



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration

Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: May 26, 2023

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

AK 5/26/23

From: Teresa Deaton, Senior Account Manager,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-73841: Child Care Information Management System (CCIMS) Services

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal ("RFP") 23-73841, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Carline, Inc. d.b.a., Playground; DSSV, Inc. d.b.a., brightwheel; and Early Learning Ventures** be selected to begin contract negotiations to serve as the State's suppliers for the Child Care Information Management System Preferred Vendor List.

Carline, Inc. d.b.a. Playground has committed to subcontract 8.00% of the contract value to **The Consultants Consortium, Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 11.00% of the contract value to **Diversified Services Network, Inc.** (a certified Woman-owned Business (WBE)), and 2.97% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc.** (Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from seven (7) vendors:

- Carline, Inc. d.b.a. Playground ("Playground")
- DSSV, Inc. d.b.a. brightwheel ("brightwheel")
- Early Learning Express, Inc. d.b.a. HiMama ("Early Learning Express")
- Early Learning Ventures ("Early Learning Ventures")
- Procure Software, LLC ("Procure")
- WeeCare, Inc. ("WeeCare")
- Wonderschool, Inc. ("Wonderschool")

According to the following criteria, which were published in Section 3, Proposal Evaluation, of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Administration ("IDOA") and scored by the evaluation team:

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	45

3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
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. All of the Respondents were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ): Initial Consensus Scoring

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

Business Proposal (5 Points)

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

Technical Proposal (40 Points)

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

- Company Background and Experience
- Core Functions and Services
- Project Management
- Customer Support
- Recommended Functions and Services
- Data Standards and Interoperability
- Vendor/Provider Contract Structure
- Service Level Agreements (SLAs)
- Security

The evaluation team's initial scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's 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

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Playground	38.75
brightwheel	38.50
Early Learning Express	18.50
Early Learning Ventures	25.75
Procare	12.75
WeeCare	19.75
Wonderschool	20.75

C. Cost Proposal (35)

Cost points were awarded based on a Respondent's proposed Total 2-Year Bid Amount.

Points were awarded on a graduated scale, with a maximum of thirty-five points (35) going to the Respondent with the lowest proposed Total 2-Year Bid Amount. Points were allocated proportionately to the other Respondents.

Points were awarded using the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \begin{cases} \bullet \text{ If the Respondent's proposed Total 2-Year Bid Amount is lowest among all Respondents, then the score is 35.} \\ \bullet \text{ If the Respondent's proposed Total 2-Year Bid Amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then the score is:} \\ 35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Total 2-Year Bid Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Proposed Total 2-Year Bid Amount})} \end{cases}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Playground	27.09
brightwheel	24.52
Early Learning Express	35.00
Early Learning Ventures	13.42
Procare	33.16
WeeCare	3.33
Wonderschool	29.88

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

Respondent	Total Score (MAQ + Cost) 80 pts.
Playground	65.84
brightwheel	63.02
Early Learning Express	53.50
Early Learning Ventures	39.17
Procare	45.91
WeeCare	23.08
Wonderschool	50.63

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, the State had the option to "short list." The State shortlisted the top six (6) scoring Respondents: **Playground, brightwheel, Early Learning Express, Early Learning Ventures, Procare, and Wonderschool.**

The evaluation team elected to issue Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests and invites to Oral Presentations to all short-listed Respondents.

E. Second Round Post BAFOs and Oral Presentations

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on Oral Presentations. Respondents were also given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round.

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

Table 4: Round 2 (Post BAFOs and Oral Presentations) – Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.	Cost Score 35 pts.	Total Score 80 pts.
Playground	38.75	17.24	55.99
brightwheel	38.50	17.39	55.89
Early Learning Express	18.50	22.27	40.77
Early Learning Ventures	25.75	35.00	60.75
Procare	19.25	21.71	40.96
Wonderschool	20.75	19.01	39.76

In accordance with Section 3.2 of the RFP, the State had the option to conduct a second "short list." The State shortlisted the top three (3) scoring Respondents after Round 2: **Playground, brightwheel, and Early Learning Ventures.**

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pts.)
Playground	38.75	17.24	0.00	5.00	5.00	4.94	70.93
brightwheel	38.50	17.39	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	52.89
Early Learning Ventures	25.75	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	57.75

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE bonus points, and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available IVOSB bonus points.

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed 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 four (4) years from the date of contract execution.