



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: November 4, 2022

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Robert Cohen, Procurement Specialist
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-71500
High Ability Coordinator: Gifted Programming Certificate Project

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-71500, it is the evaluation team's recommendation **East Central Educational Service Center (ECESC)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the High Ability Coordinator: Gifted Programming Certificate Project for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

East Central Educational Service Center has no MBE, WBE, or IVOSB subcontractor commitments to enumerate on this project.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 1-year Contract Value: \$239,393.00

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:

1. East Central Educational Service Center (ECESC)

The proposal was evaluated by IDOE 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)	40
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	40
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)

Total: 100 (103 if bonus awarded)

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 responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. The proposal was deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring

The Respondent's proposal was evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal

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:

- References; Experience Serving Similar Clients
- Experience Serving State Government

Technical Proposal

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

- Section 2.4.1.1 – Detailed description of the company's account management team structure.
- Section 2.4.1.2 – Description of how communication will be handled.
- Section 2.4.1.3 – Description of how payments to the Institute of Higher Education will be processed.
- Section 2.4.1.4 – Description of how participant stipends will be processed.
- Section 2.4.1.5 – Clarification of how the company will facilitate professional development.
- Section 2.4.1.6 – Description of the process used to maintain records of participant task completion.
- Section 2.4.1.7 – Description of how the company will communicate project progress to IDOE.
- Section 2.4.1.8 – Description of the problem resolution process, point of contact, and response time.
- Section 2.4.1.9 – Description of the escalation process for advanced problem resolution.

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Score

Respondent	MAQ Score 40 pts.
ECESC	31.38

C. Cost Proposal (40 Points)

The price points on the Respondent's Costs were awarded as follows:

Score =

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then} \\ \text{score is 40.} \\ \\ \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then} \\ \text{score is:} \\ \\ 40 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{array} \right.$$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent's cost proposal is as follows:

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score 40 pts.
ECESC	40.00

D. First Round Total Score

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluation is listed below.

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Score (MAQ + Cost)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
ECESC	71.38

E. Post Clarifications – Second Round MAQ Score

The Respondent's MAQ score was reviewed and re-evaluated based on the written responses to clarifications asked after the First Round. The evaluation team issued MAQ and Cost Clarifications to the Respondent prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. The score for the Respondent was as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Score

Respondent	MAQ Score 40 pts.
ECESC	32.81

The state issued a best and final offer, and the results are shown in Table 5 below.

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 100 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	40	40	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
ECESC	32.81	40.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	74.81

* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB bonus points.

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposal to determine the viability to meet the goals of the program and 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 one (1) year from the date of contract execution. There may be one (1) one-year renewal for a total of two (2) years at the State's option.