



STATE OF INDIANA

ERIC J. HOLCOMB, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Commissioner's Office

402 West Washington Street, Room
W469 Indiana Government Center
– South Indianapolis, Indiana
46204-2746

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: October 22, 2021

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

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

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Proposal 21-67147
Managed Services Provider (MSP)

Estimated Four (4) Year Contract Amount: \$240,779,432.41

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal (“RFP”) 21-67147, it is the evaluation team’s recommendation that **Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to serve as the State’s MSP, managing a network of vendors for the provision of temporary resources across the information technology (IT), administrative/clerical, and medical work categories and providing IT consulting services, which include IT projects and Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) of State project work.

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from seven (7) vendors:

- The Act 1 Group *dba* AgileOne
- Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)
- Industrial Staffing Services Inc. *dba* Evaluent Talent Solutions
- InGenesis, Inc.
- Guidesoft, Inc. *dba* Knowledge Services
- OST, Inc.
- Workspend, Inc.

According to the following criteria, which were published in Section 3, Proposal Evaluation, of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Administration (“IDOA”) and scored by the evaluation team:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)
- Price (30 points)
- Buy Indiana/Indiana Company (5 points)
- Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 bonus point available)
- Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 bonus point available)
- Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 bonus point available)

The proposals were evaluated according to the published process outlined in Section 3.2, “Evaluation Criteria,” of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

The proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All seven Respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on the business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (“MAQ”)

Business Proposal

For the business proposal evaluation, IDOA and the evaluation team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the business proposal: Respondent information and financial stability, references, proposed subcontractors and team structure, and all other remaining sections of the Business Proposal.

Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the technical proposal: account management, provider network recruitment and management, Selected Resource Program (SRP), Vendor Management System (VMS) requirements and State end-user experience, VMS solution security and risk posture, candidate match, screening, interview and selection, job descriptions, rate card, and pay rate methodology, invoicing and billing, customer satisfaction, implementation, transition, and training, metrics and reporting, and custom programs.

The evaluation team’s scores were based on a review of the respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal and subsequent clarifications.

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

Table 1: Initial MAQ Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)
The Act 1 Group <i>dba</i> AgileOne	21.50
Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	40.75
Industrial Staffing Services Inc. <i>dba</i> Evaluent Talent Solutions	10.75
InGenesis, Inc.	18.75
Guidesoft, Inc. <i>dba</i> Knowledge Services	35.00
OST, Inc.	37.50
Workspend, Inc.	20.50

C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were normalized, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal received a total of 30 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula where the total cost of the proposal remains the respondent’s total cost:

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

The initial cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score (30 Max)
The Act 1 Group <i>dba</i> AgileOne	26.60
Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	25.54
Industrial Staffing Services Inc. <i>dba</i> Evaluent Talent Solutions	21.88
InGenesis, Inc.	20.31
Guidesoft, Inc. <i>dba</i> Knowledge Services	30.00
OST, Inc.	23.39
Workspend, Inc.	21.27

D. Initial Round Total Scores

The Initial Cost Score was then combined with the Initial 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: Initial MAQ + Cost Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)	Cost Score (30 Max)	Total Score ¹ (80 max)
The Act 1 Group <i>dba</i> AgileOne	21.50	26.60	48.10
Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	40.75	25.54	66.29
Industrial Staffing Services Inc. <i>dba</i> Evaluent Talent Solutions	10.75	21.88	32.63
InGenesis, Inc.	18.75	20.31	39.06
Guidesoft, Inc. <i>dba</i> Knowledge Services	35.00	30.00	65.00
OST, Inc.	37.50	23.39	60.89
Workspend, Inc.	20.50	21.27	41.77

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, the State had the option to “short-list.” The State shortlisted the top three scoring Respondents: **Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)**, **Guidesoft Inc., *dba* Knowledge Services**, and **OST, Inc.**

E. Oral Presentation

The three, shortlisted Respondents were invited to deliver an oral presentation to the State’s evaluation team. Only one MAQ score, belonging to **OST, Inc.**, was updated based on the oral presentation and subsequent clarifications. Following this second round of MAQ scoring, MAQ scores were finalized and remained unchanged for the duration of the evaluation.

The MAQ scores for the short-listed respondents after these updates are as follows:

Table 4: Post Oral Presentation MAQ Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)
Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	40.75

⁴ Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.

Guidesoft, Inc. <i>dba</i> Knowledge Services	35.00
OST, Inc.	39.25

F. Hourly Rate Clarifications

After MAQ score finalization, the State's evaluation team requested further clarification on the hourly minimum and maximum rates and rate ranges for multiple positions from all shortlisted Respondents. Respondents were not allowed to lower their hourly rates, markup fees/rates, or their MSP fee for any positions during this round of clarification. All Respondents responded to the clarifications and their cost scores were updated accordingly.

Table 5: Post-Rate Clarification Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score (30 Max)
Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	29.20
Guidesoft, Inc. <i>dba</i> Knowledge Services	30.00
OST, Inc.	27.34

G. Best and Final Offer Round

IDOA then requested Best-and-Final Offers (BAFOs) from all shortlisted Respondents. During this BAFO round, Respondents were not allowed to adjust their hourly minimum and maximum hourly rates for any position. Respondents were only allowed to lower their MSP Fee for Staff Augmentation, IT Consulting, and IV&V, their Provider Markup Rate for Staff Augmentation, and their SRP Markup Rate. All shortlisted Respondents submitted BAFOs and their cost scores were updated as follows:

Table 6: Final Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score (30 Max)
Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)	30.00
Guidesoft, Inc. <i>dba</i> Knowledge Services	29.66
OST, Inc.	28.14

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the three, shortlisted respondents in Buy Indiana (5 points), MBE (5 points + 1 bonus points available), WBE (5 points + 1 bonus points available), and IVOSB (5 points + 1 bonus point available) using criteria published in the RFP. Only one Respondent, **Guidesoft, Inc. *dba* Knowledge Services**, claimed Buy Indiana status. All three Respondents proposed MBE, WBE, and IVOSB subcontractor commitments and were scored according to the criteria published in the RFP.

Table 7: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

⁵ Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)	Cost Score (30 Max)	Buy Indiana (5 Max)	MBE (5+1 Max)	WBE (5+1 Max)	IVOSB (5+1 Max)	Total Score² (100+3 Max)
<i>Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI)</i>	40.75	30.00	0.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	87.75
Guidesoft, Inc. dba Knowledge Services	35.00	29.66	5.00	6.00	5.00	5.00	85.66
OST, Inc.	39.25	28.14	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	82.39

Award Summary

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

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.

³Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.