



# 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: September 19, 2025

To: Mark Hempel, Procurement Director,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, Procurement Consultant,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFS 26-83944,  
ILEARN Through-Year Standards Spotlight

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFS 26-83944, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Ball State University (BSU)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Component 1 – Math, and **Flynn Educational Consulting (Flynn)** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer Component 2 – ELA and Component 3 – Standards Spotlight for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

*BSU has not committed to subcontract for Component 1 – Math. Flynn has committed 46.18% of the contract value to **LitLife** for Component 2 – ELA. Flynn has committed 21.56% of the contract value to **Mix & Math**, and 25.71% of the contract value to **LitLife** for Component 3 – Standards Spotlight.*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from ten (10) respondents across the three individual components:

1. 240 Tutoring, Inc. (240) – Math, ELA, and Spotlight
2. A Lasting Solution LLC (ALS) – Spotlight
3. Ball State University (BSU) – Math
4. CIESC – Math, ELA, and Spotlight
5. Educational Innovation 360 (EI360) – Math, ELA, and Spotlight
6. Flynn Educational Consulting (Flynn) – Math, ELA, and Spotlight
7. Marian University (Marian) – Math, ELA
8. Public Consulting Group (PCG) – Math, ELA
9. Indiana University Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (IU) – Spotlight
10. University of Indianapolis (UIndy) – Math, ELA, and Spotlight

The proposals were evaluated by IDOE and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFS:

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 RFS. Scoring was completed as follows:

**A. Adherence to Requirements**

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. Ten (10) proposals were 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 for each component.

**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 Information
- Experience Serving State Governments

**Technical Proposal**

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

- Scope of Work Section 2.1 – Mathematics Professional Development Courses (for component 1)
- Scope of Work Section 2.2 – English/Language Arts Professional Development Courses (for component 2)
- Scope of Work Section 2.3 – Standard Spotlights (for component 3)
- Scope of Work Section 2.4 – Professional Development Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 3.0 – Project Management and Quality Assurance
- Scope of Work Section 4.0 – Timeline for Project
- Scope of Work Section 5.0 – Staff Qualifications

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 for each individual component. The evaluation team issued MAQ Clarifications to 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 – Component 1 Math**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 50 pts.</b>
240	8.35
BSU	39.10
CIESC	28.70
EI360	8.60
Flynn	44.80
Marian	24.30
PCG	16.00
UIndy	14.70

**Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Component 2 ELA**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 50 pts.</b>
240	8.60
CIESC	28.35
EI360	7.15
Flynn	45.75
Marian	40.40
PCG	14.40
UIndy	13.80

**Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Component 3 Spotlight**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 50 pts.</b>
240	8.40
ALS	14.95
CIESC	22.90
EI360	7.20
Flynn	48.20
IU	4.95
UIndy	8.85

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist BSU and Flynn for Component 1 – Math, CIESC, Flynn, and Marian for Component 2 – ELA, and Flynn for Component 3 – Spotlight based on Round 1 MAQ Scores.

### 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 – Component 1 Math**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
BSU	30.00
Flynn	12.40

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores – Component 2 ELA**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
CIESC	30.00
Flynn	8.48
Marian	4.87

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores – Component 3 Spotlight**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Flynn	30.00

### D. First Round Total Scores

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Cost) – Component 1 Math**

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
BSU	69.10
Flynn	57.20

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Cost) – Component 2 ELA**

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
CIESC	58.35
Flynn	54.23
Marian	45.27

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Cost) – Component 3 Spotlight**

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Flynn	78.20

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the three (3) shortlisted Respondents for Component 2 – ELA.

**E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores – Component 2 ELA**

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted during the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted during the First Round) after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

**Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores – Component 2 ELA**

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
CIESC	18.05
Flynn	48.85
Marian	24.80

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist CIESC and Flynn for Component 2 – ELA based on Round 2 MAQ Scores and Cost Scores.

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the shortlisted Respondents for each individual component.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

**Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores – Component 1 Math**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
BSU	30.00
Flynn	9.95

**Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores – Component 2 ELA**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
CIESC	30.00
Flynn	10.39

**Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores – Component 3 Spotlight**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 30 pts.</b>
Flynn	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 – Component 1 Math**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
BSU	39.10	30.00	69.10
Flynn	44.80	9.95	54.75

**Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores – Component 2 ELA**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
CIESC	18.05	30.00	48.05
Flynn	48.85	10.39	59.24

**Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores – Component 3 Spotlight**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>
Flynn	48.20	30.00	78.20

## 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 RFS. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Flynn did not receive points for their subcontractor commitments due to the chosen vendors not being certified by the State of Indiana. 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 – Component 1 Math**

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.)
BSU	39.10	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	66.10
Flynn	44.80	9.95	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	51.75

**Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores – Component 2 ELA**

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.)
CIESC	18.05	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	45.05
Flynn	48.85	10.39	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	56.24

**Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores – Component 3 Spotlight**

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.)
Flynn	48.20	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	75.20

\* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 3.2.7 of the RFS 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 RFS document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of two (2) years from the date of contract execution.



