



STATE OF INDIANA
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division
Indiana Government Center South
402 W. Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: June 1, 2022

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Stephanie Nelson, Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-70622
I AM Research

Based on the State's evaluation of responses to RFP 22-70622, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **WestEd** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the I AM Research assessment for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*WestEd has committed to subcontract 11.89% of the contract value to **Briljent, LLC** (a certified Woman-Owned Business (WBE)) and 8.07% 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: \$929,606.00

The evaluation team received a proposal from one (1) Respondent:

- WestEd

The proposal was 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)
5. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)

Total: 90 (92 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 Respondent adhered to the mandatory requirements and was moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)

The Respondents proposal was 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
WestEd	41.80

C. Cost Proposal (30 points)

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

- Respondents Cost Score = (Lowest Cost Proposal / Total Cost of Proposal) X 30*

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score
WestEd	30.00

D. Initial (Round 1) Total Score

The initial Management Assessment and Quality (MAQ) Score in Table 1 was combined with the initial Cost Score in Table 2 to generate the combined initial score in Table 3. The combined initial MAQ and Cost Score from the initial evaluation is listed below.

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Score

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
WestEd	71.80

The evaluation team elected to issue Clarification Questions, Oral Presentation invitation, and Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests to the Respondent.

E. Second Round Score - BAFO Response, Oral Presentation, and Clarification Response

The Respondents MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentation and Clarification Response. 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: Round 2 (Post BAFO, Oral Presentation, and Clarification Response) – Evaluation Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
WestEd	44.80	30.00	74.80

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent 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 Respondent. 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.)
WestEd	44.80	30.00	5.00	5.00	84.80

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposal to determine the viability of the proposed solution 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.

Stephanie Nelson

Stephanie Nelson
Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration