Evaluation Committee Meeting
RFP#05-04
Name: Consulting Services for MSU Techlink
Date: March 7, 2005
Time/Location: 10:00a.m to 12:00 p.m., Techlink Conference Room, Bozeman, MT

ATTENDEES:
Evaluation Committee Members:
Will Swearington – MSU Techlink
Jeanne Wilkinson – MSU Techlink
Gordon Stroh – MSU Techlink

Staff Members:
Shawna Lanphear – MSU Purchasing

Guests:
Dan Warden – New West Strategies
Katie Frank – New West Strategies

GENERAL:
Shawna Lanphear began by reading the instructions to the Evaluation Committee. The purpose of this meeting was to evaluate the responses for the above-referenced RFP. The meeting was an open meeting pursuant to Sections 2-3-201 through 2-3-221, MCA, and was posted on the General Services Division website 72-hours in advance. The public was invited to attend and observe the Evaluation Committee deliberations; and there were two public attendees. One late submission that was not evaluated: Intellectual Assets. The following vendors submitted proposals in response to RFP#05-04 and were evaluated:

Janan International
New West Strategies
Synesis7
Tetra Technology
LK4 Technology
Susan Ewing
Paraclete Consulting
Federal Technology Group
Kristine Ellis
VMcConsulting
Alpine Strategy Group
Titan Corporation
Angle Technology Group
Diane Edwards
Richard Ladzinski
Sciental Consulting
Marti Elder
GeoCenter
Critical Incident Solutions

Scoring:
Prior to the meeting each Evaluation Committee member independently evaluated and scored each proposal based on the RFP scoring criteria and Guide. The Evaluation Committee agreed to arrive at a final score by using the consensus score method.

During the meeting the Evaluation Committee discussed each of the proposals strengths and weaknesses and arrived at a final consensus score based on the evaluation criteria laid out in the RFP.

The evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on **a maximum possible value of 100 points per Service Category**. The **Method of Providing Services, Qualifications/Resumes and Related Experience)** portions of the offer will be evaluated based on the

following Scoring Guide, while the **References (if requested) and Cost Proposal** will be evaluated based on Pass/Fail basis.

The University reserves the right to reject any proposal if the evidence submitted by, or investigation of, the Offeror fails to satisfy the University that the Offeror is properly qualified to carry out the obligations of this Contract.

SERVICE CATEGORY OFFEROR NAME	Technology Evaluation	Intellectual Property Protection, Management and Transfer	Market Research, Marketing and Licensing Activities	Technology Transition Assistance	Publications and Promotion	Proposal Writing Assistance	Transition Innovative Technology to Operational Use by the US Military
Alpine Strategy Group	88 - Pass	86 - Pass	92 Pass				82 - Pass
Angle Technology Group	83 - Pass	78 - Pass	79 - Pass	81 - Pass			85 - Pass
Critical Incident Solutions	Fail	Fail	Fail	Fail	Fail	Fail	Fail
Diane Edwards					80 - Pass		
Federal Technology Group	87 - Pass		87 - Pass	81 - Pass			81 - Pass
GeoCenter	Fail	Fail	Fail		Fail		
Janan International	89 - Pass	89 - Pass	89 - Pass	96 - Pass	89 - Pass	89 - Pass	97 - Pass
Kristine Ellis					87 - Pass		
LK4 Technology	88 - Pass	86 - Pass	91 – Pass	83 - Pass	80 - Pass	83 - Pass	83 - Pass
Marti Elder	92 - Pass	86 - Pass	99 - Pass	81 - Pass	90 - Pass	93 - Pass	84 - Pass
New West Strategies			69 - Fail			78 - Pass	82 - Pass
Paraclete Consulting	89 - Pass		91 - Pass	82 - Pass		77 - Pass	73 - Fail
Richard Ladzinski	0 - Fail	0 - Fail	0 - Fail	0 - Fail	27 - Fail	27 - Fail	0 - Fail
Sciental Consulting					96 - Pass	96 - Pass	
Susan Ewing					88 - Pass		
Synesis7	62 - Fail		59 - Fail	77 - Pass	68 - Fail	82 - Pass	71 - Fail
Tetra Technology	72 - Fail			68 - Fail	84 - Pass	84 -Pass	74 - Fail
Titan Corporation	93 - Pass				95 - Pass		
VMcConsulting					84 - Pass	83 - Pass	

Based upon the results of the RFP scoring process, the Evaluation Committee recognizes and recommends award of contracts by Service Category to those stated as meeting all of the requirements of RFP #05-04 and achieving a minimum score of 75 points by Service Category. Subject to documents submitted to the Purchasing Department, the contracts as described in the RFP #05-04 will be prepared and offered to the passing Offerors.