



## MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

### Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor  
Misty Ann Giles, Director

doa.mt.gov

406.444.2460

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)

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH**  
**Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Civitas Strategies Early Start</b>	<b>Visi0n cue LLC</b>	<b>WeeCare, Inc. (DBA Upwards)</b>	<b>Wonderschool, Inc.</b>	<b>Zero to Five Montana</b>
<b>Scope and Provision of Services</b>						
2.1 General Requirements	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>P</b>
2.2 Technical Assistance, for Child Care Provider Business Practices	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>930</b>
2.3 Technical Assistance, for All Licensed/Registererd Provider Types	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>950</b>
2.4 Community Based Solutions for Child Care	<b>1500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>930</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>1425</b>
2.5 Build Home-Based Child Care Program Expansion	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>430</b>
2.6 Shared Services Supports	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>575</b>
2.7 Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>470</b>
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>370</b>
2.9 Functionality of Service	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>504</b>
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>470</b>
2.11 Timeline for complete implementation	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>						
3.1 Compnay Profile and Experience	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>475</b>
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING</b>	<b>7,500.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3230</b>	<b>5909</b>	<b>3045</b>	<b>6849</b>
<b>MINIMUM SCORE 80% OF 7,500 = 6,000</b>						
<b>Cost Proposal</b>						
4.1.1 Budget (scored from cost formula)	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1000</b>
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	<b>1500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1250</b>
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 2 SCORING</b>	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3230</b>	<b>5909</b>	<b>3045</b>	<b>9099</b>
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>						
5% Bonus Points 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	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH  
 Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

<b>SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET</b>						
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Civitas Strategies Early Start</b>	<b>Visi0n cue LLC</b>	<b>WeeCare, Inc. (DBA Upwards)</b>	<b>Wonderschool, Inc.</b>	<b>Zero to Five Montana</b>
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORING</b>	<b>10,500.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3230</b>	<b>5909</b>	<b>3045</b>	<b>9599</b>

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 10,000 points: The Scope of Services, Company Profile and Experience, and Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Civitas Strategies Early Start</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 0</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			<b>Per Evaluation Criteria, "Achieve Minimum Score" failed score in Section 2.1, General requirements, disqualified response from the evaluation process.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	P/F	F	Failed response; Found responses to agreements in other section of RFP, not in 2.1, which is the RFP requirement; didn't follow protocol requested on the entire requirement, alluding to agreements but didn't specifically agree to comply; does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.
2.2 Technical Assistance, for Child Care Provider Business Practices	1000		
2.3 Technical Assistance, for All Licensed/Registered Provider Types	1000		
2.4 Community Based Solutions for Child Care	1500		
2.5 Build Home-Based Child Care Program Expansion	500		
2.6 Shared Services Supports	600		
2.7 Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies	500		
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500		
2.9 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for complete implementation	300		
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	500		
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING</b>	<b>7,500</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>MINIMUM SCORE 80% OF 7,500 = 6,000</b>			
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
4.1.1 Budget (scored from cost formula)	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1500		

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Civitas Strategies Early Start</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 0</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 2 SCORING</b>	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
5% Bonus Points 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	500		
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORING</b>	<b>10,500.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH  
Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 10,000 points: The Scope of Services, Company Profile and Experience, and Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Visi0n cue LLC

**Total Points Awarded:** 3230

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			<b>Per Evaluation Criteria, "Achieve Minimum Score" failed score in Section 2.7, Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies, disqualified response from the evaluation process.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; acknowledged and agreed to all in sections
2.2 Technical Assistance, for Child Care Provider Business Practices	1000	630	Fair response; minimal response with little detail; no delineation of support by provider type; was not clear they know and understand MT based on citing of the Department of Child Care services which doesn't exist in MT; very high level and training and resource heavy, wanted to see how they were going to support providers with implementation; response didn't meet the definition of good in that it was very ambiguous; 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.
2.3 Technical Assistance, for All Licensed/Registererd Provider Types	1000	620	Fair response; minimally addressed most components and gave no new information, wanted to see a plan or how they are going to accomplish the TA, wanted to see something giving a vision, how they would approach things is missing; no details about how they will achieve a timely response; seemed copied and pasted; written as an acknowledgement of compliance and no detail on how; 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.
2.4 Community Based Solutions for Child Care	1500	1000	Fair response; addressed all components, meets requirements by generally parroting or repeating the requests; no actionable plan and just repeated the State's RFP requirements; no detail and goals were rewritten 4 times replacing the target population; 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.
2.5 Build Home-Based Child Care Program Expansion	500	300	Fair response; discussed goals but didn't show how to get there, very ambiguous and minimal; no plan for achievement; liked that they gave us quantifiable goals; didn't feel they responded to the RFP requirements, discussed items outside of SOW, attachment curriculum and didn't feel they understood the requirements; identified unrealistic outcomes; 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.

2.6 Shared Services Supports	600	390	Fair response; written as an acknowledgement and no understanding of how they will complete project; liked they had a menu of potential recruitment and retention strategies; repeated "we will do..." discussed that they will explore and expand but didn't indicate how; improved detail but no "how" involved in 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.
2.7 Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies	500	290	Failed response; gave us something about each item in RFP requirements however, no strategies or plans included in the response; just repeating the RFP requirements with no details listed; couldn't find actionable time bound plans within response; project is on a tight timeline and felt they didn't address all components; hugely concerning because this is \$1,000,000 in employer sponsored grants that there's not a plan to administer; does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500		
2.9 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for complete implementation	300		
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	500		
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING</b>	<b>7,500</b>	<b>3230</b>	
<b>MINIMUM SCORE 80% OF 7,500 = 6,000</b>			
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
4.1.1 Budget (scored from cost formula)	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1500		
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 2 SCORING</b>	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>3,230.00</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
5% Bonus Points 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	500		
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORING</b>	<b>10,500.00</b>	<b>3,230.00</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH  
Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 10,000 points: The Scope of Services, Company Profile and Experience, and Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

**Offeror (Company) Name: WeeCare, Inc. (DBA Upwards)**

**Total Points Awarded: 5909**

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			
2.1 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; acknowledged all comonents of the RFP requirements and provided detail
2.2 Technical Assistance, for Child Care Provider Business Practices	1000	900	Good response; thorough and liked how they incorporated PAS/BAS assessment; liked the theory of assisting the providers to become proficient instead of doing it for them, this promotes longevity; liked they discussed continuous improvement cycle, real time feedback for program improvement; really like the list of TA content; support before and after assessment, have developed materials and resources
2.3 Technical Assistance, for All Licensed/Registererd Provider Types	1000	860	Good response; focus on data; liked detailed timeline, and focus on high needs areas; big concern regarding rural and tribal communities by leveraging technology to provide their services, seems they do not understand the rural or tribal communities, in order to build relationships in these communities you have to be in person; did state they would tailor their approach and good CQI process; offered some additional ideas to help support vulnerable areas we did ask for
2.4 Community Based Solutions for Child Care	1500	930	Fair response; left out some detail on how priorities will be set and concerned how much of a focus population they chose, immigrant population is a factor but we have a lot of high need important areas to be addressed; would have like more discussion on the type of support for each provider; preset goals for certain populations and areas which is limiting and inflexible; some of the defined goals were arbitrary and not connected to data or information about the state; thorough but lacking MT knowledge, would have liked to have seen more about FFN in the rural areas; based on goals not sure they understand MT; goal of expanding nontraditional hours only in tribal communities is an example; 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.



2.5 Build Home-Based Child Care Program Expansion	500	425	Good response; noted some conflicting goals in section, created some confusion and doubt around offeror's understanding of the RFP requirements; some items outside of SOW; concerns they do not understand what we want; like they reference partnerships like Early Interventions; thorough goals and strong partnership ideas; multipronged approach with multiple partners listed; actionable goals; concerned about statements concerned again about their statements for rural and reservation areas; will leverage technology to provide coaching; committed to supporting expansion of high quality home based childcare and not sure how they will accomplish this if they're not actually in the communities, couldn't make that connection; innovative plan to work with tribal colleges and mentioned they will establish a robust referral network to health services and that is replicative of our state system already.
2.6 Shared Services Supports	600	440	Fair response; had some additional ideas outside of SOW; spoke to annual surveying of providers for feedback; monitoring was robust; good job addressing the telehealth piece, beyond that didn't appear to be a clear vision of other shared services they would be working toward; like monitoring and evaluation process; wanted to see some possibilities of what other shared services; discussed telehealth, wasn't sure they understood what we required through that item; we asked for continuing and expansion and didn't feel the response met the RFP requirement; 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.
2.7 Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies	500	370	Fair response; well written; clear staffing plan and grant application process; really liked monitoring timeline; didn't address all components; strong description of the "how" they would accomplish this, prioritizing, discussion around implementation support; response is unclear on if they understand the annual amount for this project and contradiction about sustainability planning; didn't mention how they would solicit employer contribution; one on one support or specificity about staffing; nice staff dedication and plan; 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.
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500	472	Superior response; really like multi-media approach they discussed multiple languages and had an importance around understanding child care quality and licensing; CQI process expressed commitment to adjusting strategies; liked "grass roots approach", questions about how their application would connect and get the State data; analytics from app they will implement will track monthly; appreciated real time data analysis and commitment to being flexible and multifaceted approach; running analytics on an app they will implement, is an additional data piece outside of families, surveys, and website analytics the traditional pieces usually seen here; community partnerships to distribute materials; exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all 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.

2.9 Functionality of Service	600	442	Fair response; didn't mention intent to subcontract; all technology based, so questions on if this will work for all of MT; discuss targeted provider recruitment using outreach campaigns, questions here on the virtual nature of recruitment; noted no plan for physical office space; not having a physical location specified feels like there will be no human interaction to provide services; 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.
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500	420	Good response; met requirement; submitted logic model; could have included more details in this section, missed opportunity here; had some clear outputs that did describe how they would report, but gathering good data and clear outputs.
2.11 Timeline for complete implementation	300	250	Good response; good detail included, but nothing included on a staffing plan or increasing staffing for this project which is a huge concern; met RFP requirements; acceptable but didn't do employer grants until the 3rd month and should be a priority, but would be full implementation by 4th month
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	500	400	Good response; strong experience with most of the deliverables we are requiring, primary business in child care field; have a sense of what they do is scalable here; meets requirements, stated company mission, included relevant data points from previous work; had a couple of questions on "how" things would be accomplished so felt like it lacked detail; good experience but seemed to be all platform based; discuss innovative solutions to address child care needs in all 50 states but no demonstration to show what they have accomplished in MT; profile leaves questions to be answered about how services may be duplicative of States IT solutions required for licensed childcare providers.
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING</b>			
	<b>7,500</b>	<b>5909</b>	
<b>MINIMUM SCORE 80% OF 7,500 = 6,000</b>			
			Didn't meet the 80% minimum response requirement to move to Step 2 in evaluation process.
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
4.1.1 Budget (scored from cost formula)	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1500		
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 2 SCORING</b>			
	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>5,909.00</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
5% Bonus Points 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	500		

TOTAL RFP SCORING	10,500.00	5,909.00	
-------------------	-----------	----------	--

TOTAL RFP SCORING	10,500.00	5,909.00	
-------------------	-----------	----------	--

TOTAL RFP SCORING	10,500.00	5,909.00	
-------------------	-----------	----------	--

TOTAL RFP SCORING	10,500.00	5,909.00	
-------------------	-----------	----------	--

TOTAL RFP SCORING	10,500.00	5,909.00	
-------------------	-----------	----------	--

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH**  
**Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 10,000 points: The Scope of Services, Company Profile and Experience, and Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Wonderschool, Inc.

**Total Points Awarded:** 3045

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			<b>Per Evaluation Criteria, "Achieve Minimum Score" failed score in Section 2.6, Shared Services Supports, disqualified response from the evaluation process.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; meets requirements with no detail regarding how they will accomplish
2.2 Technical Assistance, for Child Care Provider Business Practices	1000	715	Fair response; questions regarding platform confusing to see if it is free and if everyone gets a platform; if they have to pay for platform how are we spending the funding; quarterly reporting; overall appears they have a product to implement which feels like an IT solution which is not what we are looking to procure, question as to if they understand the SOW requested through RFP; discuss teacher recruitment platform in major markets but no mention of rural/reservations, concerned with scalability of what is proposed; couldn't get a sense of how they would accomplish TA other than it is a virtual platform, no grasp on philosophy; stated they would tailor TA, but no detail about the approach for different provider types; CCMC package of tools limits individualized supports; 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.
2.3 Technical Assistance, for All Licensed/Registered Provider Types	1000	715	Fair response; felt they were agreeing to complete but no details on how they would; implementation plan gave nothing more than our RFP language back in response; goals weren't quantifiable; addressed some sort of a philosophy; lack of detail, hard to evaluate the quality of the response because of the limited information; 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.

2.4 Community Based Solutions for Child Care	1500	902	Fair response; liked detail in community and strategic planning, public/private partnership development, needed more details on the "how" and what metrics are they going to use to measure and monitor; isn't a clear plan for recruiting or engaging communities, isn't clear how relationships will be built or how individual goals will be supported; didn't define potential strategies related to community based work; storybook doesn't have enough specificity to express community needs; communities referenced from storybook have needs but also have the most services available, doesn't appear they have a good understanding of MT needs; attest to having 100% deployment in 1st quarter , but disconnect between having preexisting relationships in communities, huge concern that is not an attainable goal; 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.
2.5 Build Home-Based Child Care Program Expansion	500	360	Fair response; not confident in staffing model; where do qualified teacher candidates come from that are matched in their system?; reference to connection to Even Start, Head Start and Early Head Start, reference is very unclear because doesn't appear to be connected with home based child care; not enough detail on the "how" home base services will be expanded; peer cohorts strong base, discussed infant toddler care, what was in response didn't give the how; overall seems to be an implementation of a COTS solution which doesn't align with building home based child care programs, for example discussing self-services matching system, successful in Michigan which is not a comparable state to MT from a population/rural perspective and questions if they can work in rural MT; Care 4 Kids, didn't know what it is and appears to be a program in Connecticut and couldn't find any relation to MT; some discussion on each component, concerned with support for infant toddler expansion by demonstrating a financial incentive, but didn't give us what that would look like, concerned with nontraditional hour approach and adjusting their hours in a home based setting, response demonstrates they may not understand what "home care" looks like; 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.
2.6 Shared Services Supports	600	353	Failed response; services offered, have questions about their discussion and the wording used, was a good idea, but the support for the response wasn't clear and doesn't appear to support MT; vision from this section seems to be a resource and referral IT solution to connect people with jobs, but what seems to be missing is how they are finding these people, State needs someone to recruit the people not an IT solution to connect to them; question on what the recruitment tools they refer to are because wasn't clear from response; didn't see any mention of telehealth which was required; plan for the sub pool is replacing and is not what State is asking for it is duplicative; needs to retain and expand on telehealth and if doesn't meet the requirements because cannot find where telehealth is a shared service is not addressed in this section; discuss substitute pool, and background checks are duplicative; response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

2.7 Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies	500		
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500		
2.9 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for complete implementation	300		
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	500		
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING</b>	<b>7,500</b>	<b>3045</b>	
<b>MINIMUM SCORE 80% OF 7,500 = 6,000</b>			
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
4.1.1 Budget (scored from cost formula)	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1500		
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 2 SCORING</b>	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>3,045.00</b>	
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
5% Bonus Points 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	500		
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORING</b>	<b>10,500.00</b>	<b>3,045.00</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH  
Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 10,000 points: The Scope of Services, Company Profile and Experience, and Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Zero to Five Montana

**Total Points Awarded:** 9599

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			
2.1 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; passed
2.2 Technical Assistance, for Child Care Provider Business Practices	1000	930	Good response; pretty good detail on each item and included philosophy; demonstrated a commitment to PAS/BAS; concerned about their focus on providing implementation support for 3rd party products, example is other childcare platforms they would get support, these products have technical assistance on their own products so it was hard to understand what they were doing there; had a thoughtful mission; strategies based on research principles (First Childrens Finance); strong MT based partnerships had a testimony in section; PAS/BAS reliable by December 2024; plan for resource decimation which was clear, collaborative efforts, thorough, already having PA/BAS trained people is a strength; detailed response demonstrated an understanding of MT systems; named specific statewide partners and gave detailed examples
2.3 Technical Assistance, for All Licensed/Registererd Provider Types	1000	950	Superior response; noted specific and related knowledge and solutions; tribal staff employed currently, demonstrated flexibility/individualization; have a solution called HubSpot set up to support timely responses for technical assistance; both in person and remote connections made; strong response and people in place to complete the work; very clear they have in person support; liaison specific for tribes; good process detail; on the ground partnerships; interesting detailed data analysis; exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all 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.

2.4 Community Based Solutions for Child Care	1500	1425	Superior response; really liked the reference to coalitions which supports community; strong specific models of supports and referencing other MT supports; very MT specific; qualifiable goals; detailed plan to build off existing structures; had a good list of partnerships ; Section 2.4.4 had specific strategies; provided good data showing their impact; demonstrate a strong understanding of how to maximize their partners and the network; could be a strength but also a challenge at times; would have liked to have seen some more intentionality behind targeting infant/toddler and nontraditional hours; exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all 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.
2.5 Build Home-Based Child Care Program Expansion	500	430	Good response; discussed specifics models and measures for their goals; innovative strategies for economic development; appreciated CQI process; unclear on a purpose of "ALL OUR KIN" program; wanted to have more info on CCDF data when they have an evaluation process; some development needed, but have a defined plan; liked they reference the support for burnout, referenced current partners.
2.6 Shared Services Supports	600	575	Superior response; very impressed with retainage of existing services; and offered potential areas of expansion, i.e. insurance; addressed not only the current state but a clear plan to collect data to grow; clear vision beyond sustaining the current services; letter of support from the organization from current service provider and a clear transition process to move services to them; specifically called out telehealth services and was a main services to ensure we maintain; overall a good understanding of the current shared system; exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all 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.
2.7 Employer-Sponsored Child Care Strategies	500	470	Good response; noted have a clear plan for implementation; discussed employer cost sharing; application implementation plan well developed and current work will support this was discussed as well; appreciated implementation timeline which included hiring staff to support the work; robust list of economic partners; gave clear visual how this works fits into Family Forward initiative; called out at least 25 subgrantees and thought that was favorable for them.



2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500	370	Fair response; liked they already have marketing plans happening; exit surveys are a strength and using the information would make to drive marketing plans makes it stronger; included good examples of the target audience their marketing to, using billboards in rural areas, showing understanding there; sharing data with the State around number of users, views event counts, etc, shows they are currently evaluating that data; didn't see any discussion on family outreach or family as an audience and was highly concerning; doesn't mention coordination w/ Department regarding consumer education, doesn't reference licensing and QRS; these are specific requirements in this section; 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.
2.9 Functionality of Service	600	504	Good response; answered the questions; demonstrated state-wide reach; higher remotely but also have office space in Helena, identify with Department approval who they would subcontract with; felt there was some ambiguity with future subcontracting and they thought there might be need for more and that would call out a shift in the staffing plan, unclear on remote work, hire remote workers, not sure if it would be a public facing office or working from home; meets RFP requirements.
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500	470	Good response; logic model was robust aligned with RFP outcomes and provided significant details; have substantial inputs to move the work; very thorough, discussed past work in response; liked seeing all other RFP activities outlined in activities section and outlining the RFP; a lot of evaluation.
2.11 Timeline for complete implementation	300	250	Good response; meets expectations; doing well and seems logical, already completing statewide work; questioned the full implementation by the end of 1st quarter; looking for explanation on what they are already doing; items discussed was on new services, but not a lot on that in response.
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	500	475	Superior response; specific to this work, been completing this work, speak to in person and remote services provided; have experience completing this work, only experience in MT could be both positive and concern; letter of support with 120 partners signing it showing existing reach to complete services moving forward; a bonus with experience and strong showing of success with community capacity building piece; exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all 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.
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING</b>			
	<b>7,500</b>	<b>6849</b>	
<b>MINIMUM SCORE 80% OF 7,500 = 6,000</b>			
<b>Cost Proposal</b>			
4.1.1 Budget (scored from cost formula)	1000	1000.0	

4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1500	1250	Good response; trying to cross reference to see how staffing would be broken out, confusing because CCDF budget Exec Director is in for 5 hrs/wk for supervision for all the FT staff doesn't seem adequate; then B-5 Funding Source 2, no supervisor is listed; concern in CCDF tab 4, line items for the Summit and Mentorship program and amounts listed seems significantly undocumented in the technical response received as activities they would use to meet goals; didn't seem they put enough for mileage and travel with the expectation of being with communities.
<b>TOTAL THROUGH STEP 2 SCORING</b>			
<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>9,099.00</b>		
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>			
5% Bonus Points 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	500	500	answered "yes" to question in eMACS and certified in system
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORING</b>			
<b>10,500.00</b>	<b>9,599.00</b>		

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH**  
**Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**  
**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.

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH  
Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports**

**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 ( $\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 200$ ).

Cost			
<b>Points Available</b>	<b>1000</b>		
Lowest Cost	\$1,850,000.00		
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
Zero to Five Montana	\$1,850,000.00	1000.0	Only Offeror to score 80% to move to Step 2.
Vendor # 2		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 3		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 4		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 5		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 6		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 7		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 8		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 9		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 10		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 11		#DIV/0!	
Vendor # 12		#DIV/0!	

## Scoring Calculator

SH	100.0%
SL	95.0%
GH	94.0%
GL	74.0%
FH	74.0%
FL	59.0%
FDH	59.0%
FDL	0.0%

### Total Points Available

Score	1000
Superior (95-100%)	949.9 - 1000
Good (75-94%)	740 - 940
Fair (60-74%)	590 - 740
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 590

## Technical Scoring Session

DPHHS-RFP-2024-0543KH

Child Care Development Fund: Business Supports

Date: 7/22/2024

Time: All day

Location: DPHHS - 1625 11th Ave  
North, Helena, MT.

Evaluation Committee Members: Sally Tilleman  
Jill Christensen  
Darla Dexter  
Tracy Moseman

Subject Matter Experts: Josh Clement  
Cindy Straughn  
James Eastlick

Contracts Officer:

Order of Evaluation: Alphabetical  
Scoring Method: Consensus