



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: October 9, 2026

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

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-87450,
Rural Health Transformation Program (RHTP), Program Evaluator

Signed by:
Kevin March
F57C5348AE7D4C5...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-87450, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Public Policy Associates LLC (PPA) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the RHTP Program Evaluator for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration

*Public Policy Associates LLC has committed to subcontract 10% of the contract value to **Hutchins Consulting LLC** (a certified Minority Owned Business Enterprise (MBE)), 15% to **Transform Consulting Group, Inc** (a certified Woman Owned Business Enterprise (WBE)), and 3% of the contract value to **Bravia Services LLC** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

4-year Contract Value: \$1,000,000.00
5-year Contract Value at the State's option: \$1,250,000.00
6-year Contract Value at the State's option: \$1,500,000.00

The evaluation team received seventeen (17) proposals from:

1. Advocates for Human Potential, Inc
2. COIL Solutions LLC-S
3. Complete Wellness LLC
4. Deloitte Consulting LLP
5. Engaging Solutions LLC
6. Ernst and Young US LLP
7. Government Market Strategies Inc
8. Measurement Resources Company
9. Michigan Public Health Institute
10. Pacific Institute for Research and Eval
11. PCG-Indiana, INC
12. PlanMerica Home Solutions LLC
13. Public Policy Associates LLC
14. Remedy Healthcare Consulting LLC
15. Thomas P. Miller and Associates
16. University of IL at Chicago
17. Paramount Health Data Project

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA 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 Owned Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Owned 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. Fourteen (14) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. Three (3) 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 Respondent's proposal in the following areas:

- COMPANY INFORMATION
- EXPERIENCE SERVING STATE GOVERNMENTS
- REFERENCES

Technical Proposal

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

- Att F, Question 1.1 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Milestone 1 (Develop and Submit Overall Evaluation Plan with details on the Evaluation Process) requirements of the scope of work.
- Att F, Question 1.2 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Milestone 2 (Develop Draft and Final Annual Evaluation Report which is cumulative, encompassing all Budget Years to date) requirements of the scope of work.
- Att F, Question 1.3 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Milestone 3 (Develop Draft and Final Comprehensive RHTP Evaluation Report) requirements of the scope of work.
- Att F, Question 2.1 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Project Management Plan requirements of the scope of work.
- Att F, Question 2.2 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Key Persons requirements of the scope of work.

- Att F, Question 3.1 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Status Meetings requirements of the scope of work.
- Att F, Question 3.2 Describe in detail how the respondent will meet the Monthly Progress Reports requirements of the scope of work.

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.
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	43.11
Complete Wellness LLC	22.89
Deloitte Consulting LLP	38.67
Engaging Solutions LLC	8.00
Ernst and Young US LLP	26.00
Government Market Strategies Inc	28.22
Measurement Resources Company	30.00
Michigan Public Health Institute	25.33
Pacific Institute for Research and Eval	28.44
PCG-Indiana, INC	46.44
Public Policy Associates LLC	32.22
Thomas P. Miller and Associates	29.11
University of IL at Chicago	40.22
Paramount Health Data Project	10.89

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 * $\frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$

}

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	9.13
Complete Wellness LLC	9.90
Deloitte Consulting LLP	3.86
Engaging Solutions LLC	30.00
Ernst and Young US LLP	3.80
Government Market Strategies Inc	1.29
Measurement Resources Company	12.74
Michigan Public Health Institute	27.39
Pacific Institute for Research and Eval	3.92
PCG-Indiana, INC	11.04
Public Policy Associates LLC	27.39
Thomas P. Miller and Associates	5.24
University of IL at Chicago	2.41
Paramount Health Data Project	6.42

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.
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	52.24
Complete Wellness LLC	32.79
Deloitte Consulting LLP	42.53
Engaging Solutions LLC	38.00
Ernst and Young US LLP	29.80

Government Market Strategies Inc	29.51
Measurement Resources Company	42.74
Michigan Public Health Institute	52.72
Pacific Institute for Research and Eval	32.36
PCG-Indiana, INC	57.48
Public Policy Associates LLC	59.61
Thomas P. Miller and Associates	34.35
University of IL at Chicago	42.63
Paramount Health Data Project	17.31

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

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the four (4) 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.
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	43.11
Michigan Public Health Institute	25.33
PCG-Indiana, INC	46.44
Public Policy Associates LLC	32.22

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the NUMBER 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.
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	9.13

Michigan Public Health Institute	27.39
PCG-Indiana, INC	11.04
Public Policy Associates LLC	27.39

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
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	43.11	9.13	52.24
Michigan Public Health Institute	25.33	27.39	52.72
PCG-Indiana, INC	46.44	11.04	57.48
Public Policy Associates LLC	32.22	27.39	59.61

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final 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	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Advocates for Human Potential, Inc	43.11	9.13	0	-1	-1	-1	49.24
Michigan Public Health Institute	25.33	27.39	0	5	-1	3.33	60.05
PCG-Indiana, INC	46.44	11.04	5	-1	5	-1	65.48
Public Policy Associates LLC	32.22	27.39	0	5	6	5	75.61

* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available 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) 1-year optional years for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.