



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: August 11, 2026

To: Muneer Alam, Category Director – Professional Services
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Mike Huth, Category Director – Health and Human Services
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-85938 CCBHC Center of Excellence

Signed by:

Muneer Alam

393756D3FC774B4...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-85938, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Indiana University (IU) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the CCBHC Center of Excellence program for the Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

4-year Contract Value (the initial term): \$3,999,959.10

6-year Contract Value (including optional years, at the State's option): \$5,518,152.70

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Indiana Council of Community Mental Health Centers (Indiana Council)
2. Indiana University (IU)
3. NurseStaffing
4. Syra Health Corp (Syra)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT, 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)	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. Three (3) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. One (1) proposal from NurseStaffing 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

Technical Proposal

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

- Mandatory Contractor Qualifications 1
- Desired Contractor Qualifications 2
- Required CCBHC Evidence-Based Practices
- Contractor Responsibilities
- EBP Training Curriculum
- Training Sessions
- Licensed Training Sessions
- Evidence-Based Practice Technical Assistance 1
- Evidence-Based Practice Technical Assistance 2
- EBP Fidelity
- Scenario 1
- Scenario 2
- Project Management
- Communication and Issue Resolution Plan

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 evaluation team issued MAQ and Cost Clarifications to all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. 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.
Indiana Council	12.25
IU	33.50
Syra	4.75

C. Cost Proposal (30 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 30.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

30

*

(Lowest Respondent’s Cost Amount)

(Respondent’s Cost Amount)

.

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.
Indiana Council	30.00
IU	29.59
Syra	20.78

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.
Indiana Council	42.25
IU	63.09
Syra	25.53

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Indiana Council and IU based on 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 written 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.
Indiana Council	12.25
IU	34.75
Syra	4.75

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.
Indiana Council	30.00
IU	29.59
Syra	20.78

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
Indiana Council	12.25	30.00	42.25
IU	34.75	29.59	64.34
Syra	4.75	20.78	25.53

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.)
Indiana Council	12.25	30.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	44.25
IU	34.75	29.59	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	66.34
Syra	4.75	20.78	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	48.53

* 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 optional years for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

