




Mike Braun, Governor

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

**Award Recommendation Letter**

Date: March 24, 2026  
To: Jennifer Jansen, Category Director,  
Indiana Department of Administration   
From: Mike Huth, Category Director,  
Indiana Department of Administration  
Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86283, DMHA Medical Director

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86283, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Indiana University (IU) be selected to begin contract negotiations to serve as the DMHA Medical Director.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

4-year Contract Value: \$618,000.00  
Optional Year #5 Value: \$162,000.00  
Optional Year #6 Value: \$165,000.00  
6-year Contract Value including optional years: \$945,000

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:  
1. Indiana University

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)	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 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. The one proposal was 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:

- Company Financials
- Experience Serving State Governments
- References

**Technical Proposal**

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

- Duties
- Minimum Requirements
- Past Experience
- Substantiated Sanctions
- Committees
- Serving Similar Clients

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 and Cost Clarifications to all Respondents 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.
IU	26.25

**C. Cost Proposal (30 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 30.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
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)**

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
IU	56.25

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

The evaluation team elected to not issue invites to Oral Presentations to the shortlisted Respondent.

**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 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
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 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
Avtex	26.25	30.00	56.25

**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 7: Final Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
<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>
Avtex	46.50	30.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	58.25

\* 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.

