



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 5, 2022

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 22-68274; ILEARN, IREAD-3, and I AM Assessments

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 22-68274, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Cambium Assessment, Inc. (CAI)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the ILEARN, IREAD-3, and I AM Assessments for the Indiana Department of Education.

CAI is committed to subcontracting 2.91% of the total contract value to BCforward (a certified Minority-Owned Business) and 0.16% of the total contract value to Intrinꝑ Inc. (a certified Woman-Owned Business).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$57,829,079.00

The evaluation team received proposals from two (2) respondents:

- Cambium Assessment, Inc. (CAI)
- Cogna

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; Experience Serving Similar Clients (Sections 2.3.7, 2.3.14)
- Experience Serving State Government (2.3.13)

Technical Proposal

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

- (2) Elements; (3a) Background; (3b) Test Administration Modes; (3l) Operational Administration; (3n) Practice Administration (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.13, 1.15)
- (3d) Program Manager and Project Management Team; (3e) Project Plans and Schedules; (3f) Status and Planning Meetings (1.5, 1.6, 1.7)
- (3h) Test Design; (3g) Educator Involvement; (3i) Item Ownership; (3q) Pilot Testing (1.9, 1.8, 1.10, 1.18)
- (3j) Accessibility (1.11)
- (3c) Online System Requirements; (3o) Scoring and Reporting; (3p) Rescores (1.4, 1.16, 1.17)
- (3r) Item Analysis; (3s) Technical Analysis; (3t) Scaling and Equating; (3u) Validity; (3v) Classification Consistency; (3w) Technical Reports; (3x) Comparability Studies (1.19, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25)
- (3y) Quality Control; (3k) Manuals and Scripts to Support Test Administration (1.26, 1.12)
- (3aa) Research Studies; (3ab) Special Study Topic (1.28, 1.29)

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)
CAI	44.90
Cognia	37.08

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)
CAI	30.00
Cognia	29.18

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

RESPONDENT	Total Score (80 Max)
CAI	74.90
Cognia	66.26

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

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (Post-Oral Presentation)	COST SCORE (BAFO)	TOTAL SCORE
CAI	44.61	30.00	74.61
Cognia	37.84	29.92	67.76

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

Respondent	MAQ	Cost	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pts.)
CAI	44.61	30.00	1.88	0.00	76.49
Cognia	37.84	29.92	1.88	0.00	69.64

* 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 proposals received 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 document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of three (3) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2), one-year renewals for a total of five (5) years at the State’s option.

Emily Cranfill

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