



Award Recommendation Letter

Date: April 6, 2022
To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration
From: Stephanie Nelson, Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration
Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-70334
STEM and Literacy Plan Work

Based on the State's evaluation of responses to RFP 22-70334, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that the **University of Indianapolis** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide STEM and Literacy Plan Work for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*The University of Indianapolis has committed to subcontract 0.62% of the contract value to **Chamberlin/Dunn LLC** (a certified Woman-Owned Business (WBE)) and 1.80% to **Bucher and Christian Consulting, Inc. D/B/A BCforward** (a certified Minority-Owned Business (MBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$26,091,390.24

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

- Marian University
- University of Indianapolis

The proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and the Indiana Department of Administration (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)	50 points
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30 points
4. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)

Total: 90 (92 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. All Respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)

The Respondents proposals were evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents organizational structure and financial stability as defined in Section 2.3 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Business Proposal, Attachment E.

Technical Proposal

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents ability to effectively perform the scope of work in Section 2.4 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Technical Proposal, Attachment F.

The evaluation team’s initial (Round 1) scores were based on a review of the Respondents 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 Scores (MAQ)

Respondent	MAQ Score
Marian University	22.56
University of Indianapolis	25.91

C. Cost Proposal (30 points)

Cost scores would then be normalized to one another, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal received a total of 30 points. The normalization formula is as follows:

- $Respondents\ Cost\ Score = (Lowest\ Cost\ Proposal / Total\ Cost\ of\ Proposal) \times 30$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score
Marian University	30.00
University of Indianapolis	26.92

D. Initial (Round 1) Total Scores

The initial Management Assessment and Quality (MAQ) Score in Table 1 were combined with the initial Cost Score in Table 2 to generate the combined initial scores in Table 3. The combined initial MAQ and Cost Scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Marian University	52.56
University of Indianapolis	52.83

The evaluation team elected to issue Clarification Questions, Oral Presentations requests, and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests to both Respondents.

E. Second Round Scores - BAFO Responses, Oral Presentations, and Clarification Responses

The Respondents MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and Clarification Responses. Respondents were also given the opportunity to update their Cost Proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round.

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

Table 4: Round 2 (Post BAFOs, Oral Presentations, and Clarification Responses) – Evaluation Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Marian University	23.44	30.00	53.44
University of Indianapolis	38.38	24.03	62.41

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Minority Business Enterprises (MBE) Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and Women Business Enterprises (WBE) 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 Respondents. The total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE	WBE	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pts.)
Marian University	23.44	30.00	5.00	3.60	62.04
University of Indianapolis	38.38	24.03	1.25	0.45	64.11

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed solutions 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may two one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

Stephanie Nelson

Stephanie Nelson
Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration