



# STATE OF INDIANA

Mike Braun, 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 19, 2025

To: Mark Hempel, Procurement Director,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, Procurement Consultant,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 25-79578,  
Authorizers & Professional Development

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-79578, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that National Association for Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Authorizers & Professional Development for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*NACSA has committed to subcontract 9.65% of the contract value to **Virtuoso Education Consulting** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), and 14.85% of the contract value to **Brilject, LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 2-year Contract Value: \$673,478.00

The evaluation team received six (6) proposals from:

1. Cognia, Inc. (Cognia)
2. National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA)
3. PCG – Indiana, Inc. (PCG)
4. Resultant, LLC (Resultant)
5. SchoolWorks, LLC (SchoolWorks)
6. WestEd

The proposals were evaluated by IDOE 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 six (6) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

#### 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:

- References
- Experience Serving State Governments
- Experience Serving Similar Clients

##### Technical Proposal

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

- Vision for Authorizing
- Description of Organization's Experience
- Description of Individual's Experience
- Description of Organization's Framework
- Identifying Kinds of School
- Timeline of Strategic Arc
- Key Benchmarks within the Timeline
- Additional Timeline of Strategic Arc
- Approval of Authorizer Program Design and Logistics
- Collection of Baseline Data
- Establishing Multi-Year Plan
- Annual Charter Portfolio Reviews
- Structure of Engagement
- Evaluating Degrees of Success

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 initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

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

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 50 pts.</b>
Cognia	40.58
NACSA	48.17
PCG	39.83
Resultant	42.00
SchoolWorks	44.50
WestEd	43.33

#### 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.
Cognia	12.83
NACSA	28.44
PCG	23.98
Resultant	13.09
SchoolWorks	30.00
WestEd	22.45

#### **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.
Cognia	53.42
NACSA	76.61
PCG	63.81
Resultant	55.09
SchoolWorks	74.50
WestEd	65.78

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

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the Respondents.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

**Table 4: BAFO Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
Cognia	9.90
NACSA	21.95
PCG	18.50
Resultant	10.63
SchoolWorks	30.00
WestEd	18.33

**F. Total Scores**

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 1 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

**Table 5: Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>BAFO Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
Cognia	40.58	9.90	50.49
NACSA	48.17	21.95	70.11
PCG	39.83	18.50	58.34
Resultant	42.00	10.63	52.63
SchoolWorks	44.50	30.00	74.50
WestEd	43.33	18.33	61.66

**G. 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 Respondent, the total scores out of 90 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 6: Final Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>90 (+2 bonus pt.)</b>
Cognia	40.58	9.90	5.00	5.00	60.49
NACSA	48.17	21.95	5.00	6.00	81.11
PCG	39.83	18.50	5.00	-1.00	62.34
Resultant	42.00	10.63	6.00	-1.00	57.63

SchoolWorks	44.50	30.00	-1.00	-1.00	72.50
WestEd	43.33	18.33	-1.00	4.05	64.71

\* 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be three (3) one-year renewals for a total of five (5) years at the State's option.

