



STATE OF INDIANA

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Mike Braun, Governor

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

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 20, 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 25-80910,
High Quality Curriculum Grant Vendor

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-80910, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Prism Holistic Care Ltd. (Prism) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the High Quality Curriculum Grant Vendor for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*Prism has committed to subcontract 10% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 20% of the contract value to **Netlogx LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 5% of the contract value to **Bravia Services** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 6-month Contract Value: \$190,781.25

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Prism Holistic Care Ltd. (Prism)
2. University of Indianapolis (U of I)

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)	45
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)

Total: 100 (103 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. Both 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
- Company Financials
- Experience Serving State Government

Technical Proposal

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

- General Procedures
- Troubleshooting / Customer Service
- Project Meetings
- Project Timeline
- Staff Qualifications

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 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 45 pts.
Prism	40.81
U of I	24.50

C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

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

Score =
$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 35.} \\ \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\ 35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{array} \right.$$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' cost proposals is as follows:

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Prism	35.00
U of I	4.11

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.
Prism	75.81
U of I	28.61

The evaluation team elected not to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) Respondents.

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two (2) 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 35 pts.
Prism	35.00
U of I	3.80

F. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 1 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	45	35	80
Prism	40.81	35.00	75.81
U of I	24.50	3.80	28.30

G. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Prism	40.81	35.00	0.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	93.81
U of I	24.50	3.80	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	25.30

* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB 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 six (6) months from the date of contract execution. Renewals are at the discretion of the State.

