



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: July 10, 2026

To: Jonathan Huth, Category Director,
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Christina Garcia, Procurement Consultant,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-84342,
Hearing Aid Assistance Fund of Indiana

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84342, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Hear Indiana Inc. be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Hearing Aid Assistance Program.

Hear Indiana did not commit to subcontract with any Minority-owned Business (MBE), certified Women-owned Business (WBE), or certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$300,000.00

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:

1. Hear Indiana Inc.

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. The proposal was deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

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:

- Respondent Information and Financial Stability
- References
- Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure

Technical Proposal

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

- Part 1-1 – Mandatory Requirements
- Part 2-1– Fund Management
- Part 2-2 – Application Process
- Part 2-3– Pediatric audiology knowledge and background
- Part 2-4– Professional relationships
- Part 2-5– Public Relations
- Part 2-6 – Reporting
- Part 2-7 – Data Management
- Part 2-8 – Staffing
- Part 2-9 – Hearing Aid refurbishing program

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.
Hear Indiana Inc.	40.05

C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

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

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

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Hear Indiana Inc.	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)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Hear Indiana Inc.	75.05

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The evaluation team elected not to hold oral presentation.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Hear Indiana Inc.	40.05

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the Respondent.

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 35 pts.
Hear Indiana Inc.	35.00

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	45	35	80
Hear Indiana Inc.	40.05	35.00	76.50

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	45	35	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Hear Indiana Inc.	40.05	35.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	77.05

* 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 one (1) one-year optional year for a total of five (5) years at the State's option.

