



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: 5/8/2026

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 26-84993,
Literacy Endorsement Training

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84993, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Keys to Literacy, LLC (KtL) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Literacy Endorsement Training for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*Keys to Literacy, LLC has committed to subcontract 8.00% of the contract value to **Fineline Graphics dba Fineline Printing Group** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 11.00% of the contract value to **Briljent, LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 3.00% of the contract value to **Vespa Group, LLC**. (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received five (5) proposals from:

1. AIM Institute for Learning and Research (AIM)
2. Brainspring
3. EEP-EPS Holdings, LLC (EPS)
4. Keys to Literacy, LLC (KtL)
5. The Reading Clinic of Central Indiana (TRC)

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)	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. Five (5) 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 and Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- Question 1 – Previous Performance Issues
- Question 2 – Project Management/Subcontractors
- Question 3 – Marketing and Communication
- Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 – Professional Development/Training
- Question 9 - Educators
- Question 10 – Data and Analysis

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.
AIM	42.08
Brainspring	34.50
EPS	26.42
KtL	42.71
TRC	25.46

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =

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

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
AIM	15.00
Brainspring	15.08
EPS	30.00
KtL	30.00
TRC	22.22

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.
AIM	57.08
Brainspring	49.58
EPS	56.42
KtL	72.71
TRC	47.68

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist AIM and KtL based on the respondent having International Dyslexia Association accreditation and Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) shortlisted Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
AIM	41.58
KtL	43.88

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two shortlisted 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 30 pts.
AIM	19.33
KtL	30.00

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	50	30	80
AIM	41.58	19.33	60.91
KtL	43.88	30.00	73.88

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 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.)
AIM	41.58	19.33	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	57.91
KtL	43.88	30.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	88.88

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

