



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: May 19, 2026

To: Mike Huth, Category Director - HHS,
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, Category Director - IT,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-84994,
Home and Community-based Waiver Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84994, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Aging & In-Home Services of NE IN, Inc. (AIHS), Indiana Professional Management Group (IPMG), Inspire Case Management, Inc. (ICM), K.E. Thompkins, Inc. (KET), and The Columbus Organization (TCO) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Home and Community-based Waiver Services for the Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received nineteen (19) proposals from:

1. A Mother's Promise Home Care Services (AMPHCS)
2. Aging & Community Services of South Central Indiana (ACS)
3. Aging & In-Home Services of NE IN, Inc. (AIHS)
4. CareStar, Inc. (CS)
5. Connections Case Management, LLC (CCM)
6. Good Life Visionary Case Management, LLC (GLV)
7. Humaniti Care Services, LLC (HCS)
8. Indiana Professional Management Group (IPMG)
9. Inspire Case Management, Inc. (ICM)
10. K. E. Thompkins, Inc. (KET)
11. LifeSpan Resources, Inc. (LSR)
12. Options Case Management, LLC (OCM)
13. Remain at Home Care (RHC)
14. Sarell Case Management (SCM)
15. Sims Signature Personal Care, LLC (SSPC)
16. Southwestern Indiana Regional Council on Aging (SWIRCA)
17. The Columbus Organization (TCO)
18. Vineyard Management, LLC (VM)
19. Wholistic Home Care Services (WHCS)

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)	80
3. Geographic Coverage	20

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. Eighteen (18) 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:

- Company Financial Information & Integrity of Company Structure and Financial Reporting
- Experience Serving State Governments & Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- Company Background
- Compliance and Approach to Correction
- Enrolled Medicaid Provider
- Commitment to Coverage
- Description of the Contractor's Responsibilities
- Recruitment and Hiring of Case Managers and Average Caseloads
- Management of Case Managers
- Quality Assurance
- Training of Case Managers
- Communication
- Complaint Process
- Contractor Staff
- Record Management, Information Sharing, Monitoring, & Reporting
- Meeting Requirements
- Corrective Action & Sanctions
- Ethical Service Delivery & Billing
- Transition of Contractors
- Non-Financial Incentive Structure

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 Clarifications to some 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 80 pts.
AMPHCS	7.75
ACS	38.25

AIHS	52.25
CS	29.25
CCM	41.25
GLV	10.25
HCS	22.50
IPMG	40.50
ICM	41.50
KET	41.00
LSR	24.75
OCM	31.00
RHC	0.00
SCM	1.75
SWIRCA	23.00
TCO	45.00
VM	0.00
WHCS	0.75

C. Geographic Coverage Score

The Geographic Coverage scores are listed below.

Table 3: Round 1 –Geographic Coverage Score

Respondent	Geographic Coverage Score 20 pts.
AMPHCS	15.00
ACS	10.00
AIHS	20.00
CS	20.00
CCM	20.00
GLV	20.00
HCS	20.00
IPMG	20.00
ICM	20.00

KET	20.00
LSR	10.00
OCM	20.00
RHC	5.00
SCM	20.00
SWIRCA	5.00
TCO	20.00
VM	5.00
WHCS	20.00

D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

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

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Geographic Coverage)

Respondent	Total Score 100 pts.
AMPHCS	22.75
ACS	48.25
AIHS	72.25
CS	49.25
CCM	61.25
GLV	30.25
HCS	42.50
IPMG	60.50
ICM	61.50
KET	61.00
LSR	34.75
OCM	51.00
RHC	5.00
SCM	21.75
SWIRCA	28.00
TCO	65.00

VM	5.00
WHCS	20.75

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist AIHS, TCO, ICM, CCM, KET, and IPMG based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the six (6) 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 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 80 pts.
AIHS	52.25
CCM	37.75
IPMG	41.75
ICM	41.50
KET	41.00
TCO	45.00

F. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality and Geographic Coverage Scores are listed below.

Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Geographic Coverage Score	Total Score
Points Possible	80	20	100
AIHS	52.25	20.00	72.25
CCM	37.75	20.00	57.75
IPMG	41.75	20.00	61.75
ICM	41.50	20.00	61.50
KET	41.00	20.00	61.00
TCO	45.00	20.00	65.00

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 and decided to award to the five highest scores.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be three (3) one-year optional years for a total of five (5) years at the State's option.

