



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: November 29, 2021

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

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-68692 Vocational Education Services for the Department of Correction (IDOC)

Estimated Three and one half (3.5) years contract value: \$27,341,622.00

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-68692, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Vocational Education Services.

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana has committed to subcontract 6% of the contract value to Rite Quality (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE) and 1% to Printer Zink d/b/a One Point (a Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

- Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana
- Oakland City University

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

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	45 points
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35 points
4. Buy Indiana	5 points
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)
7. Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)

Total: 100 (103 if bonus awarded)

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

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. Oakland University was disqualified. Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana was deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements and was moved forward for evaluation.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (45 points)

The Respondents’ proposal was evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal (4 points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondent provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Financial Information
- References
- Experience Serving Similar Clients

Technical Proposal (41 points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent’s proposal in following areas:

- General Requirements and Definitions
- Scope of Work/General
- Administration
- Staffing - Minimum Staffing Schedule
- Staffing - Pro-rated Vacant Positions
- Staffing – Qualifications
- Staffing – Licensure
- Staffing – Administration/Site and Regional Management
- Staffing – Staff Training
- Staffing – Recruitment and Retention and Minimum Requirement
- Programming: Certification-to-College Credit Crosswalk Ability
- Professional Development
- Other Staff Training
- Financial Management
- Supplies and Equipment
- Administrative Responsibilities
- Administrative Responsibilities InTERS
- Required Meetings
- Reports/Measurable Outputs/Reports/Performance Measures
- Confidentiality – Trade Secrets
- Media Releases
- Implementation
- Out Custody Training

Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Round 1

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	35.00

C. Cost Proposal (35)

Cost scores were then be normalized to one another, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal received a total of 35 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

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

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' cost proposals is as follows:

Table 2: Cost Scores – Round 1

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	35.00

D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	70.00

The evaluation team elected to issue Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests, to all Respondents.

E. Post Clarifications and BAFO Responses

The Respondent's cost scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the clarifications and BAFO. The scores for the Respondents after the BAFO responses were as follows:

Table 4: Post BAFO Responses Round 2 – Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (45)	Cost Score (35)	Total Score (80)
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	37.50	35	72.50

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points) MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veterans 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. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana	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.)

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	37.5	35.00	5.00	3.75	-1.00	.99	81.24
---------------------------------------	------	-------	------	------	-------	-----	-------

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposal to meet the goals of the program and 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 three and one half (3.5) years from the date of contract execution. There may be [three] (3) one-year renewals for a total of [seven and a half] (7.5) years at the State's option.