



# 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: April 29, 2026

To: Eric Skaggs, Deputy Chief Procurement Officer,  
Indiana Department of Administration

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-84426,  
340b Contract Pharmacy

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84426, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Boswell Pharmacy Services, LLC (Boswell) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the 340b Contract Pharmacy for the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC).

*Boswell did not committed to any subcontracting.*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Four-year Contract from the date of execution. There may be two one-year renewals for a total of six year at the State's option.

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Boswell Pharmacy Services, LLC (Boswell)
2. Polaris Pharmacy Services of Warrington (Polaris)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOC 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. One (1) proposal was deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. One (1) proposal was disqualified.

#### 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 and Similar Clients

##### Technical Proposal

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

- Payment Terms
- Essential 340b Requirements
- Operational Responsibilities
- Other Pharmacy Responsibilities
- Compliance Management Rights
- Liability/Regulatory
- Compliance – Privacy & Confidentiality
- Systems - General

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.
Boswell	42.75

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

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

Score =

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

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Boswell	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)**

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Boswell	72.75

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

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 30 pts.
Boswell	30.00

**F. 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	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Boswell	42.75	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	69.75

\* 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.

