



## 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)

Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET

Category	Possible Points	Child Care Connections	Child Care Resources Inc	District 7 HRDC	Family Connections, Inc.	Greater Butte Community Coordinated Childcare Inc	Shine Early Learning	WeeCare Inc (DBA Upwards)	Wonderschool Inc
<b>Scope of Services</b>									
2.1 General Requirements	Pass/Fail	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	700	518	665	518	650	400	600	490	515
2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	800	655	765	675	650	0	775	555	450
2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	700	518	600	610	650	0	650	540	0
2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs	700	518	630	605	630	0	650	500	0
2.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system	700	400	600	540	500	0	670	500	0
2.5 Emergency Preparedness	300	0	260	260	280	0	282	220	0
2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing	500	0	375	420	370	0	470	370	0
2.7 Criminal Background Checks	500	0	460	290	370	0	450	290	0
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500	0	450	0	370	0	470	0	0
2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 4	400	0	376	0	376	0	376	0	0
2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service	600	0	500	0	450	0	540	0	0
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500	0	478	0	380	0	450	0	0
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100	0	70	0	73	0	95	0	0
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>									
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000	0	950	0	935	0	950	0	0
<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>									
4.1.1 Budget	1000	0	860	0	900	0	930	0	0
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000	0	900	0	890	0	760	0	0
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORING</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>2609</b>	<b>8939</b>	<b>3918</b>	<b>8474</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>9118</b>	<b>3465</b>	<b>965</b>
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</b>									
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>									

Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET

Category	Possible Points	Child Care Connections	Child Care Resources Inc	District 7 HRDC	Family Connections, Inc.	Greater Butte Community Coordinated Childcare Inc	Shine Early Learning	WeeCare Inc (DBA Upwards)	Wonderschool Inc
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	0	500	0	500	0	500	0	0
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>2609</b>	<b>9439</b>	<b>3918</b>	<b>8974</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>9618</b>	<b>3465</b>	<b>965</b>

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Child Care Connections</b>		<b>Total Points Awarded: 2609</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>Scope of Services</b>			<b>Per evaluation process in RFP, Section 2.4 received a failed response and is disqualified from further evaluation.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	<b>700</b>	518	Fair response; concerns are it is not specific action for nontraditional care, high in community support and developing their own plans for recruitment, for example executing community listening sessions in rural communities; gathering data on programs usage of other programs is high; response requirement stated needs to provide 3 expansion goals, response only lists a singular goal around slot expansion, addresses slot expansion in different sized facilities; struggled with the narrow scope provided; addressed questions, liked called attention to collaboration with the business contractor; demonstrated slot expansion in previous work and called it out in the response specifically, multiple strategies for recruitment outreach; missing nontraditional hours and high needs population no specifics in those areas; 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.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Child Care Connections</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 2609</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	800	655	Good response; a lot of detail, addressed cultural competency; discussed staff experience completing services with a variety of methods to implement; timelines presented appeared reasonable; discussed what they are currently completing for services but didn't see anything new or innovative moving forward; description of current staff knowledge and work but nothing new; noted collaboration with licensing and noted director round tables; behavioral observation and special needs libraries; questioned what data management system presented; discuss guidance on cultural humility and competency and inclusive environments and bilingual education materials which focuses on the high needs part of program

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Child Care Connections</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 2609</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	<b>700</b>	518	Fair response; needs to include more innovation; discussed about current services provided without addressing the change of direction of the RFP requirements; services needs to be broad and far reaching, needed specifics on renewals and support providers through renewals; didn't see examples of direct connection between technical assistance and staff retention; initiatives like the Director's Journey, which is a support to and development of a director which trickles down into the staff and then one on one support in classrooms which was good because the key is retention of staff and support to staff; no logical connection between what they are doing now and specifically aligned with retention, what they are doing now is not going to lead to the outcomes the State is expecting; no data supporting the currently implemented strategies are increasing retention in existing programs; 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.

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Child Care Connections</b>		<b>Total Points Awarded: 2609</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs	700	518	Fair response; didn't see specifics in the strategies related to newly licensed providers; didn't provide information connecting to potential providers or programs seeking to start a business; listed several program type items their staff is trained in but not how; lots of tools but nothing tying those tools to services provided; they reach out to new or potential providers which gives them good information, but not the support; many strategies were about providing information, no change in practice and can lead to assume someone will do something with the information but no data to show that occurs; nice job address unique challenges of providers and getting licensed, but no connection; 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 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system	700	400	Failed response; extensive skills presented for the staffing; training to move to support; focus was more on the qualifications of staff and what staff knew instead of how to provide the technical assistance; response to 2.4 second bullet, description of how the program will receive the information and tracking data on implementation was missing which is 50% of the response required in this section; stated would complete the requirements but gave little detail on how that would be accomplished; does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.
2.5 Emergency Preparedness	300		
2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing	500		

<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Child Care Connections</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 2609</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
2.7 Criminal Background Checks	500		
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500		
2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 4	400		
2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100		
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000		
<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000		
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>		<b>10,000</b>	<b>2,609</b>
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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>Offeror (Company) Name: Child Care Connections</b>			<b>Total Points Awarded: 2609</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded</b>
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>2,609</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Child Care Resources

**Total Points Awarded:** 9439

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services</b>			
2.1 General Requirements	Pass/Fail	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	700	665	Superior response; spoke of great collaboration with lots partners and players; lots of innovative services; spoke to a data and systematic review process; priority areas were easily defined in the table covered all required sections; value added for out school recruitment and license support; multiple strategies for expansion; examples of service area knowledge; work with refugee experience a positive; discussed licensed variance for mixed groups for center care and working toward changing that; discusses trends but not specific practices; table on page 2 and 3 very clearly articulates their goals, as a contract manager that would be super helpful; 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.

<p>2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>800</b></p>	<p>765</p>	<p>Superior response; identified teams experienced; several strategies to support adult learners, extensive list provided in response; careful to include comments for every section and response was easy to follow; reflects thoughtful planning; has planned TA documentation; planned for timely response; promotion strategies were pretty extensive and how they track their TA efforts; clear implementation plan; organized, detailed and exceeded expectations; 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.</p>
<p>2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>600</p>	<p>Good response; liked there is a caseload for staff which develops a relationship; quarterly individualized contact; cross training; appeared to be weak on evaluation strategies; well written and organized; appreciated details for each of required bullets the State required; liked correlation with training being paired with observation and coaching; loved the animated videos, were innovative and prior to expiration they have plans to track licensing and remained licensed; identified partnership with childcare business contractor; felt there were limited details and explanation around TA evaluation strategy, noted they would use "FRESHDESK", limited information on what they system would accomplish</p>

<p>2.3.6          Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>630</p>	<p>Good response; well written and organized; intentional detail given for each of the required sections; TA plan for developed for continued support for the beginning of the process; clear understanding of the system; felt no mention of differentiated strategies for potential childcare providers; strategies provided were focused on new providers; response seemed to be directed at new programs; TA specialists defined to support programs with infants and toddlers, plan to stay connected with new programs; passive supports are plentiful, U-Tube channels, pre-inspection and document checklists; for new providers receive much more support to set up environment but no details on the "how".</p>
<p>2.4          Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>600</p>	<p>Good response; staff knowledge; looking for how to support other quality initiatives and didn't see that in response; liked the referrals for community services; long standing experience, CQI process individualized approaches; familiarity with assessment tools; infant/toddler specialists; did not specifically address each TA element and didn't address data tracking for service evaluation; offering workshops to help understand the QRS structure, using baseline data in all counties which will assist with success or fail rates; focus specifically on helping programs understand the QRS system.</p>
<p>2.5          Emergency Preparedness</p>	<p><b>300</b></p>	<p>260</p>	<p>Good response; experience setting up guardian programs; will establish MOU's for guardian programs in new areas; defined partnerships during pandemic; idea to add emergency command centers; TA strategies include resource videos; liked they will help providers develop emergency plans; not only say they will coordinate but they will participate in county/region emergency planning teams; coordinate with not only DPHHS but the Governor's office in a state of emergency.</p>

<p>2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>375</p>	<p>Good response; quarterly meetings; looking at commonly observed licensing violations and concerns about specific facilities; share new providers wanting to get started; review results quarterly and annually to assess service delivery; didn't feel like there was anything innovative but this section requires joint planning between the two entities so innovation could have been difficult to speak to; very minimally responded to; felt quarterly meetings are very minimal, mentioned communication with child care licensing but didn't discuss strategies or outcomes; plan to use triage support to licensing support plans</p>
<p>2.7 Criminal Background Checks</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>460</p>	<p>Good response; section was well organized and understand the process; have a plan to make fingerprinting available in rural communities; acknowledged the no wait list requirements; really liked 2.7.3.4, discussion where the CACFP specialist will assist with fingerprinting when in rural communities; all staff is trained; multiple sites for live scans; live scans in multiple areas only if other agencies will give them the live scan that were previously purchased by the State.</p>
<p>2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>450</p>	<p>Good response; love the outreach chart and quarterly review; discussion providing DPHHS messaging through communication channels; several strategies listed; didn't describe data analysis and tracking of consumer education; plan will be reviewed and updated quarterly based on results, appears to be bare minimum; liked community presentations, individual outreach; dates were not very specific and instructions were to give targeted dates and they stated Oct 2024 through March 2026, not specific, did in each of 4 columns discuss quarterly data monitoring and assessment</p>
<p>2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 5</p>	<p><b>400</b></p>	<p>376</p>	<p>Good response; identified 19 counties; identified regions and stated distances are manageable for in person meetings outreach and services.</p>

<p>2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service</p>	<p><b>600</b></p>	<p>500</p>	<p>Good response; planning for PT space in Kalispell and Butte for purposes of live scan only; concern is delivering services in outer regions via phone conference and online; good thing they will assign specialists based on expertise and geography and will check-in with programs quarterly which feels minimal; appears only remote based support for providers who are not in Missoula which is concerning; rural services would need to be addressed in this section if awarded reference a little on how they will complete transition items; specialists will be assigned caseloads based on expertise and geography; mentioned the possibility of subcontracting with subject matter experts.</p>
<p>2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>478</p>	<p>Superior response; knocked the logic model out of the park; outcomes are qualified; clear where the data points are coming from; tied all the activities from the RFP into the plan; level of detail was more than what is necessary; qualified they outputs; liked they restated expansion goals in the logic model; included a substitute pool; covered everything and extremely thorough; 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 <u>prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.</u></p>
<p>2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation</p>	<p><b>100</b></p>	<p>70</p>	<p>Fair response; would hire with unrestricted funds to hire before they receive funds from the contract if awarded; addressed staff hiring, but didn't address other important details necessary expand; detail was minimal and if services on day one is a realistic goal; only work in the beginning is an introductory letter, appears to have some relationship building that would need to be addressed; three sentences for a response; no expansion or office space being addressed; 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.</p>
<p><b>Offeror Qualifications</b></p>			

<p>3.1 Company Profile and Experience</p>	<p>1000</p>	<p>950</p>	<p>Superior response; demonstrates clear ability to perform services outlined; identifies primary source of business structure; limited information about best practice and philosophy to serve Montana; value added was ADA compliance and translation services; established in 1969; clear on how many employees they have; operations manual for training staff for consistency which is huge; trained backups for all their roles which is huge; individualized approach to improving licensing and compliance with small grants tied to them; discussed the fiscal team which appears to have a "deep bench"; liked the 3 month cash reserve; 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.</p>
<p><b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b></p>			
<p>4.1.1 Budget</p>	<p>1000</p>	<p>860</p>	<p>Good response; outlined the budget requested; indirects look good, staffing appropriate; dollars correspond to the region; question about conferences for staff, seemed high for out of state travel.</p>
<p>4.1.2 Budget Narrative</p>	<p>1000</p>	<p>900</p>	<p>Good response; a lot of good detail; very clear how the processed their numbers; questions on having some staff listed on both indirect and direct charges and the justification for travel outlines a lot of out of state travel; staffing is concerning, ;liked the three office spaces and good mileage budget which shows they plan to travel within their service area; if awarded the contract would need clarification on if all costs are allowable.</p>
<p><b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b></p>			
	<p>10,000</p>	<p>8,939</p>	
<p><b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</b></p>			
<p><b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b></p>			

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>	500	acknowledged in eMACS by answering "yes"
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>9,439</b>	



**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** District 7 HRDC

**Total Points Awarded:** 3918

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services</b>			<b>Per evaluation process in RFP, Section 2.7 received a failed response and is disqualified from further evaluation.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	Pass/Fail	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	700	518	Fair response; some generic responses and speculation language for example might include"; provided at least 3 goals and focused on program type; offer mentorship for FFN's; discusses best practices approach but doesn't clearly define them in proposal; questions about CRM system, unclear on what that is; priority areas were named with no specific plans; questioned the CRM system, could have used a definition; liked recruitment strategies of targeted outreach offering start up and training and ongoing technical assistance; would have liked to have seen how they would do that throughout the state at the same level; section 2.2.3 stated "we will set goals " and "our goals might include" and requirement was to set goals and response is ambiguous; page 5 give some goals but no details on how they will accomplish them; page 6 discuss leverage their extensive experience and track record but no details to demonstrate what they have accomplished there; liked the development with local colleges and vocational schools as a recruitment strategy; page 7 dedicated staff being assigned to monitor and report progress, didn't see staff mentioned in company profile, unsure of what plan there; page 7 leverage experience and best practices, no additional details of what that is; 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.
2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	800	675	Good response; philosophy on adult learning professionalism and continuing quality improvement; effective adult learning; fostering a culture of continuous quality improvement and relationship building; information on TA outcomes and implementation plan; recording of type and frequency of TA requests for data purposes; named some evidence based practices; discussed for outreach using radio and TV ads to reach rural areas, hoping outreach in that area is broader than those items listed; commented they would initiate contact with all providers at least 1x per year, is that purposeful or a touchpoint? and is it realistic?; scheduled annual check-ins with licensed providers seemed limited; touched on all federally defined TA areas and defines plan for timely TA response.

<p>2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>610</p>	<p>Good response; noted discussion about annual check-ins, only annually begs a question of what the purpose is here?; addressed all required sections. Discussed lots of types of data, addressed continuous improvement; great support for licensing deficiency; longitudinal tracking system that will help connect TA to successful work; defines strategies for each TA priority area; comment about registry may indicate lack of knowledge; COPA liked they are providing workshops individual assistance and user friendly guides, seems focused on retention and renewal; track renewal dates for licensing.</p>
<p>2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>605</p>	<p>Good response; liked user friendly guides they will develop; intentional initial assessment to determine services; would have liked to have seen other referrals to other contracted services; dashboard and security measures are robust; have the potential ability to identify areas of improvement and demonstrate impact; lots of plans; pre and post TA assessments were good information; discussed navigating the regulatory system in other agencies; mentorship program between experienced and new providers; interesting discussion about future plans, curious why they are not already completing these items as a part of their services already.</p>
<p>2.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>540</p>	<p>Good response; mention specifically each TA element in this section; provided little differentiation between strategies; mention developing profiles for each provider which may be duplication of the State system; lots of information about tracking and analyzing data; QRS resource guide comprehensive support including training sessions on rating scales; peer learning groups; assessment results; section was well organized; strategies felt cookie cutter; discussed robust data system and tracking but unclear on how it will be managed; bullet point addressing serving children experiencing homelessness is an example of the vague nature of the overall response to the section; question on the central data base system.</p>
<p>2.5 Emergency Preparedness</p>	<p><b>300</b></p>	<p>260</p>	<p>Good response; have a dedicated emergency response team; cleared protocols for activating emergency childcare services; mobile childcare units to get to areas that are struck by an emergency; working with their individual providers to have procedures in place; lengthy response, left with some questions because the appearance is much of this needs to be built, left with a lot of questions of what is in existence at this time; liked dedicated hotline they would stand up in an emergency, future plan of establishing relationships with relevant emergency preparedness entities; mobile units innovative, mental health providers; specialized coordination with rural and tribes; stated they would complete a statewide risk assessment; statewide risk assessment was not something we are asking for; will there be enough in the budget for the mobile units, mental health providers, etc.; emergency information in multiple languages</p>

2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing	500	420	Good response; much of collaboration outlined felt like more collaboration with the contract monitor instead of licensing; annual full meeting; wasn't sure if they understood that the purpose of the question was around collaboration between them as a contractor and our licensing staff, or if they were really wanting to do strategic planning with the department as a whole; discussed data which was great, but a new data solution that could integrate with State's licensing system; an annual data summit which leads to believe to collaboration with the Department and not childcare licensing; liked the layout and had innovative thoughts; information data system sounds comprehensive so need more information there; really liked data summit; needs for data sharing agreements with childcare licensing, may demonstrate a lack of service area knowledge; identified programs at risk of closure and target intervention; coordinated monitoring visits conducted annually; lots of information on data tracking and analysis; organizing cross training sessions with staff from other entities to learn about other roles and responsibilities and priorities a positive; shared repository of training materials and resources accessed by all agencies
2.7 Criminal Background Checks	500	290	Failed response; have 3 live scan sites; big thoughts for ink rolls including going to provider homes to be dedicated to lead this work; discussed mobile units for this; live scans in Billings and specifically states exploring expansion to Lewistown and Miles City, but Offeror bid for 56 counties; will invest in mobile fingerprinting units; offer ink print services where live scan is not available which is all of western Montana; zero wait list; efficient online scheduling system; offer ink print services at offices, childcare sites and home and outreach events and rural and remote areas; 6 of 7 most populated communities and majority of the providers in the state are not addressed in this plan to access Livescan finger printing, these areas are not remote areas and response is submitting to serve the entire state; plan as written will not allow for a zero wait list further, this plan would require a majority of the service area to be using Ink Printing which would fundamentally change how childcare licensing and DOJ process background checks; 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		
2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 4	400		
2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100		
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000		
<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>			

4.1.1 Budget	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000		
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>			
	<b>10,000</b>	<b>3,918</b>	
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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 SCORE</b>			
	<b>10,500</b>	<b>3,918</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Family Connections

**Total Points Awarded:** 8974

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services</b>			
2.1 General Requirements	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	<b>700</b>	650	Good response; statewide data utilized; collects internal data watching childcare slots and trends; team members working in designated areas; tribal areas have specialized staff members; well written; solid use of data to inform their work; great understanding of community needs; innovative examples; demonstrated ability to work in rural communities; area of concern is they track their data in a spreadsheet; liked they would work with large employers for partners for non-traditional care; some service area knowledge; effort to increase FFN's in rural areas; many strategies for recruitment and retention; several provided, but little detail, example general areas of TA or outreach; discussed what has been accomplished.
2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	<b>800</b>	650	Good response; very solid evidence based adult learning strategy; have a clear understanding of Montana's QRS system; integration with other statewide initiatives such as MELS and Indian Education for All; address the timeline for providing technical assistance; have a robust list of topics beyond federal requirements that they provide technical assistance on; little detail, address the time requirement response system, questions on how they will accomplish this; discussed spreadsheet and with the area they are expanding it is a concern; not much detail; marketing strategy meets requirement of timely responses to TA; list federally defined categories but provide not detail on how they will individually support topics through TA; lots of buzz words no details, such as logic based goals but nothing in detail about them; mention strong relations with local licensers; high quality TA delivered through effective communication but no details on the communication.

<p>2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>650</p>	<p>Good response; liked designated staff; like tracking of renewals and sending reminders for renewal dates; mentioned collaboration with other contractors; mentioned spreadsheet for collection of data, looking for more innovation in the response; discussed ongoing support to lower the chance of licensing deficiency; access to mobile computer device; staff designated to specific areas but have back up support; connects TA to retention and offered a retention goal; robust reminders for licensing, training, first aid and collaboration with childcare licensing; lots of entry level retention; felt very provider focused and tailor made to meet their needs.</p>
<p>2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>630</p>	<p>Good response; emphasizes an individualized approach to providers; strong connection with local licensers; identify programs working toward licensing as a target group; defines a very specific program for newly licensed providers with detailed steps; restates recruitment goal; in house form which if used would help providers who need assistance with bookkeeping to help keep them focused; very detailed process supporting new providers; packet is nice but would have liked to see a personal touch, would have liked to see some new ideas outside of what they currently do.</p>
<p>2.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>500</p>	<p>Fair response; utilized assessment tools and a lot of history using them; experience with educating infant and toddler caregivers; willing to travel to programs to share within the community and families; standard outreach; documented their experience with QRIS; overall lots of experience including with specific tools; speak about infant toddler support working with department to create a network; overall need more detail and innovation in response; training around assessments, stated they will participate in some things identified in this response to this section, with no description of how; feels like an acknowledgement; didn't specifically identify each TA element in the section; spoke to assessment screening and neglected others; didn't speak to other quality initiatives, like homelessness, children with special needs, providers who serve a high volume of children in protective 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.</p>
<p>2.5 Emergency Preparedness</p>	<p><b>300</b></p>	<p>280</p>	<p>Good response; emergency temporary care kits are innovative; Guardian Providers is a current activity; address regular practice through drills; and address working closely with emergency preparedness in local communities; did good job kits, communication and coordination; establish MOU's which might be to broaden or expand service; specific 6 hour training on EP for providers 2xs a year; collaboration with CCAoA integrating the needs of children in an emergency.</p>

<p>2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>370</p>	<p>Fair response; no innovation and this is a priority in the RFP; spoke of frequency they would meet childcare licensing which was great; questioned the comment "meeting at the preference of licenser"; describe shared platform for collaborative work; licensures are invited to the meeting; didn't get a sense of a clear purpose for meeting; TA similarly tracked; doesn't demonstrate a true commitment to collaboration; quarterly meeting is a requirement of the state and minimal requirements met; buzz word "communication-oriented, task-orientated, collaboration" two way conversations around childcare providers and appears to be meeting a requirement without having any real details in the response; seems middle of the road, no innovation appears to be minimal investment in understanding the value; 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.</p>
<p>2.7 Criminal Background Checks</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>370</p>	<p>Fair response; discuss multiple strategies for maintaining wait list; offering Livescans; offering and identifying and sharing resources in communities; minimally discussed collaboration with childcare licensing didn't provide strategies for outreach to obtain fingerprints; partnerships mentioned but no strategies provided; addressing rural areas which is a vast majority of areas servicing though updated list of finger print locations outside of themselves; mentioned "through our relationships with community and providers" is how they meet the requirement; concerned they only travel to service areas quarterly, need more details on how to provide real time support to avoid a wait list; no talk of expanding the Livescan in their proposed expanded area; 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.</p>
<p>2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>370</p>	<p>Fair response; multifaceted and targets a variety of delivery methods; varying communication methods honoring preferences the differences in generations; struggled with section, good mix of strategies, response required targeted dates, good job of giving strategies and methods; efforts are not intentionally driven by a communication plan that commits them to anything; addressed components of section, lack of detail in response; briefly describe evaluation method, restate concrete goal for consumer education efforts; 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.</p>
<p>2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 5</p>	<p><b>400</b></p>	<p>376</p>	<p>Good response; listed 27 countries</p>
<p>2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service</p>	<p><b>600</b></p>	<p>450</p>	<p>Good response; liked the tribal specific specialist; rest missed detail and innovation but met RFP requirements; spoke to taking a travel loops and they are not the best for providers, completing ink fingerprint rolls during this time; staff backup; discussed about one physical location, didn't mention subcontracting; provided a description of data tracking and analysis; travel loop and meets the needs of the staff not necessarily provider, deep dive into the needs of the area and all completed remotely; no other satellite offices does travel plan meet the needs of local communities.</p>

2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500	380	Good response; model has all required components; structure of the model makes it difficult to determine alignment between strategies and outcomes; model provides good detail but isn't easy to read; believe outputs listed are not quantifiable, example expand awareness, train expert staff members; help programs work toward licensing renewal; lost in the details of response; pretty standard language, some of the strategies seems unrealistic to meet the goals these would have to align and concerns that wouldn't happen; really difficult to track; long term outcomes in logic model and no accountability for the State as a monitor on that.
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100	73	Fair response; not a change from what currently is being provided for services so feels like they can accomplish it; is it realistic to implement 100% of services within 60 days considering expansion; contract monitoring would like to know what initiatives are going to take longer to put in place in expanded areas; no specificity on how it will be accomplished; was hoping to see a step by step plan or process to account for changes in service scope and expansion; only three sentences for a response to 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.
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000	935	Good response; doing work for a long time, operate with a mixed funding source with grants and unrestricted funding; appreciate discussion of program and finance staff; have experience nationally; list of bullets demonstrated experience in solving community specific challenges; clear understanding they understand the work; would have liked more on the staffing and expansion areas; staff demonstrates relevant experience; experience with very large rural service; multiple collaborative and organizational successes and receive high satisfaction rates in evaluation of services.
<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	1000	900	Good response; good detail; thorough and no concerns; budget reflects the service area indicated personnel percentage seems appropriate; indirects are appropriate; they are looking at only hiring one new staff person for an expansion and that person is a provider support specialist rest are current staff; everything looked appropriate.
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000	890	Good response; 7 FTE staff for the size of the area seems low but the percentage in the budget seems pretty high, unclear if the budget is poised to expand staff; see only one new staff being hired with an expansion program; questions on number of new staff vs expansion; salaries looked low; breakdown of categories and justifications is sufficient detail; sufficient travel budget
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>			
	<b>10,000</b>	<b>8,474</b>	
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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	acknowledged in eMACS by answering "yes"
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>8,974</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name: Greater Butte Community**

**Total Points Awarded: 400**

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services</b>			<b>Per evaluation process in RFP, Section 2.2 received a failed response and is disqualified from further evaluation.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	<b>700</b>	400	Failed response; section guidelines needed to give us three goals and outline plan to reach goals, response has bullets but cannot find the 2nd bullet response and no data on how to achieve goals; acknowledgement of they will complete it, don't feel it met the response guideline set forth in RFP; looking for innovative ideas and more details; liked the zone idea; outreach was the main approach; demonstrating minimal strategies; discussed past successes; mentioned recruiting but didn't explain how goals would be met; data collection hiring someone to do that; recruitment goals and strategies - how is the community meetings, health fairs and farmer's markets and other outreach events; success supported by what they have accomplished; these are first steps but doesn't address how they will meet the goals; the detailed plan does not lead to the goals set forth in this section and didn't discuss TA, support, etc., which the State would expect to see in a plan that is expansion of services; does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.
2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	<b>800</b>		
2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	<b>700</b>		

2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs	700		
2.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system	700		
2.5 Emergency Preparedness	300		
2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing	500		
2.7 Criminal Background Checks	500		
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500		
2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 4	400		
2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100		
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000		
<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000		
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>400</b>	
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>400</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Shine Early Learning

**Total Points Awarded:** 9618

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services</b>			
2.1 General Requirements	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	<b>700</b>	600	Good response; appreciated comment about high quality slot expansion; questioned a few of the goals particularly related to nontraditional hours; will offer incentives for expansion; simple strategies with limited detail; data system for individual PD; didn't demonstrate specific area knowledge in this section; liked the three tier technical assistance system; tracking seemed pretty clear on what they were going to accomplish; clearly looked at State's data; wasn't a lot of detail around strategies; do acknowledge working with Business Supports contractor; TA structure seems very intentional; sophisticated data management to track; appreciated they would take money out their own budget and real time information for data collection

<p>2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>800</b></p>	<p>775</p>	<p>Superior response; 20 years of developing, refining, replicating and scaling their TA; provide learning opportunities, action oriented; skill based with descriptions; 1000 turnkey and training resources; 3 part cycle of data review and goal setting is good; marketing advertising plan built in which is something the State needs; contradicting information provided from company profile and this section response to years of direct experience; turnkey and training resources, caution of what they are actually going to do here, some things here might have to be customized to State laws and requirements; appreciated data collection from providers presented, concerned on how the data is represented, only surveyed 40 out of 1000 providers, percentages given are only from 40 out of 1000; overall their TA structure feels very structured and wonder if some of the smaller providers will want to work through tier 1 &amp; 2 to get to tier 3; loved the accreditation support and it is supported by budget too; loved RAC's (regional advisory council) it is innovative, liked the help desk, 10 locally based staff to support tiers 2 &amp; 3; one of the best responses in their submission appreciated some surveying, provided percentages but continually stated 40 provider, showed initiative to understand our providers; innovative system where they set up a phone transfer to other partners; have resources already created for all federally defined categories, reflects their understanding to CFR; 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.</p>
---	-------------------	------------	--

<p>2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>650</p>	<p>Good response; reiterated their tech solution; appreciate acknowledge working with department to identify regulatory requirements that need to be developed; liked strategy of creating "how to" videos they really understand adult learning; really appreciated the help desk; liked program growth tool, PGT; working with partnering agencies is important; working with licensures and tailoring the system, really good knowledge of system work; they have a scaffold sequence of resources for beginning, developing, emerging, advancing, and mastering seems to be able to support providers at different levels; appreciated their commitment to referrals; food program, Part C, licensing; stated they verify until regulatory issues are overcome, statement demonstrates commitment to full compliance; didn't specifically address some of the subsections; really liked professional learning community which facilitates group technical assistance and discussion boards, if it is an all-state item means providers across the state could meet each other</p>
<p>2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>650</p>	<p>Good response; help desk connects people to resources; manuals and guides are developed to be resourceful; hoping to see a unique TA for providers wanting to become licensed; identifies the differing needs and how to meet those needs for potential and new childcare providers; different ecosystems are created; for specific role types briefly described three tier model again; defining flexibility and individualization; liked they did incorporate the new providers or wanting to be provided; help desk has information for both seeking licenses and newly licensed would be provided basic information on support programs, specifically discussed the BBS and CACFP and Part C; said a TA staff will be deployed when requested, appears to be an immediate on-site could occur; liked the sophistication of the help desk</p>

<p>2.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>670</p>	<p>Superior response; demonstrates experience and results in supporting QRIS systems; three tiered TA; have reliable ERS observers and TA staff; utilization of ERS assessment results and ERS aligned resources; platform with existing ASQ resources intent to engage subcontracts FTE support for accreditation, robust marketing and advertising for TA; monitoring and analysis of progress; identified 14 local staff; really discussed developmental screening trauma informed practice and inclusive practice and deploying individuals to assist in those situations; really liked this section, it is clear quality is fundamental to their work; appreciated specific references to evidence based practices including Learn the Signs Act Early; demonstrated commitment to becoming trained in the ASQ and Infant Early Childhood Mental Health Endorsement; 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.</p>
<p>2.5 Emergency Preparedness</p>	<p><b>300</b></p>	<p>282</p>	<p>Good response; will have an operations and compliance specialist who has completed the Emergency Preparedness Train the Trainer; coordination and collaboration with CCR&amp;R's to identify current guardian programs; either transfer existing agreements or create new ones; and complete an analysis of potential gaps; innovative idea establish a weekly recovery work group which reviews and makes decision on current operational policy; demonstrated crisis leadership capabilities and technology based communication and followed by personal touch if the need arises; have an automated text feature for emergency situations, single targeted messaging.</p>
<p>2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>470</p>	<p>Good response; had some innovative ideas; liked job shadowing, demonstrates a desire to fully understand each other's roles; discuss a lot about how referrals would flow between licensing and their TA; discuss joint professional development; coordinated efforts for support plans; has demonstrated ability to move programs to no compliance issues; worked in other sectors and have demonstrated results; quarterly regional meetings, like they will provide structured time for both agencies to give updates and work through a mutually agreed upon case management protocol; discuss cases so consistent messaging and language is being used; liked commitment to collaboration.</p>



<p>2.7 Criminal Background Checks</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>450</p>	<p>Good response; liked the four regional offices, no locations yet because they are coordinating with department and stakeholders to determine location; stated staff will be prepared to roll print; some holes, for example didn't speak to people across the state that are already rolling prints and could be available to providers; utilize Lighting Scheduler module; commitment to learn what application resources and forms are required by the State; zero wait list; featured modules on record keeping, supporting providers to keep track of their own deadline; will collaborate with local and state CCL staff to effectively print, by blending regional offices will keep a zero wait list and regional presence will have offices in each region of the State for Livescans will be consistently offered; if they are awarded we would have to discuss a minimum of 7 Livescan machines to support fingerprinting in Montana.</p>
<p>2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>470</p>	<p>Good response; specifically identified priorities for consumer ed; included areas identified in RFP requirements; mobile application push feature already exists within the Shine platform allowing quick decimation of State information; identified specific timeframes for communication efforts; discussed collaboration for local entities; identified data tracking and analysis included quarterly reviews with opportunities to change direction; quality is clearly important to them; robust communications strategy.</p>
<p>2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 5</p>	<p><b>400</b></p>	<p>376</p>	<p>Good response; proposing a statewide solution</p>
<p>2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service</p>	<p><b>600</b></p>	<p>540</p>	<p>Good response; hard to envision without knowing physical locations; did acknowledge subcontracting, meeting the requirement; appreciated calling out 15 staff to support the work; would have liked to have seen more about how they will be reaching rural and tribal communities; referenced monitoring and analyzing progress and flexibility to make adjustments as needed; 10 technical assistance staff, 5 subject matter experts which will help them deploy a Spark Learning Lab Services without a wait list.</p>
<p>2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>450</p>	<p>Good response; very clear and easy to read, organized, 100% satisfaction and skill progression for providers who receive their TA; liked they will do a GAP analysis on our trainings; concise all required elements, some outputs are not quantifiable, but outcomes are; liked thier assumptions there is sufficient demand for new childcare slots in targeted areas; pretty basic response, would have like more detail; appreciate evaluations of tier 2 and 3 supports and linking it to the long term outcomes, long term outcomes are not qualified.</p>

<p>2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>95</p>	<p>Superior response; 60 day start up plan is very detailed; included 8 objectives with timelines and multiple strategies; indicates innovative approaches; planning retreat, listening tour, regional advisory council; detailed and complete; liked specialized training once staff is hired; seems like an aggressive implementation plan considering new vendor proposing statewide, feasible though due to products available and 15 staff; 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.</p>
<p><b>Offeror Qualifications</b></p>			
<p>3.1 Company Profile and Experience</p>	<p>1000</p>	<p>950</p>	<p>Superior response; liked they use the word direct response to a problem; discussed fragmented system of TA would be resolved; strengthening individual relationships between providers and TA staff; discussed fragmentation and resolving that and would like to see that; strong QRS experience; liked their problem identification statement; showed initiative in collecting Montana data, was a small sample; didn't see a lot of rural state experience, however it appears they would be bringing some Montana experts onto their team; loved the philosophy statement of "relationships alone are not enough"; described several significant projects, included outcomes achieved, projects aligned with RFP requirements; the Indiana project had successes in reduces safe sleep violations which is a current monitoring finding for Montana; included focus on school age which will be an upcoming need for Montana; 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.</p>
<p><b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b></p>			
<p>4.1.1 Budget</p>	<p>1000</p>	<p>930</p>	<p>Good response; budget is appropriate for number of staff proposing to hire; facility costs generic and appear to be low because location not determined yet; matched the counties to the overall budget; allocations for personnel seemed appropriate, indirects lower which was good</p>

4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000	760	Good response; appreciate the slot expansion grants out of their own budget, shows commitment to quality; had extensive PD for staff but appropriate; loved two accreditations specialists; had a very appropriate in-state travel budget, which shows they intend to have their people travel and the for locations; supplies and equipment information is confusing due to being based on a per person rate; questions around the technology solution and costs built in lead to believe we are paying for customization of a system and then question of ownership of the system; a big part of their technical assistance is a proprietary training and technical assistance platform; discuss 21 positions, but in narrative discuss 15 new staff question on the equipment purchase seems high because of that
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>9,118</b>	
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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	acknowledged in eMACS by answering "yes"
<b>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>9,618</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

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

**Total Points Awarded: 3465**

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
----------	-----------------	----------------	---

<b>Scope of Services</b>			<b>Per evaluation process in RFP, Section 2.7 received a failed response and is disqualified from further evaluation.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	Pass/Fail	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	<b>700</b>	490	Fair response; separated out by each provider group and set goals accordingly; comprehensive data driven plan which allows them to created detailed maps identifying areas of highest needs and priority; digital marketing campaign and series of virtual and informational sessions; goals were not quantified; detailed plan for meeting goals was a requirement and response was focused on data, other action words are provide guidance and resources, work closely with cultural organizations and communities and collaborate with the department, which didn't feel like a detailed plan or a vision of what the service might look like; plan to provide incentives to support retention work with employers, but no detail; didn't mention how they would support vulnerable populations; unclear what partnerships will do, who they are or how goals will be achieved; discuss planning for identified high needs populations and different groups, but plans should be identified at this point; 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.

<p>2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>800</b></p>	<p>555</p>	<p>Fair response; discussed adult learning philosophy; strong data plan; no detail on the content of their TA; use a lot of vague phrases, such as "our comprehensive approach rooted in best practice", but no details on what that means; page 9 identify they will develop a TA program, no detail on the required TA for federal categories; lacked detail on the "how"; honoring the knowledge with nice comprehensive library of resources; liked use of provider testimonials for marketing; TA tracking will include pre &amp; post TA assessments; really generic and restating the RFP requirements, most robust is the evaluation process 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.</p>
<p>2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>540</p>	<p>Good response; nice proactive system of reminders; leveraged ECP and technical assistance for COPA; liked customer satisfaction survey; will complete longitudinal studies; struggle with the suggestion related to the practitioner registry, seems unrealistic to obtain registry deadlines; don't understand leveraging the registry for career advancement, may show a lack of service area knowledge; addressed TA priority areas; lots of detail around evaluation strategies, but wonder if goals can be accomplished within the State's current data environment; liked the automated reminder system for registry renewals; discussed comprehensive support for COPA, they will need to develop a lot of items though and don't feel they utilized resources already available to them; strong evaluation plan, but actual technical strategies were either basic, vague or needed to be developed.</p>

<p>2.3.6          Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>500</p>	<p>Fair response; similar strategies offered from previous questions; liked collecting success stories to showcase positive impact of licensing; defined marketing campaign to reach potential providers; have strategies for CQI; repeated the prior response and didn't change much; felt duplicative and vague; outside of the statement to say requirements would be met there was nothing else for details; doesn't feel like they know Montana; 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.</p>
<p>2.4          Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system</p>	<p><b>700</b></p>	<p>500</p>	<p>Fair response; lots of ideas but same as previous sections, no depth to the response; comprehensive guidance on meeting the educational and training requirements for registry placement; duplicative of the above two sections; vague and no implementation detail; gave a statement to say what they would do to provide services but no details on the "how"; looked like the first part of response was added by a mistake to section 2.4; thoughtful strategy around screening; rest lacked detail outside of data tracking and analysis; 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.</p>

<p>2.5 Emergency Preparedness</p>	<p><b>300</b></p>	<p>220</p>	<p>Fair response; doesn't appear to have done research as to what already exists in Montana; stating will start with an initial planning phase and appears they will build emergency preparedness from scratch; liked the childcare matching system in case of emergencies and collaborate with local and state entities; training a statewide network of providers to provide the service; will establish network of guardian programs; communication protocols with already prepared EP messaging; will collaborate with local EP entities but no details on how that will occur; didn't do their homework and starting at ground zero with people who are established and in place, very short, minimal response; gives a sense they feel Montana doesn't have emergency preparedness already in place; 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.</p>
<p>2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing</p>	<p><b>500</b></p>	<p>370</p>	<p>Fair response; tier communications with licensing was good; real time data was good; felt like there was holes and don't feel like they understood the importance of collaborating with licensing; proposing strategy sessions to evaluate the effectiveness of collaboration data tracking around TA and the progress of voluntary and mandatory CCL plans including licensing compliance rates: annual strategy sessions might be interesting, it is the only thing in person with the licensers, they don't understand the structure of the licensing; gave 1/3 of a page of strategies, most of response is on data tracking and review, which appears to mean they don't understand the true collaboration with licensing; 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.</p>

2.7 Criminal Background Checks	500	290	Failed response; ensure team is trained on requirements; partnerships with other organizations that complete fingerprinting; use the word "may", at this point the decisions should be made, briefly discuss outreach and process to refer to other fingerprinting services; stated they will collaborate with CCL didn't mention locations for Livescans or how to maintain a zero wait list; generally restates the RFP requirements with very few specific strategies as a response; basically going to farm out the work in this area, don't feel they understand the 'rural' Montana which is a huge miss; no plan, no understanding of what currently happens; no plan to ensure a zero wait list, no mention of Livescans; relying on 3rd party to meet a fundamental component of the contract; 2.7.2, 2.7.3.2, and 2.7.3.3 were not addressed in the response; response does not give a clear plan that they can meet the needs of the State; 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		
2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 4	400		
2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100		
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000		
<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	1000		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	1000		
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>3,465</b>	



<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>3,465</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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, Offeror Qualifications, Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

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

**Total Points Awarded:** 965

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services</b>			<b>Per evaluation process in RFP, Section 2.3.1 through 2.3.4 received a failed response and is disqualified from further evaluation.</b>
2.1 General Requirements	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	P	Passed
2.2 Recruitment of New Licensed/Registered Child Care Providers	<b>700</b>	515	Fair response; feels like an IT solution, attempting to retro fit into a TA RFP; goals are not quantifiable; section 2.2.4 all action plans (the how) are very vague in response; don't get a picture of how these items will be completed; did address data collection question; gave us a 2 year access to platform, very unclear how that will meet contractual needs, nice ideas for slot expansion but need more details; some examples of "identifying target groups", "will offer tailored support" but no explanation of how that will happen; hard to understand how strategies will meet the goals; plan to offer incentives, unclear on how it will work and how much; discussed a cohort program and one of a kind mentoring and support with no details on how it will work; 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.

2.3.1 - 2.3.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	800	450	Failed response; no description of how will accomplish items in the response; reads like they are selling a product to us and leaves you with too many questions on the detail; response guidelines stated we need to be given the "how" and this response does not accomplish that; discuss partnerships to collaborate but no plan to establish or build partnerships; successful implementation of the proposed IT solution hinges on collaboration; felt like we are expected to buy modules and a canned product and only 4 staff and not all full time, only supervisor is a FT staff for project; does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.
2.3.5 Retention of Licensed/Registered Child Care Through Technical Assistance	700		
2.3.6 Technical Assistance for Programs Wanting to Become Licensed/Registered and Newly Licensed/Registered Child Care Programs	700		
2.4 Supporting Licensed/Registered Child Care Through the Quality Recognition system	700		
2.5 Emergency Preparedness	300		
2.6 Collaborate with Child Care Licensing	500		
2.7 Criminal Background Checks	500		
2.8 Statewide Consumer Education Efforts	500		
2.9.1 Functionality of Service – attachment 4.1 Tab 4	400		
2.9.2 - 2.9.5 Functionality of Service	600		
2.10 Goal Setting and Evaluation of Services	500		
2.11 Timeline for Complete Implementation	100		
<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>			
3.1 Company Profile and Experience	1000		

<b>Cost Proposal (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	<b>1000</b>		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	<b>1000</b>		
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>965</b>	
<b>STEP 1 MUST SCORE 80% OR ABOVE = 8,000</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>TOTAL RFP SCORE</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>965</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH**

**Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance**

**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.

## 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	500
Superior (95-100%)	475 - 500
Good (75-94%)	370 - 470
Fair (60-74%)	295 - 370
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 295

## Technical Scoring Session

DPHHS-RFP-2024-0544KH

Child Care Development Fund: Regulatory and Quality Support and Technical Assistance

Date: 8/22/2024 & 8/23/2024

Time: 8:30 AM to 5:00PM

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

Evaluation Committee Members:	Jill Christensen Tracy Moseman Chauntel Lucier Sally Tillman
Subject Matter Experts:	Josh Clement Shandi Hayes Cindy Moulton-Straughn James Eastlick
Contracts Officer:	Kristi L. Hernandez
Order of Evaluation:	Alphabetical
Scoring Method:	Consensus