



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 31, 2022

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-69116: Adoption and Guardianship Support Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-69116, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Lifeline Youth & Family Services, Inc. ("Lifeline")** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Adoption and Guardianship Support Services for the Indiana Department of Child Services (DCS).

*Lifeline has committed to subcontract 6.00% of the contract value to **Alpha Rae Personnel, Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), and 11.00% of the contract value to **Netlogx, LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$59,938,844.00

The evaluation team received five (5) proposals from:

1. Children's Bureau, Inc. ("*Children's Bureau*")
2. Counseling Partners LLC ("*Counseling Partners*")
3. Lifeline Youth & Family Services, Inc. ("*Lifeline*")
4. Southlake/Tri-City Management Corp. d.b.a. Geminus Corp. ("*Geminus*")
5. Specialized Alternatives for Families and Youth of Indiana, Inc. ("*SAFY*")

The proposals were evaluated by DCS 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 of the Respondents 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 (8 points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondents provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondents’ ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- References

Technical Proposal (42 Points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents’ proposals in the following areas:

- General Requirements and Definitions
- Scope of Work Sections 1, 2, and 3 – Introduction, Background, Objectives, and Minimum Contractor Qualifications
- Scope of Work Section 4 – Service Eligibility Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 5.1 – Full-Continuum Adoption and Guardianship Support Services
- Scope of Work Section 5.2 – Pre-Adoption and Pre-Guardianship Support Services
- Scope of Work Section 5.3 – Post-Adoption and Post-Guardianship Support Services
- Scope of Work Section 5.4 – Enhanced Adoption and Guardianship Support Services
- Scope of Work Sections 6 and 7 – Project Management and Staffing Requirements
- Scope of Work Sections 8, 9, 10, and 11 – Implementation and Transition Requirements, Billing and Invoicing, Performance and Outcome Measures, and Corrective Actions and Payment Withholds

The evaluation team’s Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondents’ 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: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Children's Bureau	19.25
Counseling Partners	7.75
Lifeline	19.25
Geminus	4.00
SAFY	19.50

C. Cost Proposal (30)

Cost points were awarded based on a Respondent’s proposed Total Four 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 Four Year Bid Amount. Points were allocated proportionately to the other Respondents.

Points were awarded using the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \begin{cases} \bullet \text{ If the Respondent's proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount is lowest among all Respondents, then the score is 30.} \\ \bullet \text{ If the Respondent's proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then the score is:} \\ 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount})} \end{cases}$$

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.
Children's Bureau	19.69
Counseling Partners	11.65
Lifeline	30.00
Geminus	16.41
SAFY	16.58

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.
Children's Bureau	38.94
Counseling Partners	19.40
Lifeline	49.25
Geminus	20.41
SAFY	36.08

The evaluation team elected to shortlist Children's Bureau, Lifeline, and SAFY based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests, Clarification Questions, and Oral Presentations requests to shortlisted Respondents.

E. Post BAFOs, Oral Presentations, and Clarification Responses

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and Clarification Responses. Respondents were also given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round.

The scores for the Respondents after these updates are as follows:

Table 4: Round 2 (Post BAFOs, Oral Presentations, and Clarification Responses) – Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Children's Bureau	19.25	22.68	41.93
Lifeline	19.25	30.00	49.25
SAFY	18.50	17.06	35.56

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the short-listed 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. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE information with the Respondents. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: 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.)
Children's Bureau	19.25	22.68	5.00	5.00	51.93
Lifeline	19.25	30.00	3.75	5.00	58.00
SAFY	18.50	17.06	0.63	-1.00	35.18

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed ability 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.