



## MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

### Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor  
Misty Ann Giles, Director

[doa.mt.gov](http://doa.mt.gov)

406.444.2460

[doadirector@mt.gov](mailto:doadirector@mt.gov)

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name:

Solicitation Number:

Solicitation Close Date:

Notice of Intent to Award Post Date:

Issuing Contracts Officer contact information:

The State intends to award a contract to the apparent successful offeror(s) of the above-mentioned solicitation. The Notice of Intent to Award shall not be considered a binding commitment by the state.

Under the Montana Procurement Act, the State has made the relevant scoring matrix/bid tab for the above-mentioned solicitation available for public inspection. Comments from the public regarding the proposed award must be submitted to the Contracts Officer listed above within this 7-day notice period.

### Apparent Successful Offeror(s)

### Unsuccessful Offeror(s)

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**  
**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**  
**SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET**

Section Number	Category	Possible Points	Pearson VUE
<b>Evaluation Criteria Section</b>			
<b>Step 1: Pass/Fail Certification</b>			
1.1.1	≥ 3-year Commitment	P/F	P
1.1.2	Examination Fees are an Agreed Upon Contractual Item	P/F	P
1.1.3	Available Web-Based Testing	P/F	P
1.1.4	Examination & CE Reviews	P/F	P
1.1.5	Record Confidentiality	P/F	P
1.1.6	Examination Locations	P/F	P
<b>Step 2: Technical Proposal Sections 1 and 2</b>			
<b>1</b>	Scope of Services		
1.2	Insurance Licensee Examinations		
1.2.1	Examination Construction		
1.2.1.1	2-Part General & State Content	125	120
1.2.1.2	Covered LOAs	100	80
1.2.1.3	Multiple-Choice Questions	50	48
1.2.1.4	Examination Relevance & Accuracy	50	47
1.2.1.5	Support New LOAS	25	20
1.2.1.6	Examination Review Process	100	95
1.2.1.7	Examination Accessibility	50	48
1.2.2	Administrations of Examinations		
1.2.2.1	Public Website	50	40
1.2.2.2	Customer Service Assistance	25	24
1.2.2.3	Registration Process	50	47
1.2.2.4	Examination Location Details	50	45
1.2.2.5	Location Accessibility	25	24
1.2.2.6	Location Staffing	50	47
1.2.2.7	Examination Supervision	50	47
1.2.2.8	Outside Montana Examinations	25	24
1.2.2.9	Registration/Examination Timing	25	12
1.2.2.10	Multiple Exams on Same Day	25	20

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**  
**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**  
**SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET**

Section Number	Category	Possible Points	Pearson VUE
1.2.2.11	Develop & maintain CIB	100	90
1.2.2.12	CIB Publishing	25	23.5
1.2.2.13	CIB Relevance & Accuracy	25	20
1.2.2.14	Detect & Handle Irregularities	50	47
1.2.2.15	Examination Performance	75	75
1.2.2.16	Examination Reporting	50	47
1.2.3	Examination Results		
1.2.3.1	Pass/Fail Notices	50	47
1.2.3.2	Examination Results Availability	75	71
1.2.3.3	CSI Access to Data	75	70
1.2.4	Customer Service - Problem Resolution		0
1.2.4.1	Customer Service Description	75	60
1.2.4.2	Candidate Exam Problem Resolution	125	110
1.2.4.3	CSI Exam Problem Resolution	100	75
1.2.5	Examination Implementation Strategy		
1.2.5.1	Examination Project Plan & Timeline	350	300
1.3	Continuing Education		
1.3.1	Course Reviews		
1.3.1.1	Course Review Outline	125	95
1.3.1.2	Use of NAIC SBS for Review	100	80
1.3.1.3	Use of NAIC SBS for Individual	50	0
1.3.1.4	Rejected Course Approval	75	67
1.3.1.5	Courses Reviewed Summary	100	94
1.3.1.6	Template Notices	75	68
1.3.1.7	CE Customer Service	75	55
1.3.1.8	CE Dispute Resolution	50	37
1.3.1.9	CSI Dispute Resolution	50	37
1.3.2	CE Implementation Strategy & Timeline		
1.3.2.1	CE Project Plan & Timeline	250	200
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>		
2.2.2	Company Profile & Experience		

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**  
**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**

**SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET**

Section Number	Category	Possible Points	Pearson VUE
2.2.2.1	Company Description	100	95
2.2.2.2	Subcontracting	75	54
2.2.2.3	Examination Services History	150	145
2.2.2.4	CE Services History	125	120
2.2.2.5	Business Philosophy	75	70
2.2.2.6	Affiliations	50	45
2.2.2.7	Service Issues	50	47
2.2.2.8	Awards	25	19
2.2.2.9	Customer List	50	50
<b>2.2.3</b>	<b>Resumes</b>		
2.2.3.1	Key Personnel Resumes	300	282
<b>Technical Total Score</b>		<b>4000</b>	<b>3484</b>
<b>Percentage to Move Forward</b>		100%	87%
<b>3</b>	<b>Cost Proposals</b>		
3.1	Examination Fee Quotes - Totals	334	334
3.2	Continuing Education Fees - Totals	333	333
3.3	Other Costs - Total	333	333
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
	Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points	250	250
		5250	4734

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**

**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

An evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total of 5,000 possible points. This request for proposal will be scored based on the ability of the Offeror to meet the Scope of Services and Offeror Qualification portions of this request for proposal as outlined in Section 4.1 Scoring Guide below. The Scope of Services Section, Pass/Fail Certification 1.1 portion, of the proposal will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis, with any Offeror receiving a “fail” to be eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in Step 3.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE	<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734
--	-----------------------------------

Section Number	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Evaluation Criteria Section</b>				
<b>Step 1: Pass/Fail Certification</b>				
1.1.1	≥ 3-year Commitment	P/F	P	Clearly states the commitments
1.1.2	Examination Fees are an Agreed Upon Contractual Item	P/F	P	Page 14 clearly accepts changes being made to the agreement.
1.1.3	Available Web-Based Testing	P/F	P	Confirmed on page 14.
1.1.4	Examination & CE Reviews	P/F	P	Confirmed on page 17.
1.1.5	Record Confidentiality	P/F	P	One pages 18 to 23 the detailed response on steps taken to maintain confidential.
1.1.6	Examination Locations	P/F	P	On page 24 it clearly states that the company will provide required locations.
<b>Step 2: Technical Proposal Sections 1 and 2</b>				
1	Scope of Services			
1.2	Insurance Licensee Examinations			
1.2.1	Examination Construction			
1.2.1.1	2-Part General & State Content	125	120	This was a solid response and liked the breakdown of how the company would be developed and the dedicated staff members for development which was noted on page 27. The methodology is well-thought-out and well-described, on page 26 they will develop and maintain, and search part exam, a very detailed response on the test development process, and an in-depth understanding of what needs to be done.
1.2.1.2	Covered LOAs	100	80	They affirmed an understanding of the requirements but didn't list any. They said they would do it. On page 34 it clearly agrees and says the exam will be provided but no details.
1.2.1.3	Multiple-Choice Questions	50	48	On page 35, they clearly agree to provide questions, choosing the random sequence in multiple forms of the exam and pretesting. This was a good explanation of how they configured the questions with a good response and answered the requirements. The depth of responses on how the multi-choice questions are administered and developed.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE				<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734
<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
1.2.1.4	Examination Relevance & Accuracy	50	47	On page 38, it clearly states they will monitor laws and provide updates and remove performance questions, but not a lot of information on monitoring the law changes, but a strong response for how to ensure accurate items. This answered what was asked, but detailed responses outlining the multi-faceted approach to question performance review and outline updates. Points were docked for not describing proactively monitoring for law changes in Montana. Thoroughly broken into pieces and described each piece was well-thought out.
1.2.1.5	Support New LOAS	25	20	It clearly listed what they can do, affirmed they knew LOAs will be developed if requested, and then gave an example, in context of previous for supporting responses. They answered the question but would have liked more information. On page 42, it clearly states they will perform the task and provides a recent example of performance. One interesting thing noticed was CSI will own some of the CSI items upon contract termination.
1.2.1.6	Examination Review Process	100	95	The detailed responses outline in-depth how exams will be reviewed periodically and provided a job task analysis on page 44 that was appreciated. Called it methodology and described what it is and was a good approach. On page 43, it is clear the company understands and provides flexibility for in-person, reviewers assigned by CSI and an in-depth national process that was provided in Appendix D.
1.2.1.7	Examination Accessibility	50	48	They expressed good sensitivity to ADA and offered a solid approach to implementation. On page 46 answers were addressed by questions writing, and with Appendix C, all accessible facilities, websites, and combinations are available. Liked everything they provided, liked the extensive procedure for accommodation requests.
1.2.2	Administrations of Examinations			
1.2.2.1	Public Website	50	40	On page 53 the website contains requested information including mobile-friendly, would have liked more information on the pricing would appear. Affirmed the website met the requirement but no supporting language or examples, explained how they would use different types of devices.
1.2.2.2	Customer Service Assistance	25	24	Answered what was asked, and listed the call center hours, they have broad hours that were requested, including weekends and live-chat and online inquiry features. The hours were excellent and offered chat options which made it superior. On page 55, states that toll-free hours were provided, and outlines contact center hours, provides live and email chats, would have liked to have seen how they would handle each inquiry.
1.2.2.3	Registration Process	50	47	They listed registration options and provided eligibility policy language, covering all points. On page 58, they provided details on steps to register the seven-day availability is good. Send confirmation notices that outline the cancellation refunds, and reschedule process, and it also shows the on-view process as well, which was appreciated.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE				<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734
<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
1.2.2.4	Examination Location Details	50	45	They did not say anything about Miles City but lots of other choices in-state out-of-state, and military bases. They have a new location in Butte, which includes a broader coverage area, and don't know the exact hours or days for the partner sites. On page 74 they described the good ability to modify for people and times they have the site manager. The chart on page 59, didn't clearly state if testing was available on Saturday. They listed the locations with details and added Butte as requested but not required and numerous locations in surrounding states.
1.2.2.5	Location Accessibility	25	24	On page 80, the ADA is compliant with a wide range of accommodations, potentially not all partners have the same accessibility options. Detailed and well-thought-through accommodations at testing sites, complete and given diagrams to express what they do.
1.2.2.6	Location Staffing	50	47	The proctor-to-test-taker ratio seems reasonable and the hiring TPA policy. The structure they cited was good and answered questions. On page 84 it was a strong response, appreciating the criminal background checks, avoiding conflict of interest, and well-thought-out training for staff, mentioned on page 86, and more information on Appendix E&F.
1.2.2.7	Examination Supervision	50	47	The proctor and AI option online with the session recording seemed good, solid the procedure for candidate verification is very solid. Exceptional coverage that was mapped out, ensures that those supervision aspects are well covered. On page 89, the strong process and identity verification, video and audio recording, the use of AI for cheating, and lots of good items.
1.2.2.8	Outside Montana Examinations	25	24	They did a great job saying how they will do it outside of Montana. On page 99, it included good coverage that will sit outside of Montana. The binary requirement was met with extensive out-of-state options.
1.2.2.9	Registration/Examination Timing	25	12	It was unclear on the no wait before test after scheduling, unsure if they understood what was asked, and were not able to commit to sitting within one working day of the exam registration. Can commit to two weeks, but didn't speak to online options or provide any attempts and didn't provide any information. Weren't responding to one-day and the wording was confusing.
1.2.2.10	Multiple Exams on Same Day	25	20	On page 102, they stated they could allow full exams if appointments were available, but did not restrict if there is the availability of times. Committed only in cases where availability of seats can be found, wasn't convinced they would do what was requested.
1.2.2.11	Develop & maintain CIB	100	90	The detail of the handbook met the requirements as described, dedicated staff member, willing and able to make changes. This was very professionally done, on page 103 the company agrees to provide the requested elements, including technical writing staff available, and can be upon the example provided in Appendix H.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734	
<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
1.2.2.12	CIB Publishing	25	23.5	Provided what was requested, on page 104 straightforward they will obtain approval before changing. The binary requirement was firm and included dedicated staff for updates.
1.2.2.13	CIB Relevance & Accuracy	25	20	The response is on page 105, with a good response including strong coordination with the CSI project manager, no information on scheduled reviews or anything about technical writing. This was a good response and added everything requested. This leans heavily on a mutually agreed plan and like the dedicated staff members, is vague and didn't answer all the questions.
1.2.2.14	Detect & Handle Irregularities	50	47	This was a good response and covered what was asked, including a detailed explanation of how the company will handle irregularities, on page 109 for test-taker violations and how violations will relate to CSI. This was a very solid process and tools to support, on page 105 liked the service direct feed for summary and detailed reports noted SIU and good priority levels will be reported to CSI.
1.2.2.15	Examination Performance	75	75	They repeated how examination question review processes will go which was previously explained. Thought it was a good description and that they were using data analysis as the foundation. On page 110 psychometric and content development team reviews single items and tests. They have comparable tests for and scaling picture, and the same performance level regardless of examinations.
1.2.2.16	Examination Reporting	50	47	They met all the requirements and went beyond, on page 114 they can report minimum lines requested, the examination performance by item in the form pass rates and they have a wide range of monthly reports available. Screenshots of examination reports were helpful and varied.
1.2.3	Examination Results			
1.2.3.1	Pass/Fail Notices	50	47	On page 121, appreciate the Photo ID on reports and the process in place seems straightforward with an example in Appendix J, provided examples.
1.2.3.2	Examination Results Availability	75	71	Advise that most are transmitted in one day, advise the SBS and IPR history but no specifics on experience history. Required and discussed how they have experience with the systems. On page 124, extensive experience results are sent generally within one day.
1.2.3.3	CSI Access to Data	75	70	They noted they have an online portal and met the requirements for access. On page 126 they can meet with a tele-capable system.
1.2.4	Customer Service - Problem Resolution			
1.2.4.1	Customer Service Description	75	60	Demonstrated a very complete process, on page 128 will utilize candidate surveys and provide direct support to CSI monitor calls, offers multilingual agents for customers. No call center metrics were included, they have candidate satisfaction surveys and training for CSRS as well as CSI dedicated staff, noted they were not very specific on the metric and the quality of CSRs



<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734	
<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
1.2.4.2	Candidate Exam Problem Resolution	125	110	On page 133 details the formal complaint tracking if not immediately resolved, discuss several items. This included a detailed CSR structure and spoke of escalation, but it lacked specifics. They cited what they expect from staff and the escalation process.
1.2.4.3	CSI Exam Problem Resolution	100	75	This leaned heavily on communication plans to prevent issues but lacked the specifics on how those issues would be resolved once posted. This focused more on the front end of the process; on page 236 the plan is collaborative with CSI high-level response.
1.2.5	Examination Implementation Strategy			
1.2.5.1	Examination Project Plan & Timeline	350	300	They had a detailed GNATT chart with timelines that are achievable on page 137. Provided more precise CSI requirements, on page 138 Appendix K & L are good plans and reasonable assumptions. Overall, a good response.
1.3	Continuing Education			
1.3.1	Course Reviews			
1.3.1.1	Course Review Outline	125	95	This was light on details, on page 139 it will take 15 days to review, but did note a key item in ensuring compliance with the ICS across the agreement. They noted the timeframe is included in the 10-15 business day policies and procedures are sparse, and did not include the maximum timeframe.
1.3.1.2	Use of NAIC SBS for Review	100	80	Page 141 states they will be unbiased review and experience with systems, they did not note specific steps in closing transactions. They affirmed the use of SBS but provided limited details, but they met the requirements.
1.3.1.3	Use of NAIC SBS for Individual	50	0	They did not fully answer the requirement on page 141, provided information on how individuals can find courses, but did not answer how individual courses will be approved or handled. State they will bank course submissions but no individual course submissions either.
1.3.1.4	Rejected Course Approval	75	67	This was good and affirms what's specified in the questions, this met the requirements. On page 142, they will work with CSI for denials of courses.
1.3.1.5	Courses Reviewed Summary	100	94	They meet the need; on page 143 they will provide a report with the required items and offer additional reporting. Affirms required items that are in the report and included additional.
1.3.1.6	Template Notices	75	68	They provided examples on page 144, notice and rely on CSI approval, templates were in Appendix M which had the description and examples. The approval notice was sufficient, but the denial notice could use more details, but it was sufficient.
1.3.1.7	CE Customer Service	75	55	They didn't completely answer the requirements on page 144, continuing education CSR hours were reasonable and the verbiage on providing the service is reasonable but no metric of CSR. They have a dedicated email address and response time within one day, they included a reference tool for staff and noted quality.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734	
<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
1.3.1.8	CE Dispute Resolution	50	37	This outlines the escalation path but no further information on how appeals will be filed, the dispute and resolution process is not as complete as the previous section. On page 146, they mention complaint management and escalation paths, they will train staff on CSI policies. They didn't give specifics on how appeals are handled, indicating they'll work with CSI to define types of issues that require notification. The fully answered the question but didn't include anything on the appeal process.
1.3.1.9	CSI Dispute Resolution	50	37	The previous response was more complete, saw Christi Nelson's name a lot, on page 147 the designated program staff, reference to prior section. Leaned very heavily on a communication plan and prevention but doesn't explain what will happen when a dispute arises.
1.3.2	CE Implementation Strategy & Timeline			
1.3.2.1	CE Project Plan & Timeline	250	200	They provided a detailed plan with a collaborative approach, mentioning Appendix K, but didn't completely answer it but did like the timeline. They had a detailed GNATT chart with thoughtful goals and milestones, and the goals were achievable There could have been more content provided and more identification on CSI responsibilities, and the GNATT chart is lightly represented.
<b>2.2 Offeror Qualifications</b>				
2.2.2	Company Profile & Experience			
2.2.2.1	Company Description	100	95	This is solid and shows they have the background and depth for form services, on page 8 they detail the experience that dates to 1986, this is 40 years of experience with many states and recent implementations.
2.2.2.2	Subcontracting	75	54	Subcontractors were listed and biographies were given for leaders, no process to ensure quality, not sure how they subcontract. On page 16, the main subcontractors and manager oversee. The contract manager meets with the team.
2.2.2.3	Examination Services History	150	145	There was lots of material included, demonstrating they are a proven provider, on page 19 they answered each bullet point with extensive history and experience in the management capacity of testing locations. The response demonstrated a long history of experience.
2.2.2.4	CE Services History	125	120	On pages 26-30 years of experience, had a good explanation of history, and strong experience in reviews with staff and administration, and they provided good information.
2.2.2.5	Business Philosophy	75	70	This was sound and lined up with the CSI goals, it was easy to read. On page 30 the philosophy is appreciated and recognizes the important aspect of protecting the public interest and recognition of the support.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name:</b> Pearson VUE			<b>Total Points Awarded:</b> 4734	
<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
2.2.2.6	Affiliations	50	45	They listed all affiliations with relevant industry associations and seem to be well-connected to industry organizations. On page 31 they will actively engage with professional associations to stay aware of industry trends including the NAIC and SILA.
2.2.2.7	Service Issues	50	47	On page 34 there are no terms for cause or litigations, had only termed for testing center closing, but no litigation return purpose.
2.2.2.8	Awards	25	19	On page 34 the endpoint assessment organization for the year but was for the United Kingdom, they listed awards that were not relevant but were solid, with no nationally recognized awards.
2.2.2.9	Customer List	50	50	They listed what was requested and have insurance contracts within 26 states and the states listed were impressive. On page 34 the extensive customer list includes many state regulators. Indicates long-term experience in this space service customer similar to CSI.
<b>2.2.3 Resumes</b>				
2.2.3.1	Key Personnel Resumes	300	282	The leadership and program staff resumes are solid and relevant for the RFP work. Included on page 42 is the extensive background and experience.
<b>Technical Total Score</b>		<b>4000</b>	<b>3484</b>	
<b>Percentage to Move Forward</b>		100%	87%	
<b>3 Cost Proposals</b>				
3.1	Examination Fee Quotes - Totals	334	334	
3.2	Continuing Education Fees - Totals	333	333	
3.3	Other Costs - Total	333	333	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>				
	Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points	250	250	
		5250.0	4733.5	

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**  
**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**  
**SCORING GUIDE**

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

**Superior Response (95-100%):** A superior response is an exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response may cover areas not originally addressed within the RFP and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.

**Good Response (75-94%):** A good response clearly meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

**Fair Response (60-74%):** A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

**Failed Response (59% or less):** A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

Score	25	50	75	100	125	150	250	300	333	334	350
<b>Superior (95-100%)</b>	23.5 - 25	47 - 50	70.5 - 75	94 - 100	117.5 - 125	141 - 150	235 - 250	282 - 300	313 - 333	314 - 334	329 - 350
<b>Good (75-94%)</b>	18.5 - 23.5	37 - 47	55.5 - 70.5	74 - 94	92.5 - 117.5	111 - 141	185 - 235	222 - 282	246.4 - 313	247.2 - 314	259 - 329
<b>Fair (60-74%)</b>	14.8 - 18.5	29.5 - 37	44.3 - 55.5	59 - 74	73.8 - 92.5	88.5 - 111	147.5 - 185	177 - 222	196.5 - 246.4	197.1 - 247.2	206.5 - 259
<b>Failed (0-59%)</b>	0 - 14.8	0 - 29.5	0 - 44.3	0 - 59	0 - 73.8	0 - 88.5	0 - 147.5	0 - 177	0 - 196.5	0 - 197.1	0 - 206.5

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**  
**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**

**Cost Worksheet**

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost are 300. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 300 points. Offeror B would receive 200 points ( $\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 200$ ).

**Examinations - Cost**

<b>Points Available</b>	<b>334</b>		
Lowest Cost	\$390.00		
<b>Vendor Name</b>	<b>Proposed Cost</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Notes:</b>
Pearson VUE	\$390.00	334.0	

**Continuing Education Fees - Cost**

<b>Points Available</b>	<b>333</b>		
Lowest Cost	\$210.00		
<b>Vendor Name</b>	<b>Proposed Cost</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Notes:</b>
Pearson VUE	\$210.00	333.0	

**Other Costs - Cost**

<b>Points Available</b>	<b>333</b>		
Lowest Cost	\$0.00		
<b>Vendor Name</b>	<b>Proposed Cost</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Notes:</b>
Pearson VUE		#DIV/0!	

## Technical Scoring Session

**AUD-RFP-2025-0009AB**

**Insurance Licensee Exam Services**

**Date** 3/19/2025  
**Time** 10:30 AM - 2:15 PM

**Location** Teams and Auditor's conference room

**Evaluation Committee Members:** David Dachs, Pam Daughtery, Matthew Eberhardt, Steven Tesinsky  
**Contracts Officer:** Amanda Battin, amanda.battin2@mt.gov

**Order of Evaluation:** Alphabetical  
**Scoring Method:** Consensus

## Breaks

morning break at 11:09 AM - 11:15 AM  
Lunch break 12:17 to 12:45  
Scoring completed and committee dismissed at 2:15 PM