



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: January 11, 2022

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

From: David Brandon-Friedman, Senior Account Manager,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-68345,
Central and Regional Change Center Eligibility Operations

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-68345, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Maximus US Services, Inc. (Maximus) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Central and Regional Change Center Eligibility Operations for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Division of Family Resources (DFR).

*Maximus has committed to subcontract 20.63% of the contract value to **Guidesoft, Inc. dba Knowledge Services** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)) and 9.27% of the contract value to **The Panther Group** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$425,896,208.00

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Automated Health Systems (AHS)
2. Conduent Inc. (Conduent)
3. Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell)
4. Maximus US Services, Inc. (Maximus)

The proposals were evaluated by DFR 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. 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. All four (4) 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
- References

Technical Proposal (45 Points)

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

- Scope of Work Section 1 and 2 – Introduction, Background, and Experience
- Scope of Work Section 3 – General Project Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 4 – Central Change Center Eligibility Determination Operations
- Scope of Work Section 4 – Regional Change Center Eligibility Determination Operations
- Scope of Work Section 5 – Transition and Turnover Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 6 and 7 – Policies and Procedures Operations Manual and Notifications of Problems
- Scope of Work Section 8 – Corrective Actions and Payment Withholds
- Scope of Work Section 9 and 11 – Quality Assurance Standards and Expectations and Quality Assurance Reporting
- Scope of Work Section 10 and 12 – Performance Metrics Validation with OV&V and Reporting Requirements
- Overall Ability to Meet State Needs

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.
AHS	4.75
Conduent	14.00
Gainwell	7.75
Maximus	31.75

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.
AHS	23.12
Conduent	29.43
Gainwell	30.00
Maximus	23.86

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

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
AHS	27.87
Conduent	43.43
Gainwell	37.75
Maximus	55.61

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Conduent, Gainwell, and Maximus based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the three 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 50 pts.
Conduent	14.00
Gainwell	7.75
Maximus	31.75

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the three 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 30 pts.
Conduent	25.04
Gainwell	30.00
Maximus	20.34

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 (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Conduent	14.00	25.04	39.04
Gainwell	7.75	30.00	37.75
Maximus	31.75	20.34	52.09

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 from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pt.)
Conduent	14.00	25.04	6.00	5.00	50.04
Gainwell	7.75	30.00	5.00	6.00	48.75
Maximus	31.75	20.34	5.00	5.00	62.09

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE 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 and nine (9) months from the date of contract execution. The first nine (9) months of the contract shall be considered the transition period. The following four (4) years shall be considered the operational period. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years and nine (9) months at the State's option.