



**Award Recommendation Letter**

Date: September 19, 2024

To: Eric Miller, Director, Indiana Department of Child Services

From: David Reed, Deputy Director of Child Welfare Services, Indiana Department of Child Services

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 01-2024, Intensive Foster Care Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 01-2024, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that the following providers be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Intensive Foster Care Services for the State of Indiana:

- Centerstone Foster Care ("Centerstone")
- Choices Coordinated Care Solutions, inc. ("Choices")
- Damar Services Inc. ("Damar")
- Family Ark, Inc. ("Family Ark")
- Children's Bureau Inc. DBA Firefly Children & Family Alliance ("Firefly")
- Infinity Counseling & Wellness Center, LLC ("Infinity")
- White's Residential and Family Services ("Josiah White")
- National Youth Advocate Program ("NYAP")
- Omni Family Services of Indiana ("Omni")
- Specialized Alternatives for Families and Youth of Indiana ("SAFY")
- Stop Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN), Inc. ("SCAN")
- The Villages of Indiana, Inc. ("Villages")
- Youth Development Project ("YDP")

*Choices has committed to subcontract 4.00% of the contract value to Favorite Part of My Day LLC. a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 3.00% of the contract value to Holliday Collaborative Agency LLC. a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), 3.00% of the contract value to Hope Haven Psychological Resources, LLC a certified Women-owned Business (WBE), 4.00% of the contract value JB Graphics Inc. a certified Women-owned Business (WBE), 3.00% of the contract value to One Sensible Solution a certified Women-owned Business (WBE), and 2.00% of the contract value to Stepping Stones Therapy Center a certified Women-owned Business (WBE).*

*Damar has committed to subcontract 5.00% of the contract value to Diamond Pest Control, LLC a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)*

*Firefly has committed to subcontract 2.00% of the contract value to Thought Kitchen, LLC a certified Women-owned Business (WBE).*

*SAFY has committed to subcontract 2.19% of the contract value to Purple Ink LLC a certified Women-owned Business (WBE).*

*Villages has committed to subcontract 0.10% of the contract value to Majesty Hair Care, LLC a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)*

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

**Estimated Four (4) Year Contract Amount:** This is a zero-based contract, with no guaranteed volume.

The evaluation team received proposals from 15 vendors:

- Centerstone
- Choices
- Damar
- Family Ark
- Firefly
- Infinity
- Inner Beauty Program Inc. (“Inner Beauty”)
- Josiah White
- Murphy Mentoring Group (“Murphy Mentoring”)
- NYAP
- Omni
- SAFY
- SCAN
- Villages
- YDP

According to the following criteria, which were published in Section 3, Proposal Evaluation, of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Department of Child Services (“DCS”) and scored by the evaluation team:

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Provider Narrative Review	15
3. Service Narrative Review	50
4. Per Diem Rate (Cost Proposal)	25

5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 100 (102 if bonus awarded)	

The proposals were evaluated according to the published process outlined in Section 3.2, “Evaluation Criteria,” of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

**A. Adherence to Requirements**

The proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All 15 Respondents met these requirements and were selected to move forward and evaluated based on Provider Narratives, Service Narratives, and Cost Proposals.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality (“MAQ”): Initial Scoring (65 points)**

**Provider Narrative**

For the Provider Narrative evaluation, the evaluation team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the Provider Narrative:

- General Information
- Agency Business Model/Logistics
- Agency Work Within the Community

**Service Narrative**

For the Service Narrative evaluation, the team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the Service Narrative:

- History of Quality Services
- Service Provision and Delivery
- Intake & Referral Process
- Service Demographics
- Practice Model
- Staffing Structure

The evaluation team’s initial scores were based on a review of the Respondents’ proposed approach to each section of the Provider and Service Narratives. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Initial MAQ Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score (65 Max)
Centerstone	50.25
Choices	50.13
Damar	54.38
Family Ark	37.66

Respondent	MAQ Score (65 Max)
Firefly	50.09
Infinity	28.00
Inner Beauty	5.78
Josiah Whites	54.06
Murphy Mentoring	15.41
NYAP	55.16
Omni	29.34
SAFY	54.00
SCAN	38.13
Villages	55.81
YDP	30.09

**C. Cost Proposal (25 Points Available)**

Cost Proposal points were awarded on the Respondents’ proposed Effective Per Diem Rate as follows:

Score = {

- If Respondent’s proposed Effective Per Diem Rate amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 25.
- If Respondent’s proposed Effective Per Diem Rate amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$25 * \frac{\text{(Lowest Respondent’s proposed Effective Per Diem Rate)}}{\text{(Respondent’s proposed Effective Per Diem Rate)}}$$

The Cost Proposal scoring as a result of the Respondents’ initial cost proposals is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score (25 Max)
Centerstone	23.01
Choices	11.40
Damar	8.60
Family Ark	19.10
Firefly	18.22
Infinity	25.00
Inner Beauty	10.34
Josiah Whites	16.93
Murphy Mentoring	14.86
NYAP	14.77
Omni	21.78
SAFY	18.84

SCAN*	12.79
Villages	13.84
YDP	21.02

\*Effective Per Diem Rate adjusted proportionally as Respondent did not submit Per Diem Rate for Intensive Respite Care

#### D. Initial Round Total Scores

The Cost Scores were then combined with the Management Assessment and Quality Score to generate the total scores. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 90 points are tabulated in the tables below.

**Table 3: MAQ + Initial Cost Score**

Respondent	MAQ Score (65 Max)	Cost Score (25 Max)	Total Score* (90 Max)
Centerstone	50.25	23.01	<b>73.26</b>
SAFY	54.00	18.84	<b>72.84</b>
Josiah Whites	54.06	16.93	<b>70.99</b>
NYAP	55.16	14.77	<b>69.92</b>
Villages	55.81	13.84	<b>69.65</b>
Firefly	50.09	18.22	<b>68.31</b>
Damar	54.38	8.60	<b>62.97</b>
Choices	50.13	11.40	<b>61.52</b>
Family Ark	37.66	19.10	<b>56.76</b>
Infinity	28.00	25.00	<b>53.00</b>
Omni	29.34	21.78	<b>51.13</b>
YDP	30.09	21.02	<b>51.11</b>
SCAN	38.13	12.79	<b>50.91</b>
Murphy Mentoring	15.41	14.86	<b>30.27</b>
Inner Beauty	5.78	10.34	<b>16.12</b>

\*Totals may not foot due to rounding differences

After reviewing the combined MAQ and initial Cost Scores, a short-list was developed. The evaluation team elected to shortlist the following 13 respondents:

- Centerstone
- Choices
- Damar
- Family Ark
- Firefly
- Infinity
- Josiah White
- NYAP
- Omni
- SAFY
- SCAN
- Villages
- YDP

The following two respondents were removed from consideration:

- Inner Beauty
- Murphy Mentoring

**E. Best and Final Offer**

Short-listed Respondents were given the opportunity to improve their Cost Proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round. The cost scores for the short-listed respondents after these updates are as follows:

**Table 4: BAFO Cost Score**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score (25 Max)</b>
Infinity	<b>25.00</b>
Centerstone	<b>19.87</b>
YDP	<b>18.52</b>
Omni	<b>17.81</b>
Family Ark	<b>14.93</b>
Firefly	<b>14.36</b>
SAFY	<b>13.99</b>
Josiah Whites	<b>12.57</b>
Villages	<b>11.40</b>
NYAP	<b>11.29</b>
SCAN*	<b>9.50</b>
Choices	<b>8.55</b>
Damar	<b>8.10</b>

\*Effective Per Diem Rate adjusted proportionally as Respondent did not submit Per Diem Rate for Intensive Respite Care

The combined BAFO cost scores and MAQ scores are as follows:

**Table 5: MAQ + BAFO Cost Score**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (65 Max)</b>	<b>Cost Score (25 Max)</b>	<b>Total Score* (90 Max)</b>
Centerstone	50.25	19.87	<b>70.12</b>
SAFY	54.00	13.99	<b>67.99</b>
Villages	55.81	11.40	<b>67.21</b>
Josiah Whites	54.06	12.57	<b>66.63</b>
NYAP	55.16	11.29	<b>66.45</b>
Firefly	50.09	14.36	<b>64.46</b>
Damar	54.38	8.10	<b>62.48</b>
Choices	50.13	8.55	<b>58.67</b>
Infinity	28.00	25.00	<b>53.00</b>
Family Ark	37.66	14.93	<b>52.59</b>

YDP	30.09	18.52	<b>48.61</b>
SCAN	38.13	9.50	<b>47.62</b>
Omni	29.34	17.81	<b>47.15</b>

\*Totals may not foot due to rounding differences

After review of the combined BAFO cost scores and MAQ scores, the evaluation team elected to move forward with all 13 shortlisted respondents.

## F. Preference Scoring

The short-listed Respondents were scored 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. When necessary, certain MBE/WBE information was clarified with Respondents. Once the final MBE/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 102 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 6: Final Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score**
Points Possible	65	25	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+2 bonus pts.)
Choices	50.13	8.55	4.38	6.00	<b>69.05</b>
Centerstone	50.25	19.87	-1.00	-1.00	<b>68.12</b>
SAFY	54.00	13.99	-1.00	0.90	<b>67.89</b>
Villages	55.81	11.40	0.00	-1.00	<b>66.21</b>
Josiah Whites	54.06	12.57	-1.00	-1.00	<b>64.63</b>
Damar	54.38	8.10	3.13	-1.00	<b>64.60</b>
NYAP	55.16	11.29	-1.00	-1.00	<b>64.45</b>
Firefly	50.09	14.36	-1.00	0.90	<b>64.36</b>
Infinity	28.00	25.00	-1.00	-1.00	<b>51.00</b>
Family Ark	37.66	14.93	-1.00	-1.00	<b>50.59</b>
YDP	30.09	18.52	-1.00	-1.00	<b>46.61</b>
SCAN	38.13	9.50	-1.00	-1.00	<b>45.62</b>
Omni	29.34	17.81	-1.00	-1.00	<b>45.15</b>

\* See Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of the RFP for information on available MBE/WBE bonus points.

\*\*Totals may not foot due to rounding differences

## Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed ability 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 from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.