



# STATE OF INDIANA

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Mike Braun, Governor

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

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: January 14, 2026

To: Jennifer Jansen, Procurement Director  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, Procurement Consultant  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 25-83916,  
Early Intervention Coaching Model System

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-83916, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Trustees of Indiana University (IU) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Early Intervention Coaching Model System for the Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), the Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services (DDRS), and the Bureau of Child Development Services (BCDS).

*IU has committed to subcontract 1.42% of the contract value to **Front Runner Media** and 0.4% of the contract value to **Guy Brown** (both certified Minority-owned Businesses (MBE)), 0.07% of the contract value to **Kids Ink Children's Bookstore**, 1.21% of the contract value to **Eloquence Language Services LLC**, 6.99% of the contract value to **Transform Consulting Group**, and 0.3% of the contract value to **Pip Metro** (all certified Women-owned Businesses (WBE)), and 1.5% of the contract value to **Plan B Marketing, Inc.** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$1,970,956.80

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Engaging Solutions LLC (ES)
2. Public Consulting Group LLC (PCG)
3. Trustees of IU University (IU)

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA / DDRS / BCDS, 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)

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 three (3) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring**

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

**Business Proposal**

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:

- Experience Serving State Governments and Similar Clients
- References
- All other remaining sections of the Business Proposal

**Technical Proposal**

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

- Purpose, First Steps Background, Respondent Required Experience
- Delivery of Professional Development – Recruitment
- Delivery of Professional Development – Training Delivery
- Ongoing Professional Development Support
- Statewide Implementation Support / Partnership Activities
- Reporting / Business Reviews and Data Requirements
- General Contract Requirements – Staffing
- General Contract Requirements – Financial Management

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
ES	0.75
PCG	30.75
IU	43.00

**C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)**

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

Score =

$$\begin{cases}
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.} \\
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\
 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}
 \end{cases}$$

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
ES	26.01
PCG	21.37
IU	30.00

**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)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
ES	26.76
PCG	52.12
IU	73.00

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist IU based on Round 1 Total Scores.

**E. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores**

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the one shortlisted Respondent.

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

**Table 4: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
IU	30.00

**F. 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 5: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
IU	43.00	30.00	73.00

#### **G. 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 commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 6: Final Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Buy Indiana*</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>IVOSB*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>100 (+3 bonus pt.)</b>
IU	43.00	30.00	5.00	1.25	4.05	2.50	85.80

\* 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**

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) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

