



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: June 30, 2026

To: Kevin March, Category Director – IT
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Robert Cohen, Category Director – Major Procurements
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86627,
Adolescent Literacy Toolkit

Signed by:
Kevin March
F57C5348AE7D4C5...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86627, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Learners Edge, LLC DBBA K12 Coalition (Learners Edge) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Adolescent Literacy Toolkit for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*Learners Edge has committed to subcontract 6.51% of the contract value to **Blueline Media Productions LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated fifteen (15) month Contract Value: \$1,365,000.00

The evaluation team received five (5) proposals from:

1. Charmtech Labs LLC, Capti (Charmtech)
2. Learners Edge, LLC DBA K12 Coalition (Learners Edge)
3. The Reading League (The Reading League)
4. The Reading Clinic of Central Indiana
5. WestEd (WestEd)

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. Four (4) proposals were 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:

- Experience Serving State Governments/Similar Clients
- Company Financials
- References

Technical Proposal

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

- Content Development & Delivery
- Toolkit Design Requirements
- Project Management
- Project Timeline

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.
Charmtech	12.75
Learners Edge	45.75
The Reading League	16.25
WestEd	27.25

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.
Charmtech	30.00
Learners Edge	7.03
The Reading League	12.89
WestEd	8.42

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.
Charmtech	42.75
Learners Edge	52.78
The Reading League	29.14
WestEd	35.67

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist (Learners Edge) based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue an invite to an Oral Presentation to the shortlisted Respondent.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondent's (who was shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentation. The scores for the Respondent after the Oral Presentation was as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Learners Edge	48.25

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

The State elected to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) request to the shortlisted Respondent.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent's BAFO Cost Proposal is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Learners Edge	30.00

G. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent 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. The total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 6: 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.)
Learners Edge	48.25	30.00	0	-1.00	3.15	-1.00	79.40

* 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 fifteen (15) months from the date of contract execution.