



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)

LEG-RFP-2025-0036AB
Facilitation of IEE Working Group under HB 153 (2025)

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET		
Category	Possible Points	The National Center on Education and the Economy

Evaluated RFP Sections		
Offeror Qualifications, specific examples	200	195
IEEWG Facilitation: detailed description, materials, additional recommendations	200	190
Commitment to meet the aggressive timeline	P/F	P
Cost proposal	100	100
Equal Pay for MT Women	25	25
Total of all categories	525	510

LEG-RFP-2025-0036AB			
Facilitation of IEE Working Group under HB 153 (2025)			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, based on a total of 500 points. The ability to meet the offeror qualifications, detailed description, materials, and additional recommendations portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. The commitment to meet the aggressive timeline will be scored based on a pass/fail basis, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set in the evaluation process.			
Offeror (Company) Name: The National Center on Education and the Economy			Total Points Awarded: 510
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Evaluated RFP Sections			
Offeror Qualifications, specific examples	200	195	Overall, this was a very strong proposal, with three strong points: (1) decades of experience in space and the ability to benchmark domestic and international schools to complete assessments in other countries; (2) they have completed facilitation work with other commissions, and they have worked with Nevada, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. (2) They reference work done with constitutional player meetings, coming into this project with an understanding of public education in Montana. Concern: (1) reference blueprint framework, including four planks they see as evidence and time-tested things that we focus on. The NCEE has extensive experience with helping education transformation with other states, they cited specific examples, produced documents that can be downloaded and used, but the noteworthy parts of the proposal, is that they helped to formulate policy that turned into bills that they had presented to legislators, they included demonstrated outcomes of how the analysis helped formulate the response. They have a wide audience of people involved as stakeholders.
IEEWG Facilitation: detailed description, materials, additional recommendations	200	190	The work plan includes both vertical and horizontal alignments to allow stakeholders for input. They propose a three-phase approach with timelines fitting the requirements, very ambitious. They talk about a roadshow schedule across Montana to provide a case for change in consensus-building. Phase 1: the timeline is short and will need additional time; Phase 2: they will implement the roadshow and four (4) session with the working group, back-and-forth to develop a plan and complete the steps; Phase 3: the draft plan based on the information from across the state and working groups, with ongoing consultation through 7/2026. They recommended using a company that can do some analysis of the funding, including (After Partners) to analyze the funding structure, which can help the working committee to understand how to better streamline the funding. This was a well-thought out comprehensive plan, with a commitment to stakeholder engagement is the impression. Within the work plan, they talk about how they will treat the stakeholders and incorporate them into the process, including critical input to the process. They focus on consensus amongst the commissioners to help with implementation. Identifying partners to complete a financial analysis is appreciated. A concern is that they are being ambitious with the schedule, but they are responsive to the RFP. The committee would have liked to see more talk about contingency planning and interruptions.
Commitment to meet the aggressive timeline	P/F	P	LK:) P LM:) P
Cost proposal	100	100	
Equal Pay for MT Women	25	25	
Total of all categories	525	510	

LEG-RFP-2025-0036AB
Facilitation of IEE Working Group under HB 153 (2025)
SCORING GUIDE

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

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

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

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

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

Score	25	100	200
Superior (95-100%)	23.5 - 25	94 - 100	188 - 200
Good (75-94%)	18.5 - 23.5	74 - 94	148 - 188
Fair (60-74%)	14.8 - 18.5	59 - 74	118 - 148
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 14.8	0 - 59	0 - 118

LEG-RFP-2025-0036AB
Facilitation of IEE Working Group under HB 153 (2025)

Cost Worksheet	
<p>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$).</p>	

Cost			
Points Available		100	
Lowest Cost		\$119,900.00	
Vendor Name		Proposed Cost	Points Earned
			Notes:
The National Center on Education and the Economy		\$119,900.00	100.0

Technical Scoring Session

LEG-RFP-2025-0036AB

Facilitation of IEE Working Group under HB 153 (2025)

Date 7/18/2025

Time 1:30PM - 3:30 PM

Location Microsoft Teams

Evaluation Committee Members: Linda Reksten, Luke Muzkiewicz

Subject Matter Experts: Brad Barker

Contracts Officer: Amanda Battin, amanda.battin2@mt.gov, 406.444.9665

Order of Evalution: Alphabetical

Scoring Method: Consensus