



STATE OF INDIANA

Michael R. Pence, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Procurement Division
402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317 / 232-3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: August 8, 2016

To: Eric Klinefelter, Deputy Director of Strategic Sourcing
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPO, CPPB, Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation for Selection for RFP 17-003 -Monitoring of disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Education Agencies and/or Calculating disproportionality data and providing a disproportionality data website

Estimated Amount of Initial 1-Year Contract Term: \$308,897.00

Based on the State's evaluation of responses for RFP 17-003, we recommend The Trustees of Indiana University be eligible to begin contract negotiations to provide Program Area 1 - Monitoring of disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Education Agencies and Program Area 2 - Calculating disproportionality data and providing a disproportionality data website for the Department of Education.

The Trustees of Indiana University is committed to subcontracting 10.04% of the total contract value to Virtuoso Education Consulting (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 4.78% of the total contract value to Roeing Corporation (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE) on Program Area 1 – Monitoring of Disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Unit of Government.

The terms of this recommendation are outlined in this letter.

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from the following:

- eImagine Technology Group, Inc.
- The Trustees of Indiana University
- PCG Indiana, Inc.

The proposals were evaluated by DOE and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFP for both program areas:

- Adherence to Mandatory Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ) (60 points)
- Cost Proposal (30 points)
- Minority and Women Participation (10 points, with an additional 2 points if certain criteria was met)

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 adherence to mandatory requirements. All Respondents were deemed responsive. Each proposal was then evaluated based on its Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (60 Pts)

Business Proposal (5 points)

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered the information each respondent provided in the business proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Structure
- Financial Information
- Sub-Contractors
- Contract Terms/Clauses
- References, Pending Litigation and Terminated Contracts
- Experience Serving State Government
- Experience Serving Similar Clients

Technical Proposal (55 Points) Program Area 1 – Monitoring of Disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Unit of Government

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent’s proposal in the following areas for Program Area 1:

- Data
- Timeline and Responsibilities
- Tools/Other Responsibilities
- Technical Assistance/Professional Development

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Program Area 1

| RESPONDENT | MAQ SCORE (60 MAX) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| eImagine Technology Group, Inc. | 9.38 |
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 42.03 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 56.00 |

Technical Proposal (55 Points) Program Area 2 – Calculating of disproportionality data and providing disproportionality data website for Local Education Agencies

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent’s proposal in the following areas for Program Area 2:

- Data
- Timeline and Responsibilities
- Tools/Other Responsibilities

The evaluation team’s scores were based on a review of each Respondent’s business proposal, Section 2.3, and each Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, Section 2.4, as well as responses to proposal clarifications.

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

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Program Area 2

| RESPONDENT | MAQ SCORE (60 MAX) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| eImagine Technology Group, Inc. | 15.63 |
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 39.22 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 58.75 |

C. Cost Proposal (-30 +30 – 5 bonus Points)

Price was measured against the State’s baseline cost for this scope of work. Cost scoring points were assigned as follows:

- Respondents who met the State’s current baseline cost received zero (0) cost points.
- Respondents who proposed a decrease to the State’s current costs received positive points at the same rate as bid increasing cost.
- Respondents who proposed an increase to the State’s current cost received negative points at the same rate as bid lowering cost.

- Respondents who proposed a 10% decrease to the State’s current baseline cost received all of the available cost points.
- If multiple Respondents decreased costs below 10% of the current baseline, an additional 5 points was added to the Respondent proposing the lowest cost to the State.

The cost scoring as a result of Respondents’ initial proposals is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Program 1 – Monitoring of Disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Unit of Government

| RESPONDENT | Cost Score 30 (+5) |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 35 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 30 |

Initial Cost Scores – Program 2 – Calculating of disproportionality data and providing disproportionality data website for Local Education Agencies

| RESPONDENT | Cost Score 30 (+5) |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 35 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 30 |

D. MAQ and Cost Scores

The combined MAQ and Cost scores from the evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Combined Management Assessment/Quality Scores and Cost Scores

Program Area 1 – Monitoring of Disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Unit of Government

All proposals were ranked on the basis of their combined scores for Management Assessment/Quality and Cost. This ranking was used to create a “short-list.” Based on the resulting scores, proposals from IU and PCG Education were short-listed for further consideration in this program area.

| RESPONDENT | MAQ SCORE (60 MAX) | COST SCORE (30 + 5 pts MAX) | TOTAL SCORE (95 Max) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| eImagine Technology Group, Inc. | 9.38 | 0 | 9.38 |
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 42.03 | 35.00 | 77.03 |
| The Trustee of Indiana University | 56.00 | 30.00 | 86.00 |

All proposals were ranked on the basis of their combined scores for Management Assessment/Quality and Cost. This ranking was used to create a “short-list.” Based on the resulting scores, proposals from IU and PCG Education were short-listed for further consideration in this program area.

Program Area 2 – Calculating of disproportionality data and providing disproportionality data website for Local Education Agencies

| RESPONDENT | MAQ SCORE (60 MAX) | COST SCORE (35 MAX) | TOTAL SCORE (95 Max) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| eImagine Technology Group, Inc. | 15.63 | 0 | 15.63 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 39.22 | 35.00 | 74.22 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 58.75 | 30.00 | 88.75 |

E. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain information with the Respondents. Once the final forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 107 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 4: Final Evaluation Scores

Program Area 1 – Monitoring of Disproportionality compliance and providing a technical assistance resource center for Local Unit of Government

| RESPONDENT | MAQ SCORE 60 Max | COST SCORE 35 Max | MBE (5 max + 1 bonus point) | WBE (5 max + 1 bonus point) | TOTAL SCORE 107 Max |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 42.03 | 35.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 87.03 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 56.00 | 30.00 | 6.00 | 3.30 | 95.30 |

Program Area 2 – Calculating of disproportionality data and providing disproportionality data website for Local Education Agencies

| RESPONDENT | MAQ SCORE 60 Max | COST SCORE 35 Max | MBE (5 max + 1 bonus point) | WBE (5 max + 1 bonus point) | TOTAL SCORE 107 Max |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| PCG-Indiana, Inc. | 39.22 | 35.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 84.22 |
| The Trustees of Indiana University | 58.75 | 30.00 | -1 | -1 | 86.75 |

Award Summary

During the course of the evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions and ability 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 one (1) year from the date of contract execution. There may be three (3) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State’s option.