



STATE OF INDIANA

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: July 12, 2023

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

From: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-74560,
Employment and Training Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-74560, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Arbor E&T, LLC dba Equus Workforce Solutions be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Employment and Training Services for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Division of Family Resources (DFR).

*Arbor E&T, LLC dba Equus Workforce Solutions has committed to subcontract 3.22% of the contract value to **Diversified Services Network, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), 9.08% of the contract value to **Koehler Partners, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), 4.63% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), and 3.85% of the contract value to **RADcube** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Total Contract Value including Transition and 4-Year Base Term: \$27,443,089.96

The evaluation team received proposals from three (3) vendors:

1. Arbor E&T, LLC dba Equus Workforce Solutions
2. Maximus US Services, Inc.
3. Minority Contractors Collaboration

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA 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)	55
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	25
4. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
5. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total:	90 (92 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. Two (2) of the proposals adhered to the mandatory requirements and were then evaluated based on their business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

1. Arbor E&T, LLC dba Equus Workforce Solutions
2. Maximus US Services, Inc.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

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

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:

- References, Experience Serving State Governments, and Experience Serving Similar Clients
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- All Other Business Proposal Sections

Technical Proposal (50 Points)

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

- Program Overview and Minimum Qualifications to Bid
- General Project Requirements and Geographic Requirements
- Project Implementation Requirements
- Security and Risk Mitigation, Technology, and Reporting
- Staffing
- Billing, Audit, and Payment Point Claims
- Service Level Agreements and Pay-for-Performance
- Continuity of Services (End of Contract Turnover)

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to the above-listed areas 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 55 pts.
Equus	12.5
Maximus	17.5

* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal

C. Cost Proposal (25 Points)

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

Score =

If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 25.

If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$25 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores*

Respondent	Cost Score 25 pts.
Equus	25.0
Maximus	17.8

** Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.*

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.
Equus	37.5
Maximus	35.3

** Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.*

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

The evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications and invitations to Oral Presentations to the two Respondents prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Clarification Responses and Oral Presentations. 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 55 pts.
Equus	22.0
Maximus	20.5

** Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.*

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

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

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

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores*

Respondent	Cost Score 25 pts.
Equus	25.0
Maximus	18.4

* *Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.*

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	55	25	80
Equus	22.0	25.0	47.0
Maximus	20.5	18.4	38.9

* *Note: additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal*

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 90 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	55	25	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pt.)
Equus	22.0	25.0	5	5	57.0
Maximus	20.5	18.4	6	6	50.9

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

** *Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal*

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 four (4) years and three (3) months. There may be four (4) one-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years and three months at the State's option.