Draft
Request for Proposal
Two-Year Equipment

Timeline:
- March 17: RFP finalized for Board of Regents Approval at Workforce Subcommittee
- March 21: RFP sent to two-year programs.
- April 25: Legislature ends, amount of funding finalized.
- May 5: RFP proposals due to OCHE.
- May 10: RFP proposals sent to RFP committee.
- May 17 (Day before BOR meeting): RFP committee meets to evaluate proposals.
- May 18-20: BOR reviews/approves recommendations of the RFP review committee.
- July 1: funds available.

Evaluation Criteria: criteria for the RFP process for two-year program funding for equipment ($3.6 million).

Each institution may submit up to three proposals, either individually or jointly with other institutions in the Montana University System. Institutions should submit one proposal for each new or replacement equipment request.

Logical groups of equipment may be submitted within one proposal so long as each item of equipment described in each proposal is <u>required</u> to achieve the proposal's objectives. All equipment listed in a proposal will be considered a non-severable set for purposes of the evaluation committee.

Proposals can only be submitted for equipment used in existing programs. Programs already approved by the Board of Regents qualify as existing programs.

Proposals should address each of the following criteria and should consist of no more than three pages of at least 11 point font. Diagrams and pictures, with minimal words, may be included as attachments.

The following criteria will be used to prioritize spending for new or replacement equipment within Montana's two-year programs. Each proposal will be scored up to a maximum in each section as indicated (proposal maximum is 100 points). Items 7 and 8 are pass/fail and a score of "fail" on either item will eliminate the proposal from further consideration.

1) **Describe the effects of the new equipment on the institution. As appropriate, how will the equipment (20 points):**

   a) Improve and expand development of academic and career programs.

   b) Expand faculty professional development opportunities.

   c) Strengthen academic and career programs.

   d) Enhance services to students.

   e) Improve student learning outcomes and retention.

   f) Result in development of courses integrating technology in the classroom.

2) **Describe the program being developed/expanded for which the equipment will be used. Does the program (10 points):**

   a) Have (or is it currently seeking) appropriate state, regional, or national accreditation?

   b) Have highly-qualified faculty (licensed, certified, strong credentials)?

   c) Have or plan to have an active advisory board?

3) **Describe how this equipment will contribute to economic development within Montana and how it will meet the state's workforce training needs (15 points):**

   a) Describe the program's current capacity.

   b) Describe the program's student placement rates in industry and in Montana.

   c) Describe what evidence the institution will provide showing quantifiable results from the new/replacement equipment during the next 2 years.

4) **Describe the ability of the equipment to support training needs in other areas of the state and with other institutions (15 points):**

   a) Does the equipment support other programs or workforce needs outside the region of the host program?

   b) Describe the collaboration with other programs and/or institutions that led to this proposal for new or replacement equipment.

5) **Describe how the equipment and/or program will be maintained after the one-time funding for the proposal (15 points):**

   a) After the grant ends how will the equipment be maintained?

   b) How will the institution fund operational costs and/or equipment maintenance upgrades?

   c) Are there additional personnel costs and how will these be funded?

6) **A match is required, although no minimum amount has been defined in law. Proposals that provide a higher match and/or greater certainty of match funds being available will receive a higher score. Describe the matching funds that will be used for the proposal (25 points).**

   a) How much eligible (see item 7) matching funding will the host program commit -- either directly or through other secured funding sources?

   b) How certain is the program that the matching funds are available?

7) **Eligible match funding sources include: federal funds, private funds, non-state university funds, or some in-kind contributions. In-kind contributions can only be used if the match is for actual equipment contributed, for cost reductions offered for purchased equipment, or for space to house equipment. Can the institution provide a match from eligible funds? (pass/fail)**

8) **A commitment letter from the funding source(s) for any match funds is required before any grant funds are dispersed. Will the institution be able to provide this commitment letter at or before the time of the grant award? (pass/fail).**

SCORING GUIDE

Superior Response: A superior response will be a highly comprehensive, excellent reply that meets all of the requirements of the areas within that category. In addition, the response covers areas not originally addressed within the RFP category and includes additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the review committee. This response is considered to be an excellent standard, demonstrating authoritative knowledge and understanding of the project.

Very Good Response: A very good response will provide useful information, while showing experience and knowledge about the project. The proposal is well thought out and addresses all requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror provides insight into their institution's experience and understanding of the subject matter.

Good Response: A good response meets all the requirements and has demonstrated in a clear and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. This response demonstrates an above average performance with no apparent deficiencies noted.

Fair Response: A fair response meets the requirements in an adequate manner. This response demonstrates an ability to comply with guidelines, parameters, and requirements with no additional information put forth by offeror.

Poor Response: A poor response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP.

Failed Response: A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP.

Score	10 point scale	15 point scale	20 point scale	25 point scale	100 point scale
Superior	10	14-15	19-20	23-25	94-100
Very Good	9	13	17-18	21-22	86-93
Good	8	11-12	15-16	18-20	74-85
Fair	7	10	13-14	16-17	66-73
Poor	6	8-9	11-12	13-15	54-65
Failed	0-5	0-7	0-10	0-12	0-53