



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

317 / 232-3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: January 22, 2021

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Emily Cranfill, Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 20-1941; Universal Screening for Social-Emotional Learning

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 20-1941, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Panorama Education, Inc.** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the Universal Screening for Social-Emotional Learning for the Indiana Department of Education.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$165,000

The evaluation team received proposals from five (5) respondents:

- Fusion Technologies
- Illuminate Education
- Panorama Education
- Pearson Clinical Assessments
- xSEL Labs, Inc.

The proposals were evaluated by IDOA and the evaluation team according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (45 points)
- Cost Proposal (35 points)
- Buy Indiana (5 points)
- Minority Business Enterprise Participation (5 +1 potential points)
- Woman-Owned Business Enterprise Participation (5+1 potential points)
- Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise (5+1 potential points)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in section 3.2 ("Evaluation Criteria") of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

All proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements.

All respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were then evaluated based on their business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality

Business Proposal

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent's proposal in the following areas:

- Respondent Information and Financial Stability
- References
- Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure

Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent's proposal in the following areas:

- 2.4.1 - General Information
- 2.4.2 – Capacity to Collect & Analyze Data
- 2.4.3 – Process & Capacity for Statewide Implementation
- 2.4.4 – Background & Experience
- 2.4.5 – Capacity for Inclusive Materials & Training
- 2.4.6 – Capacity for Technical Assistance & Training
- 2.4.7 – Additional Information

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of each respondent's business proposal, Section 2.3, and each respondent's proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, Section 2.4, as well as responses to proposal clarifications.

Results of the initial management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (45 Max)
Fusion Technologies	36.60
Illuminate Education	27.15
Panorama Education	41.80
Pearson Clinical Assessments	38.90
xSEL Labs, Inc.	29.75

C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were then normalized to one another, with the lowest cost receiving a total of 35 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 35 \text{ points}$$

The initial cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

RESPONDENT	Cost Score (35 Max)
Fusion Technologies	29.75
Illuminate Education	5.94
Panorama Education	34.00
Pearson Clinical Assessments	8.69
xSEL Labs, Inc.	35.00

D. Initial Round Total Scores

The cost score was combined with the management assessment and quality score to generate the total score for this step of the evaluation process as described in the RFP. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 80 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Round 1 Total Scores

RESPONDENT	Total Score (80 Max)
Fusion Technologies	66.35
Illuminate Education	33.09
Panorama Education	75.80
Pearson Clinical Assessments	47.59
xSEL Labs, Inc.	64.75

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, a “short-list” of respondents was created. Out of the five (5) respondents, three (3) respondents moved forward in evaluations with Illuminate Education and Pearson Clinical Assessments removed from consideration.

E. Oral Presentation

Short-listed respondents were invited to participate in an oral presentation after which MAQ scores were updated based on the oral presentations.

The respondents were given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round. The updated scores for the respondents are reflected in the table below.

Table 5: Post BAFO Total Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (Post-Oral Presentation) 45	COST SCORE (Post-BAFO) 35	TOTAL SCORE 80
Fusion Technologies	34.70	30.52	65.22

Panorama Education	43.15	35.00	78.15
xSEL Labs, Inc.	35.35	33.97	69.32

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, a secondary “short-list” of respondents was created. Out of the three (3) remaining respondents, one (1) respondent moved forward in evaluations with Fusion Technologies and xSEL Labs, Inc. removed from consideration.

E. Final Evaluation Scores

IDOA scored the respondent in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), Minority Business Enterprises Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), Women Business Enterprises Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE and IVOSB information with the Respondents. The total scores, out of 103 possible points, were tabulated and are as shown below:

Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ	Cost	Buy IN	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pts.)
Panorama Education	43.15	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	75.15

** See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB bonus points.

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet the needs of the state. The team evaluated proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of one (1) year from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2), one-year renewals for a total of three (3) years at the State’s option.

Emily J. Cranfill

Emily Cranfill, Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration