



Worcester County Administration Office
 1 West Market Street, Room 1103
 Snow Hill, MD 21863
 Ph. 410-632-1194 Fax 410-632-3131
 Email: purchasing@co.worcester.md.us

Addendum # 1 – LMB – CCIF (Q&A)

03/23/26

Date of Addendum:

NOTICE TO ALL BIDDERS AND PLANHOLDERS	
<p>The Proposal Documents for the above-referenced Project are modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original Proposal Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the Proposal Documents. Vendors will take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting a Proposal and shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided in the Proposal Documents.</p>	
PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE	
<p>The Proposal submittal time has not been changed.</p>	
1.0 – ATTACHMENTS	
Item	Description
2.0 – CLARIFICATIONS	
<p>The following clarifications are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the Proposal Documents.</p>	
Item	Description
3.0 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	
<p>The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the Proposal Documents.</p>	
Item	Questions and Answers
1.	<p>Attendance data access pathway (post-award) For awarded CCIF programs, what is the standard pathway for accessing student-level attendance data needed to validate outcomes (county/LMB process, WCPS process, or a post-award agreement executed directly with WCPS)? If there is a standard DSA/MOU template or protocol used for CCIF partners, is it available to applicants prior to award? This would be data that would come from the WCPS, the LMB does not have real time access to this data.</p>
2.	<p>EWS / attendance extract specifications Does WCPS provide program partners a standard Early Warning System output or attendance extract for student identification and ongoing monitoring? If yes, can you share the typical field list, frequency, and delivery method (for example export file, secure portal, etc.)? The LMB does not have access to this. This would need to be a discussion</p>

with the WCPS if granted the award.

3. **Data scope and minimum necessary fields (to align data governance plan)** For CCIF reporting and outcome validation, does the LMB/WCPS anticipate that awardees will receive student-level records with a unique identifier, or will reporting be aggregate-only? If student-level data is anticipated, what is the minimum necessary field set WCPS expects to share for attendance-focused validation? **The LMB is the awarding body of these grant funds. Should the proposed provider need access to school level data in order to show a "turn" in the data, then the provider will have to develop a relationship with the school system to receive that data (most likely through an MOU).**
4. **Secure transfer and storage requirements (to align security controls and budget)** If student-level attendance data is shared with an awardee, what secure transfer and storage method does WCPS require or prefer (for example SFTP, secure portal, encrypted files)? Is that mechanism provided by WCPS/county, or should applicants budget to procure it? **The LMB cannot answer this on behalf of the WCPS. The LMB is a separate entity that works closely with the school-system, but does not have access to any student data that is not public.**
5. **Required reporting platform (if any)** Does the LMB require awardees to use a specific outcomes reporting platform, case management system, or dashboard tool for CCIF grants? If so, is access provided by the county/LMB, or should applicants include licensing and seats in the proposal budget? **No, the LMB does not require a platform.**
6. **Allowability of pre-award costs (July 1 readiness)** Are any pre-award costs allowable to support readiness for a July 1, 2026 implementation start (for example staff onboarding, required trainings, system setup), or must all costs occur after contract execution? **No; the LMB cannot award funding prior to July 1, 2026 due to the funding coming from the State of Maryland, not locally.**
7. **No-cost trainings and technical assistance** The RFP notes that training/technical assistance made available at no cost by GOC/Children's Cabinet is unallowable as a paid expense. Is there a current list of no-cost trainings or technical assistance offerings that CCIF awardees should assume (e.g., RBA support, reporting training, or required trainings)? **We do not have a list of trainings for FY27 yet; however in past years, the LMB has offered all contracted providers trainings on RBA, Race and Equity, Trauma and ACEs, Poverty Work, etc.**
8. **Budget classification preference (mentor staffing)** For budget formatting, is there a preferred classification structure the LMB uses for mentoring staff (for example direct service personnel under Salaries/Fringe vs. another category) to align with how budgets are reviewed? **Direct service staff should be listed under salary/fringe. If the program provider is anticipating hiring contractual staff, that can be listed under the contractual line item.**
9. **Letters of support / MOUs at submission** The RFP lists letters of support as optional. For school-based programs, does the Evaluation Committee generally expect letters/MOUs at submission for competitiveness, or is partner formalization typically completed post-award? **Letters of support are optional. It is not a requirement and the grading criteria does not list them as something to be evaluated.**

END OF ADDENDUM