



MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor
Misty Ann Giles, Director

doa.mt.gov

406.444.2460

doadirector@mt.gov

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name:

Solicitation Number:

Solicitation Close Date:

Notice of Intent to Award Post Date:

Issuing Contracts Officer contact information:

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

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

Apparent Successful Offeror(s)

Unsuccessful Offeror(s)

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB
Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET

Category	Possible Points	Corona Research, Inc	Market Decisions, LLC	Public Consulting Group	Rathbone Falvey Research	Tansi Consulting, LLC	Zilo International Group, LLC
Requirements							
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	P	P	P	P	P
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	P	P	P	P	P
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	P	P	P	P	P
Section 4.0 Provision of Services							
Section 4.1	235	200	235	221	175	200	173
Section 4.2	67	39	67	67	55	45	40
Section 4.3	33	25	33	28	30	20	25
Section 4.4	67	39	67	63	60	45	50
Section 4.5	67	40	67	63	50	45	40
Section 4.6	33	24	33	30	30	24	20
Section 4.7	33	20	33	30	30	22	20
Section 4.8	33	25	33	33	30	20	20
Section 4.9	33	25	33	33	25	20	20
Section 4.10	33	21	33	31	28	20	20
Section 4.11	33	22	33	33	26	25	20
Section 4.12	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
Company Profile and Experience							
Company Profile and Experience	100	85	100	95	80	75	80
References							
References	P/F	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost Proposal							
Total Budget Request	200	188	187	189	187	200	200
Equal Pay for Montana Women							
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	50	50	50	50	50
Technical Total Points	800	598	800	760	652	594	561
Cost Proposal Total Points	200	188	187	189	187	200	200
Technical + cost	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Total Points Awarded	1050	836	1037	999	889	844	811

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB

Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,000 points. The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, and Resumes will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Budget Request and the formula.

Offeror (Company) Name: Corona Research, Inc			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Requirements			
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	This didn't have a specific section for the requirement but was addressed in the documents. The elements were present, but no separate sheet to address.
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	This was addressed in the monthly reports, but it wasn't obvious. It was hard to find in the documents sent, did find a link to page 10 of the Offeror Qualifications, that led to a non-company site.
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	This mentioned different procedures throughout the response and provided and explanation of how they will mitigate. No specific reference or attachment in this section, but section 4.3 did provide more specifics. The elements were present.
Section 4.0 Provision of Services			
Section 4.1	235	200	They didn't outline the specific pieces of the question, but they mention having 2 decades of experience, with experience with disabilities and services associated. They are familiar with screen readers and accessibility platforms but don't have VR experience. They have experience with conferences and working with diverse cultures, including using non-jargon language, and Spanish-speaking translators, and are mobile and screen-reader friendly. They didn't give enough information on working and doing surveys geared toward those with disabilities and didn't touch on VR.
Section 4.2	67	39	They didn't have any experience with VR and didn't provide any explanation about how they would meet the requirements.

Offeror (Company) Name: Corona Research, Inc			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.3	33	25	They had good information on how they did it previously, but what would happen if no responses are received, who will be reaching out to the participants? Liked the examples of 'small vs. large' survey sizes and mentions for quicker and easier questions. They will not be sending out surveys on Monday or Friday because they won't be done, and use unique survey links for each participant. They have clear ideas to ensure reliability, follow-ups, and clear communication.
Section 4.4	67	39	They did get responses from previous surveys, but no elaboration of how they completed these and provided no examples. Concise but no elaboration on the answer related to industry best practices. They talked about follow-up and gift card incentives but didn't answer or provide any examples of how they achieved in the past.
Section 4.5	67	40	They provided an answer to what was requested, and the components were there. They provided a couple of sentences but no elaboration, addressed the email surveys being flagged as spam, they had an idea to announce that a survey was going to be sent, and this would be on the agency. The answers were brief and there is worry about the reliance on email surveys.
Section 4.6	33	24	They can customize reports for clients that were liked, but it was hard to understand they don't have a general report template that refined reporting overtime as needed. The customized report will be suited to our needs but no set report for disabilities, would have liked more elaboration.
Section 4.7	33	20	They provided a clear concise response which shows ongoing monitoring and course correcting. They are missing stuff and didn't describe in detail how they will monitor the responses, there was a misunderstanding in the last sentence, who will be sending reminders? They provided a response that was minimal, but no examples were provided, they have clients send reminders.
Section 4.8	33	25	The question was confusing and was confused about how they answered. They have a lack of knowledge of VR program, this was missing context. They demonstrated an understanding and experience in measuring outcomes and feedback.

Offeror (Company) Name: Corona Research, Inc			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.9	33	25	This question was confusing when posted, but the company had a thoughtful interpretation of the survey results, with no further explanation.
Section 4.10	33	21	The anticipated issues show an understanding of how clients would prefer to take surveys and incentive responses. With all the survey experience would have liked more examples and anticipated issues.
Section 4.11	33	22	They talked about the 'first year, will be the true test', which is concerning. They didn't address the time it will take for survey execution which seemed to cover all the topic areas and addressed incentives as well as most of the mandatory requirements. The timeline provided was not detailed.
Section 4.12	33	33	All companies were awarded full points for this category, the question was missing from the Scope of Work.
Company Profile and Experience			
Company Profile and Experience	100	85	They have experience in social sciences and conducting surveys. They didn't elaborate on the current surveys they are doing, and generally lacking information. Company has two PHD level staff members, and 2/3 of the surveys are from repeat customers, including work in Montana. Appreciated the inclusion of data security and AI tools
References			
References	P/F		
Cost Proposal			
Total Budget Request	200	188	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
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	
Technical Total Points	800	598	
Cost Proposal Total Points	200	188	
Technical + cost	50	50	

Offeror (Company) Name: Corona Research, Inc			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Total Points Awarded	1050	836	

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB

Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,000 points. The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, and Resumes will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Budget Request and the formula.

Offeror (Company) Name: Market Decisions, LLC			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Requirements			
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	This was very well organized with clear responses to all sections. With lots of VR experience.
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	The response was present, they have already have software in place for this, but no visual examples, although they did provide a sample of how they will provide the services.
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	The policy and procedures were mentioned throughout with an explanation of how they are put into place. They explained how they would identify and mitigate potential response issues, but nothing specific.
Section 4.0 Provision of Services			
Section 4.1	235	235	They had lots of VR experience and loved how they outlined the response, they mentioned ADA and Universal with extensive experience with VR and DEI of the team. Extensive experience surveying public rehabilitation facilities in ten (10) states. Resumes all looked like they had masters-level degrees and would use storytelling for reporting.
Section 4.2	67	67	With extensive experience surveying public rehabilitation facilities in 10 states, referenced reviews, and work throughout, Dr. Robertson has 30 years of experience in VR.
Section 4.3	33	33	Liked the primary survey types, and the effectiveness of responses for VR, including in-house resources like a call-center. They provided the software they used called VoxCo. Their experience in the field has shown the most effective methods related to VR, they have experience and can back this up with previous survey work.
Section 4.4	67	67	They consistently achieved target response rates and answered sections with no missing information that was sufficient. Would have liked statistics as further evidence of ability.

Offeror (Company) Name: Market Decisions, LLC			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.5	67	67	Liked how they talked about issues with smaller programs and provided an explanation of how they addressed collaboration with an agency to boost surveys. They have plenty of experience already and have ways to deal with issues. Experience in the field has shown the most effective methods that worked in the past like posting to the agency website to show legitimacy of the survey.
Section 4.6	33	33	This was a thorough response, which referenced the section above instead of duplicating, essential components of the report, summary, and graphs to build on the monthly report for annual surveys. Liked how they didn't repeat the information.
Section 4.7	33	33	They provided examples and targeted areas to monitor responses, liked how they would deal with negative feedback, and would be in close contact with VR to assist with data before being presented to leadership. The program manager monitors data daily handles issues as they arise and conducts quality checks.
Section 4.8	33	33	Liked the checks and balances and challenges to make improvements, this was answered well and included experience in knowing how to deliver results.
Section 4.9	33	33	Odd question but has experience with VR, the answer is consistent with common issues in the field. They know VR and mention a lack of awareness of the program to understand the difficulty clients might have with answering the survey question.
Section 4.10	33	33	They have experience knowing how to deliver results and already know what gives best results, which is phone calls, knowledge to complete surveys. Would have liked a sample, but they have worked with 14 different programs in different states.
Section 4.11	33	33	Very impressive timeline that fits with the needs, they didn't put the mandatory requirements into a chart, but they were addressed. A thorough timeline that meets the deadlines of the individuals responsible, seems to hit all the points
Section 4.12	33	33	All companies were awarded full points for this category, the question was missing from the Scope of Work.
Company Profile and Experience			

Offeror (Company) Name: Market Decisions, LLC			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience	100	100	This response showed extensive experience with consumer satisfaction surveys across 14 programs and 10 states. They have extensive experience surveying public rehabilitation facilities in 10 states. They have plenty of experience including master-level researchers, Dr. Robertson has 30 years of experience.
References			
References	P/F		
Cost Proposal			
Total Budget Request	200	187	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
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	
Technical Total Points	800	800	
Cost Proposal Total Points	200	187	
Technical + cost	50	50	
Total Points Awarded	1050	1037	

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB

Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,000 points. The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, and Resumes will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Budget Request and the formula.

Offeror (Company) Name: Public Consulting Group, LLC			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Requirements			
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	This was addressed in section 4.11.
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	They provided a dashboard example.
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	This was touched on in the executive summary.

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB

Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,000 points. The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, and Resumes will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Budget Request and the formula.

Offeror (Company) Name: Rathbone Falvey Research			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Requirements			
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	Information is present.
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	Information is present.
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	These were located on page 5, but was not labeled.

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB

Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,000 points. The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, and Resumes will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Budget Request and the formula.

Offeror (Company) Name: Tansi Consulting, LLC			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Requirements			
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	Present.
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	Couldn't find an example but explanation is present.
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	Addressed in section 4.3.

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB

Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Individual Scoring Matrix

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,000 points. The Provision of Services, Statement of Qualifications, Company Profile and Experience, and Resumes will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the Total Budget Request and the formula.

Offeror (Company) Name: Zilo International Group, LLC			Total Points Awarded:
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Requirements			
Mandatory Requirements	P/F	P	Present.
Strategies: Monthly report sample	P/F	P	They provided a screenshot.
Strategies: Policy/Procedures	P/F	P	Hard-time following.

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB
Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

SCORING GUIDE

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

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

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

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

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

Score	33	67	100	200	235
Superior (95-100%)	31 - 33	63 - 67	94 - 100	188 - 200	220.9 - 235

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB
Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Cost Worksheet

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

Cost			
Points Available	200		
Lowest Cost	\$69,999.00		
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
Corona Research	\$74,656.00	188	
Market Decisions, LLC	\$74,823.00	187	
Public Consulting Group, LLC	\$73,999.00	189	
Rathbone Falvey Research	\$75,000.00	187	
Tansi Consulting, LLC	\$69,999.00	200	
Zilo International Group, LLC	\$70,000.00	200	

Technical Scoring Session

DPHHS-RFP-2025-0579AB
Vocational Rehabilitation Consumer
Satisfaction Survey

Date	Thursday, January 30, 2025
Time	9:30:00 AM
Location	Microsoft Teams
Evaluation Committee Members:	Allyson Talskala, Lacey Conzelman, Celine Cline
Contracts Officer:	Amanda Battin, amanda.battin2@mt.gov, 406.444.9665
Order of Evaluation:	Alphabetical
Scoring Method:	Consensus

Meeting Summary

Started evaluations at 9:15	
1st coffee break	10:53 - 11:00
lunch	1206 - 1230 - recording stopped for lunch
final break to complete scoring sheet links	2:13 - 3:00 recording stopped during this period
Next steps discussion	3-3:11 - completion of meeting