



# STATE OF INDIANA

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

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

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 15, 2024

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

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-77693,  
Learning and Development Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-77693, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Conduent State Healthcare, LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Learning and Development Services for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Division of Family Resources (DFR).

Conduent State Healthcare, LLC *has committed to subcontract 10.90% of the contract value to **Koehler Partners, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 9.51% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Four (4)-year and five (5)-month with an estimated contract value of \$18,850,682.27.

Three (3) proposals were submitted- The evaluation team evaluated proposals from:

1. Brilljent, LLC (Brilljent)
2. Conduent State Healthcare, LLC (Conduent)
3. Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte)

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)
<b>Total:</b>	<b>90 (92 if bonus awarded)</b>

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. Three (3) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. None were disqualified.

#### 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:

- References, Experience Serving State Governments, and Experience Serving Similar Clients
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- All Other Business Proposal Sections

##### Technical Proposal (45 Points)

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

- Overview and Background
- General Project Requirements
- Vital Positions and Staffing
- Performance Metrics; Performance Metrics Validation
- Quality Assurance Standards
- Reporting Requirements
- Billing and Invoicing; Corrective Actions and Payment Withholds
- State Functions; State Eligibility Systems; System and Infrastructure Requirements
- Initial Transition Requirements; End of Contract Transition

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to the above-listed sections of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The evaluation team issued MAQ & Cost Clarifications prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation and Pricing Questions are shown below:

**Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores\***

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Briljent	22.8
Conduent	31.3
Deloitte	29.0

\* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal

### C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

The price points on the Respondent's Costs were awarded as follows:

Score = 
$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{If a Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then the score is 30 points.} \\ \text{If a Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then the score is:} \\ 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{array} \right.$$

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.
Briljent	22.4
Conduent	30.0
Deloitte	22.2

\* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

### 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.
Briljent	45.2
Conduent	61.3
Deloitte	51.2

\* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.

**E. Post MAQ Clarification Responses – Second Round MAQ Scores**

The evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications and held Oral Presentations with all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the written responses to these clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the second round of MAQ scoring are listed below.

**Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores\***

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Briljent	26.8
Conduent	32.8
Deloitte	27.0

*\* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.*

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the three Respondents. Briljent did not lower their pricing in the BAFO response.

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.
Briljent	21.5
Conduent	30.0
Deloitte	21.4

*\* Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal.*

**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	50	30	80

Briljent	26.8	21.5	48.3
Conduent	32.8	30.0	62.8
Deloitte	27.0	21.4	48.4

\* *Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal*

#### 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 commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 90 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.)
Briljent	26.8	21.5	5.0	5.0	58.3
Conduent	32.8	30.0	5.0	5.0	72.8
Deloitte	27.0	21.4	6.0	6.0	60.4

\* See Sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE bonus points.

\*\* *Note: Additive scores have been rounded to the nearest decimal*

#### 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 five (5) months from the contract start date. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years and five (5) months at the State's option.