



# 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: February 16, 2026

To: Jennifer Jansen, Director of Procurement,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Mike Huth, Procurement Consultant,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-85528, Workforce Diploma Program

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-85528, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Graduation Alliance be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Workforce Diploma Program for the Indiana Department of Workforce Development (DWD).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 1-year Contract Value: \$1,325,000.00.

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Graduation Alliance
2. Smart Schools

The proposals were evaluated by 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)
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. Two (2) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. No proposals were 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

### Technical Proposal

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

- Section 2: Consideration Milestones per Student
- Section 3.a: Employability and Career & Technical Skills
- Section 3.b: Obtain a high school diploma
- Section 3.c: Academic skill intake assessments and transcript evaluations
- Section 3.d: Learning Plan and Career Goals
- Section 3.e: Remediation – Literacy and Numeracy
- Section 3.f: Academic Resiliency Assessment & Intervention
- Section 3.g: Career Pathways
- Section 3.h: Industry Recognized Credentials
- Section 3.i: Career Placement Services
- Section 4a: Historical Performance Data
- Section 4b: Data Collection and Accountability
- Section 5. Data Security

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 45 pts.
Graduation Alliance	32.25
Smart Schools	13.25

## C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

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

Score =

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

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 35 pts.</b>
Graduation Alliance	35.00
Smart Schools	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)**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
Graduation Alliance	62.25
Smart Schools	43.25

**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**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 35 pts.</b>
Graduation Alliance	35.00
Smart Schools	35.00

**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 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>80</b>
Graduation Alliance	32.25	35.00	62.25
Smart Schools	13.25	35.00	43.25

**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 7: 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>45</b>	<b>35</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>
Graduation Alliance	46.50	30.00	0.00	-1	-1	-1	59.25
Smart Schools	44.50	27.25	0.00	-1	-1	-1	40.25

\* 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 three (3) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

