



# 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 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 25-80349,  
External Evaluation Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-80349, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Professional Data Analysts (PDA) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the External Evaluation Services for the Indiana Department of Health (IDOH).

*PDA has committed to subcontract 2.51% of the contract value to **Fineline Graphics, Inc. dba Fineline Printing Group** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 3.52% of the contract value to **Chamberlin/Dunn LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 2.41% 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.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$1,990,695.00

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Delineate LLC (Delineate)
2. Professional Data Analysts (PDA)
3. Syra Health Corp. (Syra)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOH 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. 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. All three (3) 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 Governments

##### Technical Proposal

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

- Section 1 – Respondent's Organization and Capacity to Serve IDOH, TPC
- Section 2 – Proposed Solution
- Section 3A – Measure Adult Tobacco Use
- Section 3B – Measure Youth Tobacco Use
- Section 3C – 5-Year Evaluation Plan
- Section 3D – Indiana Tobacco Quitline Evaluation
- Section 3E – Survey of Youth and Young Adult Tobacco Use Behaviors
- Section 3F – Evaluation Advisory Group
- Section 3G – Emerging Areas of Evaluation

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**

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Delineate	17.71
PDA	47.39
Syra	14.18

#### C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

$$\text{Score} = \begin{cases} 
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.} \\
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\
 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}
 \end{cases}$$

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
Delineate	24.58
PDA	27.31
Syra	30.00

**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)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
Delineate	42.29
PDA	74.70
Syra	44.18

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist PDA based on Round 1 Total Scores. All other respondents were removed from further consideration.

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

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

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

**Table 4: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
PDA	30.00

**F. 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 5: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
PDA	47.39	30.00	77.39

**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 6: Final Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Buy Indiana*</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>IVOSB*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>100 (+3 bonus pt.)</b>
PDA	47.39	30.00	0.00	1.88	1.80	4.02	85.09

\* 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 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.

