



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: February 1, 2021

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 21-2422; Item Bank and Authoring System

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 21-2422, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **NCS Pearson, Inc.** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide the Item Bank and Authoring System for the Indiana Department of Education.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$575,056.00

The evaluation team received proposals from six (6) respondents:

- Breakthrough Technologies, LLC
- Cambium Assessment, Inc.
- Castle Rock Research Corp.
- Education Testing Service
- LearningMate Solutions, Inc.
- NCS Pearson, Inc.

The proposals were 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)
- Buy Indiana (5 points)
- Minority Business Enterprise Participation (5+1 potential points)
- Woman-Owned Business Enterprise Participation (5+1 potential points)
- Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise (5+1 potential points)

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

All proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements.

All respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were 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:

- Respondent Information and Financial Stability
- References
- Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure
- Experience Serving State Government and Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- 2.4.1/2.4.3 – Product and Update History
- 2.4.2/2.4.7 – Adherence to Standards
- 2.4.4 – Item Authoring and Ownership
- 2.4.5 – User Designations
- 2.4.6 – New Item Development
- 2.4.8 – Item Imports
- 2.4.9 – Metadata Fields
- 2.4.10 – Product Availability
- 2.4.11 – Reporting
- 2.4.12 – Item Import and Export
- 2.4.13/2.4.14 – Security
- 2.4.15 – Product Storage and Security

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.

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

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (50 Max)
Breakthrough Technologies	27.85
Cambium Assessment	34.20
Castle Rock	34.45
Educational Testing Service	40.75
LearningMate Solutions	27.75
NCS Pearson	40.00

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)
Breakthrough Technologies	0.83
Cambium Assessment	1.97
Castle Rock	3.76
Educational Testing Service	3.43
LearningMate Solutions	30.00
NCS Pearson	5.44

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 scores out of a maximum possible 80 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Round 1 Total Scores

RESPONDENT	Total Score (80 Max)
Breakthrough Technologies	28.68
Cambium Assessment	36.17
Castle Rock	38.21
Educational Testing Service	44.18
LearningMate Solutions	57.75
NCS Pearson	45.44

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, a “short-list” of respondents was created. Out of the six (6) respondents, three (3) respondents moved forward in evaluations with Breakthrough Technologies, Cambium Assessment, and Castle Rock removed from consideration.

E. Oral Presentation

Short-listed respondents were 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 presentations.

The scores for the short-listed respondents after these updates are as follows:

Table 4: Post Oral Presentation Total Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (Post-Oral Presentation)	COST SCORE (Initial)	TOTAL SCORE
Educational Testing Service	45.50	3.43	48.93
LearningMate Solutions	14.40	30.00	44.40
NCS Pearson	44.55	5.44	49.99

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, a secondary “short-list” of respondents was created. Out of the three (3) remaining respondents, two (2) respondents moved forward in evaluations with LearningMate Solutions removed from consideration.

The short-listed respondents were given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round. The updated scores for the respondents are reflected in the table below.

Table 5: Post BAFO Total Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (Post-Oral Presentation)	COST SCORE (Post-BAFO)	TOTAL SCORE
Educational Testing Service	45.50	17.99	63.49
NCS Pearson	44.55	30.00	74.55

E. Final Evaluation Scores

IDOA scored the respondent in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), Minority Business Enterprises Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), Women Business Enterprises Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE and IVOSB information with the Respondents. The total scores, out of 103 possible points, were tabulated and are as shown below:

Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ	Cost	Buy IN	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 pts.)
Educational Testing Service	45.50	17.99	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	60.49
NCS Pearson	44.55	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	71.55

** See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 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 of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet 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 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 J. Cranfill

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