



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: July 11, 2023

To: L. Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Robert Cohen, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-74523, Assistive Technology

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-74523, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation and the Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for All Students project (BCSC-PATINS) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Assistive Technology for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*BCSC-PATINS has committed to subcontract 1.5% of the contract value to **Hearn, Inc. DBA: BLU JAY MEDIA** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 1.5% of the contract value to **Eloquence Language Services LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 0.7% of the contract value to **JAM Printing & Promotions** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 2-year Contract Value: \$6,174,313.08

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:

1. Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation and the Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for All Students project (BCSC-PATINS)

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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
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 each 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:

- Company Information
- References
- Experience Serving State Governments

Technical Proposal

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

- Section 2 – Program Director and Project Management Team Questions
- Section 3 – Project Plans & Schedules Questions
- Section 4 – Project Meetings Questions
- Section 5 – Timeline for Project Questions
- Section 6 – Contractor Responsibilities Questions
- Section 7 – Communication and Marketing Questions
- Section 8 – Virtual Help Desk Office Hours Questions
- Section 9 – Staff Qualifications Questions

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 evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications to the Respondent prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Score

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
BCSC-PATINS	31.60

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =
$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.} \\ \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\ 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{array} \right.$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
BCSC-PATINS	30.00

D. First Round Total Score

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost score from the initial evaluation are listed below.

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

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
BCSC-PATINS	61.60

The evaluation team elected to issue an Oral Presentation invite to the Respondent.

E. Post Oral Presentation – Second Round MAQ Score

The Respondent's MAQ score was reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentation and additional Clarifications. The scores for the Respondent after the Oral Presentation were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Score

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
BCSC-PATINS	32.40

F. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Round Cost Score

The State elected to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) to the Respondent.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent's BAFO Cost Proposal is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
BCSC-PATINS	30

G. Round 2 - Total Score

The combined final score for the Respondent, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
BCSC-PATINS	32.40	30	62.40

H. 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. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total score out of 100 possible points was tabulated and is as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
BCSC-PATINS	32.40	30	0	1.25	0.90	1.17	65.72

* 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 all proposals to determine the viability 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 be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

