time to incorporate answers to questions?  | No   |
| 79. | On page 5 of Section 9.0, can MCPS clarify which sections of the RFP need a “point-by-point” response? Is this Section 3.1, or all of the Sections 1.0- 23.0?  | See response 65 above. We are looking for evidence and experience with evaluating school programs and plan to evaluate.  |
| 80. | On page 5, can MCPS confirm they meant “References” see 14.0 (not 7.0).  | See Erratum #1   |
| 81. | Is MCPS willing to provide the contractor access to existing student administrative data, such as attendance, course grades, standardized test scores, and/or Maryland School Survey responses? Is MCPS willing to provide this for both 21st CCLC program attendees and a comparison group of students who do not attend the program? | Yes- data will be provided but not a comparison group  |
| 82. | Are the partners and advisory council meetings referenced on page 1 in person and/or virtual?  | Virtual  |
| 83. | Is the partners and advisory council referenced on page 1 to be a new 21st CCLC advisory council, or does this refer to existing school board and/or superintendent advisory committees?   | They are new   |
| 84. | How often will the partners and advisory council meetings referenced on page 1 take place each year?   | Each site will have approximately 3 virtual meetings.  |
| 85. | How many 21st CCLC centers does MCPS operate that will be evaluated as part of this grant? How many students are served by each center or overall?   | See above  |
| 86. | Is this RFP to evaluate one cohort of 21st CCLC grantees (e.g. FY25 cohort) or all grantees operating in the 25-26 school year?  | This is for 3 grants   |
| 87. | In addition to the number of projects included in this RFP, is it possible to get a narrative about the goals, key activities, etc. for each project?  | There are three grants serving seven schools. Two grants are for two elementary schools each. The third grant is at three high schools. The elementary grants offer high dosage tutoring, theatre, and recreation. The high school grant offers academics for students learning English and Positive Youth Development. The grants are for 25 weeks a year and 12 hours each week. |

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Angela McIntosh Davis, Director

AMD

Please indicate your acceptance of this notice by signing below and returning with your RFP or under separate cover.

Accepted: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name and Title

Name of Company \_\_\_\_\_