



## 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)

DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH

Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET

Category	Possible Points	Dawson County Health Department	Evergreen Kids Corner Inc	Mountain Home Montana	Peace Place	Toby's House Crisis Nursery
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>						
2.1 Eligibility	P/F	F	P	P	P	P
2.2 - 2.2.15 General Requirements	P/F	0	P	P	P	P
2.2.16 Work Plan and logic Model	150	0	125	120	140	140
2.2.17 Evidence-Based or Evidence-Informed Program	100	0	85	82	84	94
2.2.18 Partnership and Collaboration	200	0	170	189	130	148
2.3 - 2.4 Requirements and Billing and Payment	P/F	0	P	P	P	P
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>						
3.1.1 Parent/Caregiver Letters of Support	100	0	90	90	74	92
3.1.2 Local Community Partners Letters of Support	100	0	92	74	94	92
3.2 Company Profile and Experience	100	0	80	95	91	89
3.3 Resumes	50	0	40	45	47	43
<b>Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (workbook)</b>						
4.1.1 Budget	100	0	80	90	66	94
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	100	0	74	80	70	84
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>876</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	50	0	50	50	0	50
<b>TOTAL RFP POINTS</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>926</b>

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH  
Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Scope and Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, and Budget Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Dawson County Health  
Department

**Total Points Awarded:** 0

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			<b>Per the Evaluation Process, Achieve Minimum Score, A "fail" for any individual evaluation criteria will result in proposal disqualification at the discretion of the procurement officer. Response was disqualified from the process after failing Section 2.1. per consensus of the evaluation committee.</b>
2.1 Eligibility	P/F	F	Failed response; not able to locate an acknowledgement and agreement required in the response guidelines for 2.1.2, did not specifically define a self-defined service area; found responses throughout, hard to locate and were unclear because were not identified or labeled; identified as a county health department, included home visiting program, parent groups, and parents as teachers; does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter; per the Evaluation Process criteria of RFP, response is disqualified from further evaluation and the process.
2.2 - 2.2.15 General Requirements	P/F		
2.2.16 Work Plan and logic Model	150		
2.2.17 Evidence-Based or Evidence-Informed Program	100		
2.2.18 Partnership and Collaboration	200		
2.3 - 2.4 Requirements and Billing and Payment	P/F		
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1.1 Parent/Caregiver Letters of Support	100		
3.1.2 Local Community Partners Letters of Support	100		
3.2 Company Profile and Experience	100		
3.3 Resumes	50		
<b>Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	100		
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	100		
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>0</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	50		Per Evaluation Process didn't meet the 80% required to move to Step 2
<b>TOTAL RFP POINTS</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>0</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH  
Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Scope and Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, and Budget Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name: Evergreen Kids Corner Inc.**

**Total Points Awarded: 886**

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			
2.1 Eligibility	P/F	P	Good response, acknowledgements were included and service area was included; demonstrated an understanding of primary and secondary prevention.
2.2 - 2.2.15 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; specifically acknowledged and agreed to each requirement; easy to find in response; provided some additional detail in each component of RFP requirements.
2.2.16 Work Plan and Logic Model	150	125	Good response; fairly adequate response, met basic requirements of RFP; didn't provide additional information; provided a clear work plan and logic model; some items were unclear in work plan, evaluations not beginning until months 11 and 12, one indicator was unclear, evaluation reports, indicating progress on key performance indicators and outcome measures does not seem to have measurable criteria; inconsistencies between the logic model and work plan, items identified in one and not the other, example is IECMHC.
2.2.17 Evidence-Based or Evidence-Informed Program	100	85	Good response; met requirements, included overall approach to program; described early childhood consultation partnership which has a promising rating; used language from the clearinghouse to describe it; didn't find 2.2.17 labeled or identified clearly, some items discussed but were not noted in clearinghouse; description was general and not specific enough.
2.2.18 Partnership and Collaboration	200	170	Good response; describe historical partnership with families, provided opportunities for input on organization strategic planning; parents are involved in training and community events; describe improvement plans over 12 months; acknowledged 2.2.18.1, self-assessment; community collaboration described the current state of partnerships across sectors and provided a response to each point under community collaboration, however, some statements were broad and without a description of how they would complete the activity; met requirement for partnerships; had a thoughtful plan for community partnership, but some gaps in the plans provided; added language describing their outreach plan for rural and tribal communities.

2.3 - 2.4 Requirements and Billing and Payment	P/F	P	Good response; provided agreements for strengthening families month; met all the RFP requirements and acknowledged them.
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1.1 Parent/Caregiver Letters of Support	100	90	Good response; parent letters were detailed, seemed like parents on the board and parents receiving services; were no signatures to the letters, would have liked to have that in there; speaks to the involvement of parents and leadership; meets expectations, appreciates the organization of having contact information before the letters.
3.1.2 Local Community Partners Letters of Support	100	92	Good response; met requirement with one community letter; letter came from Early Childhood Coalition.
3.2 Company Profile and Experience	100	80	Good response; addressed each component of company profile and experience section, section on reaching underserved populations didn't describe how services are tailored to support needs; current programming described doesn't reflect primary or secondary prevention; the underserved definition didn't match description in 2.2.15; didn't provide any examples or a clear description of how they will provide services.
3.3 Resumes	50	40	Good response; met requirements; quality of resume seemed to be lacking; very brief descriptions and lacked information.
<b>Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	100	80	Good response; met all RFP requirements of section; cash match for year 1 didn't equal minimally to 10%.
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	100	74	Fair response; minimal detail included; questions on source of payments for direct early childhood education services, "Are these payments from families for services rendered or from other funding sources?", need the information on if it is federal funding; would have needed to have more information included on ECE Services and Workshops, unclear on what this 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.
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>836</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	50	50	acknowledged through RFP submission by answering "yes" in eMACS
<b>TOTAL RFP POINTS</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>886</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH  
Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Scope and Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, and Budget Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name: Mountain Home Montana**

**Total Points Awarded: 915**

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			
2.1 Eligibility	P/F	P	Good response; met RFP requirements.
2.2 - 2.2.15 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; met RFP requirements.
2.2.16 Work Plan and Logic Model	150	120	Good response; wanted more information from the work plan and logic model; included work plan and logic model, acknowledge to the work with University of Montana; some activities are scheduled to start before funding begins and doesn't clearly go through funding period; noted it seems like an aggressive work plan and concerns if they can attain the goals; unclear with child care assessment tool not defined; MOU with prevention providers, unclear on that because the RFP requirement is to provide prevention services.
2.2.17 Evidence-Based or Evidence-Informed Program	100	82	Good response; provided an evidence based model in partnership with mental health consultation; provided a list of programs including a mix of evidence based/informed programs and non-evidence based /informed programs, not clear if CBT program offered is part of a specific evidence based program; wasn't clear if they used the descriptions from the clearinghouse; Nurturing Parenting has 2 programs and they don't specify which one, one is able to be rated and one is not able to be rated in the clearinghouse; Circle of Security Parenting is also not able to be rated; didn't use the language from the clearinghouse as specified in the response guidelines of the RFP; mentioned childcare staff training of several evidence based practices.

2.2.18 Partnership and Collaboration	200	189	Superior response; described the creation of the funded program as a response to voiced needs of families; parents provide evaluation for programming they are involved in, they have a CORE Team which is client led and provides input on program development implementation and evaluation; they intend to invite members of the CORE Team to community collaboration discussions; described the need for collaborative work and collaborative relationships are currently in place and have plans to improve collaborative efforts through MOU's and community trainings; describe a warm handoff as an innovative example; appreciated they discussed collaborative efforts outside of the city of Missoula to rural communities; 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.
2.3 - 2.4 Requirements and Billing and Payment	P/F	P	Good response; met the RFP requirements by acknowledgement and agreement.
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			
3.1.1 Parent/Caregiver Letters of Support	100	90	Good response; letters were good, appeared that is was copied and pasted because of all the similar comments between the two, however had some individualization for each parent and signed the letters; specifically discussed the involvement in parent leadership and specifically proposed funded program; appeared formatted and meets expectations, contact information is there, 2 generation success in parent letter one.
3.1.2 Local Community Partners Letters of Support	100	74	Fair response; thoughtful letter meeting the RFP requirements; community from United Way and reflected a clear understanding of the agency, however an Early Childhood coalition exists in Missoula County and offeror qualifications require that the letter be from the coalition if one exists, which is Missoula Healthy Start; thoughtful detail and meets expectations; 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.
3.2 Company Profile and Experience	100	95	Superior response; provided a clear description of history of organization and current organizational information and a description of services to the at risk populations; large diverse board with successful fundraising efforts described; board has a lot of parents, specifically mother's; appreciated the breakdown of funding sources, had a really strong representation of board members from community members, except no one identified as an Early Childhood Coalition; 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.



3.3 Resumes	50	45	Good response; appreciated resumes were easy to review because formatting was similar to each other; very in depth; inclusion of job description and wasn't included in our requirements but was very helpful to have in response, in lieu of a resume for that position because it wasn't filled currently.
<b>Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	100	90	Good response; met expectations; met RFP requirements; felt budget is clear, added in information into locked cells and not sure how they accomplished that; included a larger cash match than required.
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	100	80	Good response; provided narrative describing justification of line items amounts in the budget; narrative indicates there is additional funding that can be considered hard cash match however it is in the incorrect section, under subsequent years cash match requirements and added information into locked cells; inconsistent details throughout, sometimes items were clear and others were lacking details.
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>			
	<b>1000</b>	<b>865</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	50	50	acknowledged thorough RFP submission by answering "yes" in eMACS
<b>TOTAL RFP POINTS</b>			
	<b>1050</b>	<b>915</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH  
Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Scope and Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, and Budget Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name:** Peace Place

**Total Points Awarded:** 796

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			
2.1 Eligibility	P/F	P	Good response; very thorough; very good response, but it was hard to identify what services were identified as primary and secondary.
2.2 - 2.2.15 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; would have appreciated some numbering in the section to follow it easier but every requirement was addressed.
2.2.16 Work Plan and Logic Model	150	140	Good response; very strong work plan with start/end dates and was very structured; both logic and work plan included detail and timelines and best practice approaches; work plan began prior to the start of funding and ended on 6/30/2025 last activities noted well before the end of funding; a full 3 months before the end; indicators are measurable and aligned; one vague strategy, but was practical and obtainable and made sense.
2.2.17 Evidence-Based or Evidence-Informed Program	100	84	Good response; detail provided about the evidence based/informed program; describe the services offered including respite care, Carolina curriculum; Circle of Parents; and trauma informed care as well as research based interventions; however, program didn't utilize clearinghouse language for those programs which appear in the clearinghouse such as Circle of Parents, which is not able to be rated; are all research based Carolina curriculum.
2.2.18 Partnership and Collaboration	200	130	Fair response; didn't address section 2.2.18.1, on parent partnership; did provide information on community partners including the prevention task force and CFS; describe plans to reach the rural communities; proposal didn't describe in detail how community partners work together to make decisions; lacked information and didn't describe in detail the partnerships; didn't see the CBCAP self-assessment; 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 - 2.4 Requirements and Billing and Payment	P/F	P	Good response; meets RFP requirements.
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			

3.1.1 Parent/Caregiver Letters of Support	100	74	Fair response; doesn't provide contact information for one of the writers of the letters as the RFP requirements states to give the State the opportunity to verify the information if needed from the support letters received; letter received were very detailed and a good response though; 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.
3.1.2 Local Community Partners Letters of Support	100	94	Good response; met requirements; call out of the past involvement in the Early Childhood coalition and ongoing efforts to revive the coalition; call out in involvement in the prevent child abuse task force.
3.2 Company Profile and Experience	100	91	Good response; met RFP requirements, covered the history of the organization and current programming, the board and other leadership.
3.3 Resumes	50	47	Good response; all three role types were represented and one with a job description; appreciated a thorough job description for the executive director position in lieu of a resume.
<b>Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	100	66	Fair response; budget didn't equal the max amount possibly awarded, requested more than could be approved and therefore, was unclear on what the CTF program would be funding; column B doesn't reflect the CTF budget amount only; 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.
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	100	70	Fair response; initially met requirements with minimal detail; administrative indirect costs were not completed; and didn't specify how much was coming from United Way for cash match funds; missing narrative pieces for administrative fees and marketing and didn't comply with State mileage rates with travel listed; 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>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>796</b>	Per Evaluation Process, Step 1, didn't meet the 80% required to move to Step 2
<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	50		Per Evaluation Process didn't meet the 80% required to move to Step 2
<b>TOTAL RFP POINTS</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>796</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH  
Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP**

**Individual Scoring Matrix**

The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1000 points: The Scope and Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, and Budget Proposal will be evaluated based on the scoring guide.

**Offeror (Company) Name: Toby's House Crisis Nursey**

**Total Points Awarded: 926**

Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
<b>Scope of Services/Provision of Services</b>			
2.1 Eligibility	P/F	P	Good response; very thorough; lots of extra detail.
2.2 - 2.2.15 General Requirements	P/F	P	Good response; above and beyond acknowledgement of requirements.
2.2.16 Work Plan and Logic Model	150	140	Good response; good work plan seems like realistic goals; clear logic model and work plan; timeline begins prior to funding but continues through the funding period of September 2025; logic model was cohesive however not all indicator describe the specific target goal to be measured.
2.2.17 Evidence-Based or Evidence-Informed Program	100	94	Good response; clear description of work plan including submission to the developers of the tool which was impressive worth mentioning; didn't indicate the rating from the clearinghouse for the program; appreciated they sought and obtained approval for the modification to the promoting 1st relationships approach; very impactful and important to seek approval from developers to stay within fidelity.
2.2.18 Partnership and Collaboration	200	148	Fair response; described the current status of parent partnership and they would potentially add a parent as a board member; community collaboration section was pretty general; community partnership area was lacking, listed partners but didn't describe how collaboration would actually occur; mentioned the CBCAP self-assessment would be used; wasn't a lot of detail about 12 month plan; lacking parent engagement and didn't give examples on how the current parent engagement was set up; brief plan of how they would engage with family and parents there was no plan identified as the collaboration plan required in RFP; 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 - 2.4 Requirements and Billing and Payment	P/F	P	Good response; meets RFP requirements.
<b>Company Profile and Experience</b>			

3.1.1 Parent/Caregiver Letters of Support	100	92	Good responses, met the RFP requirements; included contact information along with the letters; appreciated the information they compiled as a preamble to the letters, provided the information with the description of services; letter from a parent who has utilized the services in the past and a parent who is currently utilizing the services; letters were not signed
3.1.2 Local Community Partners Letters of Support	100	92	Good response; provided community letter, referenced PCAN; preamble description and closest to a prevention coalition they have; provided an additional provider from the Part C provider.
3.2 Company Profile and Experience	100	89	Good response; described past and current services provided board of directors, however, the experience with underserved populations provides general information; appreciated the detailed numbering and labeling to make information accessible; minimal past experience.
3.3 Resumes	50	43	Good response; all roles were identified up front and meets RFP expectations; identified most of the staff, but they don't have job descriptions developed for other staff is concerning; wasn't in resume format, which is what was preferred.
<b>Budget and Detailed Budget Narrative (workbook)</b>			
4.1.1 Budget	100	94	Good response; met RFP requirements and indicated issues with the spreadsheet, mentioned hard cash not included for personnel only included for fringe benefits and in kind match was changed around in the 2nd year; hard to make sense of the hard cash match and the switch to the in kind match; entire complete response with explanation for the calculation error/issue; high emphasis on personnel is commendable.
4.1.2 Budget Narrative	100	84	Good response; met RFP requirements; narrative doesn't describe how the administration costs will be used; description of marketing expenses is unclear, provides basic information on the source of the cash match, basically is an attestation it is not federal; CTF funded FTE status for the additional childcare workers was not added to the 2nd page of the narrative; numbers are different in comparison from the budget submitted to the narrative in the response, concern with inconsistencies.
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>			
	<b>1000</b>	<b>876</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	50	50	acknowledged through RFP submission by answering "yes" in eMACS
<b>TOTAL RFP POINTS</b>			
	<b>1050</b>	<b>926</b>	

**DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH**  
**Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP**

**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	94.0%
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%)	470 - 500
Good (75-94%)	370 - 470
Fair (60-74%)	295 - 370
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 295

## Technical Scoring Session

DPHHS-RFP-2024-0536KH

Children's Trust Fund Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect RFP

Date: July 1, 2024

Time: All day (8:00 AM to 3:00 PM)

Location: DPHHS USF&G Building

1625 11th Ave

Helena, MT

Evaluation Committee Members:

Sandy Cade

Jill Christensen

MacKenzie Forbis

Joshua Kendrick

Subject Matter Experts:

Josh Clement

Lona Gregor-Martin

Susan Wensel

Contracts Officer:

Kristi L. Hernandez

Order of Evaluation:

Alphabetical

Scoring Method:

Consensus