



## 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: August 20, 2021

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

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-67411; Well-Rounded Course Access  
(WRCA) Framework

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 22-67411, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Indiana University** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the Well-Rounded Course Access Framework for the Indiana Department of Education.

*Indiana University is committed to subcontracting 2.18% of the total contract value to Sondhi Solutions (a certified Minority-Owned Business) and 10.06% of the total contract value to Briljent, LLC (a certified Woman-Owned Business).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$2,980,673.37

The evaluation team received proposals from one (1) respondent:

- Indiana University

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

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)
- Cost Proposal (30 points)
- Minority Business Enterprise Participation (5+1 potential points)
- Woman-Owned Business Enterprise Participation (5+1 potential points)

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

## A. Adherence to Requirements

The proposal was reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements.

The respondent adhered to the mandatory requirements and was 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:

- References (Section 2.3.6)
- Experience Serving State Government (2.3.12)
- Experience Serving Similar Clients (2.3.13)

### Technical Proposal

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

- Research and Planning (2.4.2; 2.5.2; 2.6.1; 2.6.2; 2.6.3; 2.7.1; 2.7.2; 2.7.3; 2.7.4; 2.7.5)
- Development and Implementation (2.8.1; 2.9.2; 2.9.3; 2.9.4; 2.9.5; 2.9.6)
- Reporting and Documentation (2.9.1)
- Expertise and Staffing (2.4.1; 2.5.1; 2.10.1)

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

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

**Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (50 Max)
Indiana University	26.70

## C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were then normalized to one another, with the lowest cost receiving a total of 30 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 30 \text{ points}$$

The initial cost scoring is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Scores**

RESPONDENT	Cost Score (30 Max)
Indiana University	30.00

#### 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 score out of a maximum possible 80 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Round 1 Total Scores**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>Total Score (80 Max)</b>
Indiana University	56.70

#### E. Oral Presentation

The respondent was invited to participate in an oral presentation, as well as submit responses to proposal clarifications, after which MAQ scores were updated based on the oral presentation.

The respondent was also given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round.

The scores for the respondent after these updates are as follows:

**Table 4: Post Oral Presentation and BAFO Total Scores**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>MAQ SCORE (Post-Oral Presentation)</b>	<b>COST SCORE (BAFO)</b>	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>
Indiana University	35.35	30.00	65.35

#### E. Final Evaluation Scores

IDOA scored the respondent in the following areas: Minority Business Enterprises Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and Women Business Enterprises Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE information with the Respondent. The total score, out of 92 possible points, were tabulated and are as shown below:

**Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>90 (+2 bonus pts.)</b>
Indiana University	35.35	30.00	1.25	6.00	77.60

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

### **Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposal 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 the proposal based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2), one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

*Emily Cranfill*

---

Emily Cranfill, CPPB; Senior Account Manager  
Indiana Department of Administration