



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division

Indiana Government Center South
402 W. Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: February 1, 2024

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

From: Robert Cohen, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-75844
Kindergarten Readiness Assessment

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-75844, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Johns Hopkins University (JHU)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*JHU has committed to subcontract 2.8% of the contract value to **Bucher + Christian Consulting, Inc. dba BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 0.8% of the contract value to **Briljent, LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 1.2% of the contract value to **Bingle Research Group, Inc.** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Initial contract term of two (2) years, and one, optional, two (2) year renewals, with an estimated contract amount of \$3,852,440.00.

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Cognitive ToyBox (CBT)
2. Indiana University School of Education's Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP)
3. Johns Hopkins University (JHU)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOE, Key Stakeholder State Agencies, 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)

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. All 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:

- Section 1.1, 1.2, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.10 | Assessment Design
- Section 1.3, 1.13, 1.16, 1.4, 1.14, 1.5, 1.15 | Assessment Timeline & Test Administration
- Section 1.17 – 1.24 | Project Management
- Section 1.12 | Accessibility
- Section 1.19, 1.11, 1.25, 1.26, 1.28 | Scoring and Reporting
- Section 1.27, 1.29, 1.30 - 1.39 | Quality Assurance & Technical Integrity
- Section 1.40 – 1.42 | Training and Communication

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 and Cost 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.
CBT	30.04
CEEP	12.71
JHU	35.33

C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

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

Score =

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

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.
CBT	7.38
CEEP	7.52
JHU	35.00

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.
CBT	37.43
CEEP	20.23
JHU	70.33

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the three (3) Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
CBT	30.96
CEEP	12.50
JHU	36.21

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the three (3) 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.
-------------------	-------------------------------

CBT	8.41
CEEP	8.84
JHU	35.00

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	45	35	80
CBT	30.96	8.41	39.37
CEEP	12.50	8.84	21.34
JHU	36.21	35.00	71.21

H. 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 Respondents, 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.)
CBT	30.96	8.41	0.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	57.37
CEEP	12.50	8.84	5.00	-1.00	0.00	-1.00	24.34
JHU	36.21	35.00	0.00	1.88	0.45	2.00	75.53

* 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be one (1) two-year renewal for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.