

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000948

Notice of Intent to Award Date: 6/21/2024

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000002188 for the MDHHS Capacity Building Center – A Training and Workforce Development Project and has recommended an award to Public Consulting Group LLC in the amount of \$2,668,755.00, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Susan Watt-Smith, Solicitation Manager
 wattsmiths@michigan.gov
 517-230-0535

Public copies of all bidder proposals can be found here: [DTMB - Bid Proposals \(michigan.gov\)](#)

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide training services and workforce development for the MDHHS Capacity Building Center. The term of this contract is three (3) years, with up to three (3) 1-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Wednesday, January 24, 2024, for six (6) weeks. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of Wednesday, March 6, 2024.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Linked Workforce, LLC	43000 W. 9 Mile Rd., Ste 109 #300 Novi, MI 48375	No	No
Public Consulting Group LLC	148 State Street, 10 th Floor, Boston, MA 02109	No	No
Wayne State University School of Social Work	5447 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, MI 48202	No	Yes
Resiliency Center for Families and Children at Unified Clinics	1903 W. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008	No	No

Western Michigan University			
------------------------------------	--	--	--

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1, 4, and 5	40
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2, 3, and 9	15
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 7 and 8	5
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	40
	Total	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the Solicitation Manager in collaboration with the Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Lisa Collins, Access, Workforce Development & Education Section Manager, MDHHS	Doug Alcott, ITM 14, DTMB
Alicia Cosgrove, State Assistant Administrator, MDHHS	Michelle Howe, BGP Analyst, MDHHS
Susan Watt-Smith, Category Analyst, DTMB-CPS	Phillip Kurdunowicz, Division Director-Standard, Service Array & Policy Division, MDHHS
-	Bob Marquis, MDHHS Contractor
-	John Moore, BRM Supporting MDHHS, DTMB

Voting	Advisory
-	Soopriya Razdan, Business Relationship Manager, DTMB
-	Justin Tate, State Administrative Manager, MDHHS
-	Pat Thelen, IT Manager, DTMB

III. Evaluation Results

A. Linked Workforce, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Linked Workforce, LLC based on a score of 80.50, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1, 4, and 5 (22/40)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.1.: Bidder had inconsistencies between responses; it was not clear who would be performing aspects of the work.
- b. Section 1.1.2.: Bidder’s response is not specific to the requirements of the RFP.
- c. Section 1.1.2.4.: Bidder did not sufficiently describe how they will host In-person and Live virtual trainings.
- d. Section 1.1.2.15.: Bidder did not identify the system it would use for continuous monitoring and feedback per response.
- e. Section 1.1.2.18: Bidder did not identify the system it would use for robust tracking and reporting.
- f. Section 1.1.2.19.: Bidder marked that they have an exception to the requirement but no exception was noted.
- g. Section 1.1.2.20.: Bidder did not sufficiently describe how they will comply with the requirements.
- h. Section 1.3.: Bidder marked that they have an exception to the requirement but no exception was noted.
- i. Section 1.3. Bidder did not sufficiently explain their training capabilities.
- j. Section 1.4. ADA Compliance Bidder did not provide sufficient detail for how they will meet the requirements.
- k. Section 1.5. Bidder Box 1: Bidder did not define what a robust database and server infrastructure are, additionally, Bidder mentions designing or scaling up a platform but did not provide specifics when discussing technology capabilities.

- l. Section 1.5. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not identify their recommended platform for rapid page loading, or the recommended system for standardized reports; for Ad hoc reporting, Bidder did not identify what the advanced query optimization techniques are.
- m. Section 1.8. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not identify any 3rd party products they would propose for end user license agreements as part of their overall solution.
- n. Section 1.8 Bidder Box 3: Bidder did not provide a response in the space provided.
- o. Section 1.9 Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not provide a Disaster Recovery Plan.
- p. Section 1.10. Bidder Box 1: Bidder did not provide a response.
- q. Section 4.2. Bidder did not provide its technical support number.
- r. Section 4.2.c.: Bidder did not provide any detail for the Service-Level Agreement (SLA) they proposed establishing.
- s. Section 5.1.b.: Bidder did not provide a sufficient draft Implementation Roadmap.
- t. Section 5.1.e.: Bidder did not provide a sufficient draft Risk Management Plan.
- u. Section 5.1.f.: Bidder did not provide a sufficient draft Issue Management Plan.
- v. Section 5.1.h.: Bidder did not provide a sample timeline of what their complete analysis would look like as part of their draft Training Scope/Change Management plan. It is not clear to the JEC how (or if) this will fit into the project timeline.
- w. Section 5.1.i.: Bidder’s draft Action Management plan is not tailored to the requirements of this RFP. It appears to the State that it is a generic, stock answer.
- x. Section 5.1.j.: Bidder’s did not provide a sufficient draft Communications plan.
- y. Section 5.3.1.: Bidder did not provide a sample Status Report.
- z. Section 5.3.2.: Bidder did not provide a sample Evaluation Plan Report.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2, 3, and 9 (15/15)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 7 and 8 (5/5)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet (38.50/40)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sections 5.1., 5.2., and 5.3.: Bidder's experiences are not provided under bidding company's name.

Total Score: 80.50/100

B. Public Consulting Group LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Consulting Group LLC based on a score of 99.50, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1, 4, and 5 (39.50/40)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 4.2.: Bidder did not provide its technical support number.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2, 3, and 9 (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 7 and 8 (5/5)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet (40/40)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

Total Score: 99.50/100

C. Wayne State University

The Evaluation Team determined that Wayne State University based on a score of 95, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1, 4, and 5 (38/40)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.2.4.A.: Bidder only responded to 1.1.2.4.A, not the requirements of 1.1.2.4.
- b. Section 1.9. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not provide the Disaster Recovery Plan for CMHA as mentioned; they provided their business continuity plan for ELB

Learning, which has not been mentioned anywhere else in their RFP response.

- 2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2, 3, and 9 (15/15)**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.
- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 7 and 8 (5/5)**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.
- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet (37/40)**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 6.: Bidder did not agree to the State’s Standard Contract Terms and did not provide written exceptions as expressed in this section and the Proposal Instructions.

Total Score: 95/100

D. Resiliency Center for Families and Children at Unified Clinics, Western Michigan University

The Evaluation Team determined that Resiliency Center for Families and Children at Unified Clinics, Western Michigan University based on a score of 86.50, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1, 4, and 5 (35.50/40)**
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 1.5. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not provide sufficient details regarding latency response time.
 - b. Section 1.7. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not sufficiently describe the requirements of this section.
 - c. Section 1.8. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not provide the EULA for the potential CloudCME or Brightspace Desire2Learn.
 - d. Section 1.9. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not provide a Disaster Recovery Plan for the State’s LMS system.
 - e. Section 1.10. Bidder Box 1: Bidder did not sufficiently demonstrate how each PMM/SEM requirement will be met.
 - f. Section 1.10. Bidder Box 2: Bidder did not respond sufficiently.
 - g. Section 5.1.h.: Bidder did not provide a draft plan as required.

h. Section 5.1.i.: Bidder’s draft Action Management Plan lacked sufficient detail.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2, 3, and 9 (15/15)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 7 and 8 (5/5)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet (31/40)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. 5.1. and 5.3.: Organization listed is the bidder themselves and did not provide details of reference information.
- b. 5.2.: The experience listed is not relevant to the RFP.

Total Score: 86.50/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	Weight	Linked Workforce, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Wayne State University	R.C.F.C.U.C. Western Michigan University
1	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1, 4, and 5	40	22	39.5	38	35.50
2	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2, 3, and 9	15	15	15	15	15
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 7 and 8	5	5	5	5	5
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet	40	38.5	40	37	31
	Total	100	80.50	99.50	95	86.50

V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their initial price proposals:

	Deliverable	Linked Workforce, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Wayne State University	R.C.F.C.U.C. Western Michigan University
1	Trainings	\$178,900.00	\$2,811,420.00	\$221,652.60	\$4,211,100.00
6	A-La-Carte Pricing (3-YR)	\$2,774,783.00*	\$2,539,455.00*	\$2,075,061.81*	-
	Total Price	\$2,953,683.00*	\$5,350,875.00*	\$2,296,714.41*	\$4,211,100.00

*Social Media and Web Support were removed due to having to utilize existing State contracts

VI. Negotiations

The State requested second round pricing. Two Bidders responded with price adjustments.

Second Round Pricing	Deliverable	Linked Workforce, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Wayne State University	R.C.F.C.U.C. Western Michigan University
1	Trainings	\$155,600.00	\$137,700.00	\$198,784.60	\$4,033,500.00
6	A-La-Carte Pricing (3-YR)	\$2,846,780.00*	\$2,531,055.00*	\$2,013,329.49*	\$915,159.30*
	Total Price	\$3,002,380.00*	\$2,668,755.00*	\$2,212,114.09*	\$4,948,659.30*

*Social Media and Web Support were removed due to having to utilize existing State contracts

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Public Consulting Group LLC provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include agreeing with the State’s stated Contract Terms; a team with more than 30 years of experience managing projects across a range of health and human service programs, including behavioral health; relationships with private providers, and numerous other stakeholders; developed and customized a training curriculum and participant workbook for Michigan’s child welfare system.

As part of the best value determination amongst bidders overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered in making this award. Public Consulting Group LLC provides the greatest overall economic impact to Michigan because they currently employ

28 individuals at locations within the State of Michigan, 69% of which are covered by employer-provided health insurance.

Award Recommendation is made to Public Consulting Group LLC in the amount of \$2,668,755.00.