



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: November 20, 2024

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

From: Angie Alexander, Procurement Specialist
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 25-79309,
First Steps Program Evaluation

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-79309, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Health Management Associates, Inc.** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide First Steps Program Evaluation for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services (DDRS) Bureau of Child Development Services (BCDS).

Estimated 2-year Contract Value: \$422,410.34. At the State's option, there may be either two (2) two-year renewals, four (4) one-year renewals, or a combination of two-year and one-year renewals. In no event shall the term of this Contract exceed a total of six (6) years.

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Health Management Associates, Inc.
2. HER Consulting LLC

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)	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. All proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to 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 (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
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Information
- References

Technical Proposal (45 Points)

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

- Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - Purpose, Background, Definitions, Respondent Eligibility Requirements, and Respondent Preferred Experience
- Sections 6, 7, and 8 - Annual SPOE Quality Review Activities, Child Outcomes (SPP/APR Indicator 3) Data Repository and Collection, and Family Outcomes (SPP/APR Indicator 4) Data Repository, Dissemination, and Collection
- Section 9 - Provider Agency Monitoring
- Section 10 - State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Evaluation
- Section 11 - Ad Hoc Program Evaluation
- Section 13 – Staffing
- Sections 12, 14, 15, and 16 - Deliverables, Billing and Invoicing, Performance Measures, and Payment Withholds

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 (MAQ) Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ) Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	14.00
HER Consulting LLC	32.00

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

Cost points were awarded based on Respondents' Proposed Total Two-Year Bid Amount. Points were awarded on a graduated scale, with a maximum of thirty points (30) going to the Respondent with the lowest Proposed Total Two-Year Bid Amount.

Points were allocated proportionately to the other Respondents using the following formula:

Score =

- If the Respondent's Proposed Total Two-Year Bid Amount is lowest among all Respondents, then the score is 30.
- If the Respondent's Proposed Total Two-Year Bid Amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then the score is:

$$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Proposed Total Two-Year Bid Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Proposed Total Two-Year Bid Amount})}$$

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

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	30.00
HER Consulting LLC	4.09

D. Initial Round Total Scores

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

Table 3: Initial MAQ + Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	44.00
HER Consulting LLC	36.09

The evaluation team elected to issue Clarification Questions, Oral Presentations, and Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) requests to all Respondents.

E. Clarification Responses and Oral Presentations

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: Second Round Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ) Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	23.00
HER Consulting LLC	33.25

F. Best and Final Offers (BAFOs)

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to each Respondent. The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 5: BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Health Management Associates, Inc.	30.00
HER Consulting LLC	4.09

G. Second Round - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Second Round Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 6: Second Round MAQ + BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
Health Management Associates, Inc.	23.00	30.00	53.00
HER Consulting LLC	33.25	4.09	37.34

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored each 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. The total scores out of 100 possible points (+3 available bonus 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.)
Health Management Associates, Inc.	23.00	30.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	0.00	50.00
HER Consulting LLC	33.25	4.09	0.63	0.45	6.00	5.00	49.41

* 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. At the State's option, there may be either two (2) two-year renewals, four (4) one-year renewals, or a combination of two-year and one-year renewals. In no event shall the term of this Contract exceed a total of six (6) years.