



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: June 2, 2026

To: Kevin March, Category Director – Information Technology,
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Mike Huth, Category Director – Health and Human Services,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-84328, Medical De-escalation and Intervention Training

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84328, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Bridge Building Communication Techniques, Inc. ("Bridge Building") be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Medical De-escalation and Intervention Training program.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$472,500.00

Estimated 6-year Contract Value, with Optional Years 5 and 6: \$731,250.00

The evaluation team received five (5) proposals from:

1. Bridge Building Communication Techniques, Inc. ("Bridge Building")
2. Crisis Prevention Institute ("CPI")
3. Hybrid Academy of Behavioral Science ("Hybrid Academy")
4. Jump Start Mastery ("Jump Start")
5. Kellie Meyer Training Solutions ("Kellie Meyer")

The proposals were evaluated by IOT, Key Stakeholder State Agencies, 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)	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 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. Five (5) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. No proposals were disqualified.

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:

- References
- Company Financials
- Experience Serving State Governments

Technical Proposal

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

- Mandatory Requirements
- Target Audience
- Required Services
- Cost-Saving Opportunities
- Reporting and Evaluation Requirements
- Compliance Requirements

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 initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Bridge Building	31.50
CPI	35.25
Hybrid Academy	5.75
Jump Start	6.50
Kellie Meyer	12.25

C. Cost Proposal (35 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 35.
- If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Bridge Building	35.00
CPI	10.92
Hybrid Academy	8.93
Jump Start	9.84
Kellie Meyer	7.43

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.
Bridge Building	66.50
CPI	46.17
Hybrid Academy	14.68
Jump Start	16.34
Kellie Meyer	19.68

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Bridge Building and CPI based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) shortlisted Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the written responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Bridge Building	31.50
CPI	32.75

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two shortlisted 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 35 pts.
Bridge Building	35.00
CPI	10.92

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	45	35	80
Bridge Building	31.50	35.00	66.50
CPI	32.75	10.92	43.67

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 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 7: 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 pt.)
Bridge Building	31.50	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	63.50
CPI	32.75	10.92	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	40.67

* 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 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. The cost for Optional Year 5 is \$127,500.00. The cost for Optional Year 6 is \$131,250.00.

