

State of Indiana Contact:

Teresa Deaton-Reese,
Procurement Consultant
tdeaton@idoa.in.gov
Indiana Department of
Administration

Attachment H
Reference Check Form
RFP-23-72518
COMPONENT A, C, D, & E

Reference Check Form Due Date:

[October 17, 2022 by 3:00 PM Eastern Time]

INSTRUCTIONS: You have been asked by the vendor listed below to provide a reference as they are responding the current solicitation with the state of Indiana. This is a standard form created by the State of Indiana and your input is very much appreciated. During this competitive process, a representative from the State of Indiana, may contact you directly for more detail. If you have any questions, please contact the State of Indiana contact listed in the box in the top left side of the form.

Please provide the information requested below and submit this reference check form to:
idoareferences@idoa.in.gov:

The subject line of the email submissions must clearly state the following:
RFP-23-72518 Reference – [PCG-Indiana, Inc.]

VENDOR NAME

PCG-Indiana, Inc.

REFERENCE CONTACT INFORMATION

Reference Company Name	Clark University
Contact Name	Dug Jones
Contact Title	Program Director for Workforce Grants
Company Mailing Address	950 Main Street
Company City, State, Zip	Worcester, MA 01610
Company Website Address	www.clarku.edu
Contact Telephone Number	(352) 359 - 6287
Contact Fax Number	N/A
Contact Email	dugjones@clarku.edu
Industry of Company	Higher Education

QUESTIONS: Please provide a response to each of the questions listed below regarding the vendor listed above.

1. If you decline to provide a reference, please indicate that below and provide any comments you would be willing to share regarding the reason.

2. How long did you/have you and/or members of your team worked with the vendor? Please provide the specific dates of service.

We began working with PCG during the DOLETA Scaling Apprenticeship Grant application process in July of 2019 and worked steadily with them on two large (\$22M combined) grant funded projects since then. We have three years of direct experience with PCG.

3. With what type of internal and external stakeholders did the vendor have to communicate with?

Approximately ten persons within Clark University and over 150 external partners that include; 12 Workforce Development Boards, 22 private sector IT Industry training partners, 4 higher education institutions, 100 IT industry employers, and a number of collaborating organizations.

4. Has the vendor been cited for any financial audit issues? If you are able to, please describe the issue briefly, and any corrective actions required. Did the vendor ultimately address the issue(s) in a satisfactory manner?

Clark has been completely satisfied with PCG's financial accountability and accuracy.

5. Has the vendor been subject to any requests for corrective action to cure performance issues? If you are able to, please describe the issue briefly, and any corrective actions required. Did the vendor ultimately address the issue(s) in a satisfactory manner?

No need for corrective actions.

6. Would you rate your experience with the quality of services/work provided by vendor as poor, satisfactory, above average or superior? Please elaborate on why you are giving the vendor this rating.

Superior. PCG provides excellent support and perspective promptly.

7. Would you rate the vendor's knowledge of your business as poor, satisfactory, above average or superior? Please elaborate on why you are giving the vendor this rating.

Superior. PCG's workforce team is very experienced and knowledgeable. They have a long-term national perspective.

8. Would you rate the overall quality of the vendor's staff as poor, satisfactory, above average or superior? Please elaborate on why you are giving the vendor this rating.

Superior. The PCG team includes former WDB directors and former state level apprenticeship administrators. All are readily available and strong communicators.

9. Would you describe the quality of the vendor's engagement and communication with stakeholders (internal and external) throughout the project as poor, satisfactory, above average or superior? Please elaborate on why you are giving the vendor this rating.

Superior. We meet with each of our 30+ partners individually on a monthly basis and meet with the groups for broader topics quarterly. The agendas are always clear and well organized. The presentations are professionally created.

10. Would you rate the vendor's ability to provide appropriate staff and resources for the project, as needed, at all times as poor, satisfactory, above average or superior? Please elaborate on why you are giving the vendor this rating.

Superior. The PCG team is large enough and diverse enough to have met every need we have articulated.

11. Would you rate the vendor's performance regarding cost and/or schedule overruns on the project as poor, satisfactory, above average or superior? Please elaborate on why you are giving the vendor this rating.

Superior. All deadlines met to date on both projects.

12. Are there any other topics you believe Indiana should consider during its reference evaluation or comments you would like to share?

When We are awarded our next project, I'm hopeful we will be working with PCG as our administrative entity again.

13. Would your overall rating of the vendor be poor, satisfactory, above average or superior?

Clearly Superior