

**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: September 17, 2026

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

Signed by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Muneer Alam".
393756D3FC774B4...From: Mike Huth, Category Director – Health and Human Services
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-87556, Preceptor Registry

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-87556, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Concourse Tech, Inc (Concourse) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Preceptor Registry for the Indiana Department of Health.

This award recommendation is conditioned upon successful finalization of a contract between the State and Concourse within fifteen (15) calendar days. If the State and Concourse fail to reach an agreement on contract terms in a timely manner, the State may choose to withdraw this award recommendation and may select an alternative respondent.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Five (5)-year contract value: \$809,500.00

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Audacious Inquiry (Audacious)
2. Bucher and Christian Consulting Inc (BCForward)
3. Concourse Tech, Inc (Concourse)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOH 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. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 90 (91 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. 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 Respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- 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:

- Executive Summary
- Background and Experience
- Minimum Requirements
- Functional Requirements
- Technical Requirements
- Design, Development, and Implementation
- Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity

- Maintenance and Operations
- Staffing
- Project Management
- Software Warranty
- End of Contract Transition and Turnover
- Key Performance Indicators
- Compliance Requirements
- Optional - State Hosting

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.
Audacious	25.11
BCForward	26.22
Concourse	11.00

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

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

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.
Audacious	4.04
BCForward	2.03
Concourse	30.00

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)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Audacious	29.15
BCForward	28.25
Concourse	41.00

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

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the three (3) 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.
Audacious	25.11
BCForward	26.22
Concourse	16.33

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the three (3) 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.
Audacious	4.04
BCForward	2.86
Concourse	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
Audacious	25.11	4.04	29.15
BCForward	26.22	2.86	29.08
Concourse	16.33	30.00	46.33

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 updated 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 90 possible points (91 with bonus) were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+1 bonus pt.)
Audacious	25.11	4.04	0.00	5.00	34.15
BCForward	26.22	2.86	5.00	6.00	40.08
Concourse	16.33	30.00	0.00	-1.00	45.33

* See Sections 3.2.5 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 five (5) years from the date of contract execution.