



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: May 12, 2023

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

From: Robert Cohen, Specialist, Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-73611
Individualized Education Plan/Individualized Learning Plan Management System

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-73611, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **PowerSchool Holdings, LLC** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Individualized Education Plan/Individualized Learning Plan Management System for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

PowerSchool Holdings, LLC has committed to subcontract 8% of the contract value to **Brite Systems, Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).

PowerSchool Holdings, LLC has committed to subcontract 1.75% of the contract value to **Marucco, Stoddard, Ferenbach & Walsh, Inc** (MSF&W) (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).

PowerSchool Holdings, LLC has committed to subcontract 3% of the contract value to **Vespa Group, LLC.** (a certified Veteran-owned Business (IVOSB)).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$22,695,218.48

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. PowerSchool Holdings, LLC (PowerSchool)
2. Ed Tech Soft, Inc (ETS)
3. Public Consulting Group, LLC (PCG)
4. Kyndryl Holdings, Inc.

The proposals were 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 Proposal 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 Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 100 (103 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. Three (3) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. One (1) proposal (Kyndryl Holdings, Inc.) was disqualified because it did not meet the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

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

Business Proposal and Technical Proposal (50 points)

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

- References; Experience Serving State Governments; Experience Serving Similar Clients; and Background, General Requirements, and Key Definitions
- All Other Business Proposal Sections
- System Infrastructure and Functionality
- Project Management and Staffing
- Data Migration, Integration, and Testing
- Implementation, New Releases, Training, and User Roles
- Service Level Agreements (SLAs), Security, Backup, and Recovery

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to the above-listed sections of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The evaluation team issued clarifications prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation Questions are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
ETS	7.50
PCG	25.00
PowerSchool	40.50

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Scoring Category 1 Score =	<div>If Respondent's Cost amount for all Components Except Data Conversion and Migration is lowest among Respondents, then score is 28.</div> <div>If Respondent's Cost amount for all Components Except Data Conversion and Migration is NOT lowest among Respondents, then score is: $28 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$</div>
Scoring Category 2 Score =	<div>If Respondent's Cost amount for Data Conversion and Migration is lowest among Respondents, then score is 2.</div> <div>If Respondent's Cost amount for Data Conversion and Migration is NOT lowest among Respondents, then score is: $2 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$</div>
Total Cost Score =	Scoring Category 1 Score + Scoring Category 2 Score

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Total Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
ETS	28.00
PCG	9.77
PowerSchool	4.47

D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

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

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
ETS	35.50
PCG	34.77
PowerSchool	44.97

E. Post Oral Presentations and MAQ Clarification Responses – Second Round MAQ Scores

The evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications to Respondents prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. Additionally, Respondents were invited to give oral presentations to the evaluation team. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on oral presentations and the written responses to clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the second round of MAQ scoring are listed below.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
ETS	7.50
PCG	25.00
PowerSchool	46.75

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the three Respondents.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Total Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
ETS	28.00
PCG	9.85
PowerSchool	5.05

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, 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
ETS	7.50	28.0	35.50
PCG	25.00	9.85	34.85
PowerSchool	46.75	5.05	51.80

H. 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), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitment forms from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB commitment forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores*

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Buy Indiana*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
ETS	7.50	28.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	0.00	32.50
PCG	25.00	9.85	5.00	5.00	-1.00	5.00	48.85
PowerSchool	46.75	5.05	5.00	0.90	5.00	0.00	62.70

* 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 meeting mandatory requirements 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 four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) two-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option.