

Performance Work Statement (PWS)  
Military Training Evaluation Program

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Education and Training (DASD FE&T) implements policies and procedures for Career Investment Programs (CIP) that are critical for war-fighting readiness as well as to ensure that service members are prepared for transition to the civilian workforce following military service. As a CIP, Voluntary Education (VolEd) programs enable service member access to quality postsecondary educational opportunities, empower informed service member decision-making, shape meaningful personal and professional pathways, and drive military student success in higher education. On behalf of the DASD FE&T, the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES), a component of the Defense Human Resources Activity (DHRA), manages a portfolio of Defense voluntary education programs that help service members achieve their personal and professional career goals.

The Military Training Evaluation Program (MilEval) is a Defense education program that assesses the learning gained from military training and occupational experiences. MilEval helps to ensure this learning is translated solely into college credit recommendations that are documented on the Joint Services Transcript (JST) and applied to satisfy vocational through graduate level postsecondary degree requirements.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

For more than sixty years, the MilEval Program, with the support of a higher education organization, has evaluated and maintained a repository of college credit recommendations gained by service members through military training courses and occupational experiences. The program operates in accordance with DoDD 1322.08E, the Department of Defense (DoD) Voluntary Education (VolEd) Strategic Plan; and specifically, DoDI 1322.25 Encl. 3 para. 6.c.(5)(d). Through the MilEval Program, knowledge gained through military experiences is assessed and translated into recommended postsecondary college credit in terms of semester-hours. These college credit recommendations are currently accepted at over 2,000 academic institutions, as a form of prior learning assessment. Institutional acceptance of these credits is at the discretion of individual colleges and universities and varies greatly based on institutional credit acceptance and award policies. Applying college credit recommendations reduces the number of classes a service member must complete to satisfy degree requirements, thus saving time to degree completion while avoiding Tuition Assistance costs for the DoD. As a result, this program provides fiscal accountability for taxpayer investments on Defense human capital by expanding the benefits of training and occupational experiences beyond warfighting to support educational attainment and transition into the civilian workforce. Credit recommendations are summarized and documented on the JST, and additional information to substantiate each evaluated college credit recommendation is cataloged and archived in an online catalog. The JST Operations Center releases more than 400,000 transcripts to colleges and universities each year on behalf of service members and veterans able to convert military experience into college credit.

Traditionally, the incumbent Contractor has performed onsite academic military training course reviews using multidisciplinary postsecondary faculty teams. After a series of pre-assessment meetings with relevant military training school personnel, the faculty evaluation teams assessed the learning that occurred within military courses having more than 45 contact hours by reviewing course related materials and assessments. Additionally, learning that occurred through occupational experience was evaluated through semi-structured interviews with service member panels that represented each successive career level. In recent years, virtual faculty reviews of course materials uploaded to a secure site began augmenting the on-site review methodology. Using these methods, the DoD currently reviews approximately 440 training courses (an average total of 108,000 academic hours) and 60 occupations each

year. Credit recommendations maintain a ten-year shelf life, with the exception of healthcare and information technology related courses which require more frequent reviews.

Although this evaluation methodology has served the Defense Department well over the years, policy direction for program modernization includes improving the Department's capacity to:

- Optimize the evaluation process to decrease costs and increase the number of reviews
- Expand the transparency of service members' equivalent college level learning to support the Department's recruitment, retention, readiness, and transition efforts

### 3.0 SCOPE

The goal of this requirement is to improve the Defense Department's capacity to evaluate, document, and communicate the college level learning gained by service members as a result of military training courses and on-the-job experiences in a credible manner accepted by a wide range of stakeholders (e.g., the military Services, academic institutions, etc.). The Contractor shall provide an evaluation methodology, personnel, management, materials, information technology infrastructure, and equipment necessary to fulfill these requirements. Depending on the complexity of the course (e.g., length of course, number of programs of instruction, etc.) or occupational assessment, reviews may be conducted either remotely (virtual), face-to-face (on-site), or by some combination thereof. The Contractor shall ensure the output of these evaluations (e.g., postsecondary-level academic learning expressed as college credit equivalents) align with postsecondary academic credit frameworks and are clearly translated into formats accepted by academic institutions. The emphasis for this requirement is on increasing the Department's capacity to conduct virtual reviews and support training initiatives to improve academic credibility of curriculum, assessments, and feedback on occupational training evaluations.

The Contractor shall leverage the multidisciplinary best and emerging practices from across postsecondary education and prior learning assessment to provide technical and management support in the following areas, further defined under PWS 4.0 REQUIREMENTS, herein:

#### 4.1 Program Management

- 4.1.1 Program and Project Management
- 4.1.2 Reporting Requirements
- 4.1.3 Subject Matter Expert Reviewers
- 4.1.4 Human Subjects Research Compliance
- 4.1.5 Contractor Personnel, Disciplines, and Specialties
- 4.1.6 Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure

#### 4.2 Pre-Evaluation Preparation

- 4.2.1 Annual Review Schedule Support and Risk Mitigation
- 4.2.2 Training Site Readiness, Evaluation Methodology
- 4.2.3 Training Site Readiness, Virtual and Onsite Support

#### 4.3 Evaluation Methodology, Implementation, Assessment, and Refinement

- 4.3.1 Virtual and On-site Course and Occupational Reviews
- 4.3.2 Evaluation Types and Number of Reviews
- 4.3.3 Post Evaluation Workshops
- 4.3.4 On-Site Inspections
- 4.3.5 Evaluation Outputs

#### 4.4 Data Management and Security

- 4.4.1 Data Repository
- 4.4.2 Data Transmittal for Military Transcript
- 4.4.3 Interoperability for Stakeholder Data Exchanges
- 4.4.4 Data Security

#### 4.5 Customer and Stakeholder Support

4.5.1 Customer Support

4.5.2 Stakeholder Support

All materials accumulated, produced, or developed as a result of this contract are property of the Government and shall be available to the COR via electronic means at the end of the period covered by this contract.

4.0 REQUIREMENTS

*The Contractor shall:*

4.1 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Provide program and project management support to plan and execute all work required under this PWS. All work conducted under this PWS shall be planned and executed in a manner that will achieve schedule and performance objectives. The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) shall serve as the Government's primary point of contact for all program activities.

4.1.1 Program and Project Management

4.1.1.1 Facilitate a **Post-Award Conference** with key stakeholders identified by the Government within seven business days after contract award. The date, time, and location for the kick-off meeting shall be coordinated with the COR. Contractor personnel shall discuss technical, management, and security issues during the Post-Award Conference. The Contractor shall be prepared to discuss any items requiring clarification and gather information to support each deliverable and provide a **written summary** of the conference within five business days after the conference.

Within 14 calendar days of completion of the Post-Award Conference, develop a detailed **Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&M)** for each initial requirement that supports the approach and methodology proposed. The plan shall indicate the timeline for deliverables, dependencies and resources needed, roles and responsibilities, and status report meetings. It shall address the major milestones and timing for delivering initial drafts, incorporating the COR's comments, delivering revised copy/messaging, and delivering final products to the COR for approval. The COR will review the proposed project plan and return it to the Contractor within a reasonable period with comments and necessary adjustments.

4.1.1.2 Develop and execute a detailed **Communication Management Plan** to govern the process of providing stakeholders with program information (e.g., program/policy staff, military training sites, etc.). The plan shall outline key messages, supporting information, and status updates communicated to specific audience segments (e.g., military Service training commands, academic institutions, service members, veterans, etc.). Additionally, the plan shall address authorities to release information, when and through what communication channels information will be delivered. The plan shall demonstrate how channels will solicit feedback and identify how communication will be documented and archived. The plan shall be delivered to the COR per the POA&M.

4.1.1.3 Develop and maintain a **Risk Management Plan** to address risks, their potential impact to the program, and include strategies to reduce these risks. The plan shall focus attention on minimizing threats to achievement of the program objectives. The Risk Management Plan shall include an approach for identifying and assessing risks; determining cost-effective risk reduction actions; and monitoring and reporting progress in reducing risks. The plan shall detail how the Contractor plans on reducing identified risks, to an acceptable level, within a specified timeframe. The plan shall describe how specific approaches will incorporate into program and project management plans to minimize or avoid identified risks; include proactive contingent risk response actions; and enable a means of rapidly implementing risk responses based on timely identification of risk occurrence. To provide visibility of risks and progress in mitigating them, the Risk Management Plan shall include a documented project **Risk Watch List**. The Risk Watch List shall be reviewed bi-weekly by the Contractor and Government team during routine

meetings. This watch list shall summarize in a table the following items: risk identification/description, risk analysis (on a scale from 1 to 4), risk impact time horizon (e.g., short term or long term/ phase/date), risk control (internal or external), risk priority number, area of impact (e.g., time, cost, quality, other projects/programs, etc.), response strategy(ies), response strategy resources requirements, assigned person to handle risk, and date completed. The Risk Watch List shall function as the mechanism to track and report risks associated with the program. When necessary, risk occurrences shall be elevated to the COR and relevant Government stakeholders for their attention. The plan shall be delivered to the COR per the POA&M for review and approval.

4.1.1.4 Develop and adhere to an internal **Quality Control Plan (QCP)** to govern all aspects of program/project management, review preparation, the execution of reviews, the management of data, engagement with stakeholders, customer support to protect the integrity of the program and its associated outputs (e.g., college credit recommendations, stakeholder data exchanges, etc.). The Contractor shall include mechanisms to identify and self-assess critical processes under this effort. The plan shall describe measures, inspections, quality checks, monitoring of process parameters, etc. required to assure the evaluation process, the outputs it produces, and the resulting data repository conform to PWS requirements. The plan must detail the information required to control associated processes, produce quality outputs, and maintain improvements over the life cycle of the period of performance. This includes at a minimum, a method for performing inspections; identifying, correcting and preventing problems/defective service; addressing customer complaints, and improving the quality of services over the life of the contract. Consider the QCP a living document that should be updated periodically as the measurement methods and controls improve throughout the life cycle of the period of performance. The plan shall provide the basis for a **quarterly risk-based surveillance report** that details the on-going self-assessment and monitoring of critical processes. Deliver the plan to the COR per the POA&M for review and approval.

The QCP shall:

- a. Demonstrate the reliability and validity of the evaluation methodology (whether virtual, onsite; etc.) and its outputs. This should include identifying sources of variation or discrepancies in the evaluation process and establishing controls to monitor them. It is the Government's expectation that a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods will be used to assess and control quality (e.g., statistical process control; process capability measurement; quality scores; measures of reliability; confidence intervals; parameters to determine sampling size and frequency; comparing and contrasting course and occupational review outputs between virtual and on-site means; attributing data collection; error proofing; visual inspection using panels of experts for random quality checks; applying special characteristics matrices and lessons learned from credit acceptance/application issues; design reviews; process failure mode and effects analysis; team knowledge about the process; etc.).
- b. Be transparent and provide assurance to a variety of stakeholders to support academic credit recommendation acceptance by colleges and universities. The QCP shall evolve as identified stakeholder needs evolve.

The Government reserves the right to perform inspections and surveillance to evaluate the Contractor's compliance to the contract terms and performance of the requirements in the PWS.

4.1.1.5 Develop and execute a **Configuration Management Plan** to establish and mature the programmatic, technical, and functional attributes of systems that support the program. This includes configuration items such as systems, databases, and related support systems that are specifically used by the Contractor in the execution of this program. It shall govern the ongoing process of identifying and managing changes to deliverables and other program outputs. The plan shall define, document, control, implement, account for, and audit changes to various components of the program's systems as they

evolve to meet the Services and the Department's needs. The Contractor shall develop the plan in accordance with (IAW) Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and the National Institute of Science and Technology Special Publication (NIST SP) 800-53, Rev. 4. The Configuration Management Plan shall identify the Contractor's approach to the systematic evaluation, coordination, approval or rejection, and implementation of all proposed changes in the configuration of a configuration item after formal establishment of its baseline. The plan must include procedures to ensure that changes are accomplished in an organized manner with traceability and accountability so that configuration management requirements are properly implemented. The Contractor shall ensure that requested changes to software, hardware, data, networks, or documentation are formally reviewed and approved or denied in order to allow evaluation of the effect of the change on security, performance, interfaces, acceptability, completeness, and documentation. The plan shall be delivered to the COR per the POA&M for review and approval.

4.1.1.6 The Configuration Management Plan shall include a project task list and corresponding timeline to deliver **Configuration Baseline Information** to the Government. This collection of information shall describe the technical characteristics of each configuration item (e.g., system, database). The baselines shall serve as technical control points in the life cycle for the evaluation of proposed changes to the technical characteristics. The baseline and approved changes or modifications shall be updated routinely to provide a current description of systems that support the program. The baselines shall include: the functional/requirements baseline; design baseline; development baseline; product baseline; and operational baseline.

The Configuration Management Plan shall also include a change management process that Government reviewers can monitor (e.g., security test and evaluation team) multiple times annually in support of FISMA and other reporting and auditing requirements. This includes the availability of change artifacts (e.g., Change Requests, Test Release Transmittals, Security Impact Analysis, testing evidence, etc.) to verify that the change control process is in place and operating effectively. The change management process must include: change/problem resolution tracking; measurements to determine the status of control implementation and effectiveness for configuration management activities and processes; configuration status accounting to record, store, and report activities; and release management to govern software, hardware, and license controls.

The Contractor shall cooperate and coordinate with the Government technical team for formal configuration audits. The audits will certify that the design, development, and integration meet the system's technical requirements, that they are accurately documented, and that they do not include unauthorized changes. To the extent possible, audits shall be performed to minimize impact on the program's schedules. The Contractor shall address deficiencies through the recommended corrective actions according to the timelines proposed by the Government team.

4.1.1.7 Provide **In-Process Reviews (IPRs)** either virtually via teleconferencing or at a Government facility (DANTES in Pensacola, FL; the Mark Center Building, Alexandria, VA; or another designated Government site within the Washington, DC metropolitan area). The IPR shall focus on the status, progress, and any issues regarding the requirements. Summarize the IPR in a concise report that shall clearly summarize program data on work accomplished during the reporting period:

- a. Semi-annual reporting periods shall be October-March and April-September. The period's reports shall be published no later than (NLT) 15 days following the end of each reporting period. Additional IPRs might be scheduled if critical issues arise or significant events or changes occur.
- b. Electronic copies of the IPR summary shall be delivered to the COR and Technical Assistant(s) (TA). In addition, members of the InterService Voluntary Education Board (IVEB) may request copies of the reports.
- c. Clearly summarize and present work accomplished during the reporting period, including but not

be limited to qualitative and quantitative updates to summarize activity within each of the six PWS 4.0 Requirements (e.g., Program Management; Pre-Evaluation Preparation; Evaluation Methodology, Implementation, and Refinement; Data Management and Security; Customer and Stakeholder Support; and Travel).

In preparation of any IPR, the Contractor shall provide the following deliverable: **Briefing Materials** (IPR Summary with accompanying PowerPoint slide deck).

#### 4.1.1.8 **Records Management**

Maintain records and documents used in the evaluation of military educational and occupational experiences including courses, programs of instruction, evaluation outputs, rubrics, etc. The Contractor shall convert all such records that are hard-copy documents into electronic format. In addition to the records and documents submitted by the Military Services, the Contractor shall maintain the documents used in completing the tasks of this statement of work. A central part of the records maintenance by the Contractor shall be a registry of all credit recommendations made as a result of the evaluations.

The purpose of maintaining records is to provide data and information; to develop reports regarding the program; to provide backup information to explain and document evaluations and procedures; to provide long-range management continuity (Government or Contractor); and to provide data and information to prepare products required within this PWS. The documentation should be stored in a manner that is readily accessible to the Government for broader analysis across Voluntary Education programs and systems with the goal of being able to document service member and program outcomes.

#### 4.1.1.9 **Corrective Actions**

Rectify a task, process, product, or personnel behavior when any of these factors produce errors, problems in producing deliverables, deviations from intended program and project management plans, or impact the credibility of the program and its subsequent credit award. The Contractor shall promptly act to correct nonconforming outputs, processes, procedures, or personnel behavior to preclude the recurrence of the problem and to satisfy contract requirements. In these instances, the Contractor shall develop and submit a **Corrective Action Report** to the COR within seven business days.

#### 4.1.1.10 **Team Conferences**

The Contractor's team shall coordinate and join a conference call involving team members within DANTES and JST. The conference call is a forum to discuss timely aspects of contract performance on a weekly to bi-weekly basis.

#### 4.1.2 **Reporting Requirements**

4.1.2.1 Deliver **Routine Reports** to include, but not limited to: program activities, project schedule, budget, issues, risk, planned value, etc.

#### 4.1.2.2 **Quarterly Reports**

(1) Deliver a **Quarterly Status Report (QSR)** to the COR for distribution at InterService Voluntary Education Board (IVEB) meetings. The COR shall provide the annual IVEB meeting schedule and may provide a template for use in preparing the report. The QSR shall be delivered at least 15 business days prior to the scheduled IVEB meeting. The intent of this report is to provide the Voluntary Education Service Chiefs relevant information to support data-informed decision making, such as: overall program status, executed and upcoming reviews, issues that require policy level resolution, trends, and a forecast of possible constraints or efficiencies.

(2) Provide a **Quarterly Military Programs Report** based on the previous three months, to the COR and contract TA(s) and to each Service Program Manager (SPM) by 15 October, 15 January, 15

April, and 15 July, each year. The Contractor shall collaborate with the COR and contract TA(s) to assure the report's data representation is clear to the recipients so that they understand the details of work accomplished during the reporting period as well as important trends and issues. The Contractor may report any data considered pertinent including, but not limited to, assessment of the following:

a. Qualitative Summary

- Background / general overview of the program period of performance
- Review data / synopsis (# of reviews, academic credit by subject area, breakdown by Service, breakdown by course and occupational community)
- Outreach, Articles, Publications, and Training
- Resource Support / Customer Service
- JST / Transcripts
- Faculty SMEs
- Budget
- Executed training site self-studies, preparation events, and reviews
- Trends from stakeholder engagements
- Programmatic recommendations for consideration

b. Quantitative Summary

At minimum, the report shall cover the following data points by branch of Service and in total:

- Program of Instruction (POI)/Course Planning Document (CPD)
  - POIs/CPDs submitted by Service for review
  - Credit Extended - No substantial difference in content, Contractor extended the credit evaluation vice conducting full review
- Team Course Reviews:
  - Onsite - # of team reviews at the training site.
  - Virtual - # of team reviews through virtual collaboration (synchronous and asynchronous)
  - Hybrid - # of team reviews through aspects of Onsite & Virtual
  - Re-Scheduled - A planned Team review is rescheduled, whether onsite or virtual
  - Cancelled - A planned Team review is cancelled, whether onsite or virtual
- Total # of academic hours reviewed
- Total # of Course POIs/CPDs Reviewed: Self-explanatory
- Occupational Reviews:
  - Occupations Reviewed - The number and type of occupations reviewed according to occupational categories, whether onsite or virtual
  - Occupations Pulled from Reviews - Self-explanatory
- # of Credits Recommended by vocational, lower undergraduate, upper undergraduate, and graduate level
- # of Credits Recommended (in semester hours) *by subject area* (e.g., general education – math, communication, science, etc.; possible major area—business, information technology, STEM, aeronautics, healthcare management, etc.; graduate level possible major area—business, accounting, management, etc.).

#### 4.1.2.3 Military Programs Data Report

An annual **Military Programs Data Report** shall report annual totals for each of the quantitative data points included in the Quarterly Military Programs Report for the previous October through September (fiscal year) period. The Military Programs Data Report shall be delivered to the COR NLT 15 Oct, each year, as the basis for the Voluntary Education Enterprise Management Information System (VEMIS), Military Evaluations Program (Sections 25. and 25.B) reporting requirements.

25. MILITARY EVALUATIONS PROGRAM								
	# COURSES & OCCUPATIONS REVIEWED	# COURSES & OCCUPATIONS RECEIVING FINAL EVALUATIONS  (TEAM VISITS, IN-HOUSE, MAIL-OUT, REVIEWED AT OTHER LOCATIONS, CREDIT EXTENDED)			# CREDIT HOURS RECOMMENDED			
					LOWER	UPPER	GRADUATE	
ARMY	318	324			1,709.00	907.00	18.00	
NAVY	117	123			967.00	1,242.00	0.00	
MARINE CORPS	84	92			377.00	178.00	3.00	
AIR FORCE	34	34			3.00	280.00	291.00	
COAST GUARD	8	8			15.00	101.00	0.00	
TOTAL	561	581			3,071.00	2,708.00	312.00	
25. B MILITARY EVALUATIONS PROGRAM DETAIL								
	TEAM COURSE POI REVIEWS				# OF COURSE POIS REVIEWED	# OF POI ACADEMIC HOURS REVIEWED	OCCUPATIONS	
	ONSITE	VIRTUAL	RE-SCHEDULED	CANCELED			REVIEWED	PULLED FROM REVIEWS
ARMY	19	7	4	4	302	76,326	16	0
NAVY	3	2	2	7	31	11,621	86	0
MARINE CORPS	10	5	0	8	82	17,231	2	0
AIR FORCE	3	1	0	3	34	12,564	0	0
COAST GUARD	4	0	1	4	5	1,648	3	0
TOTAL	39	15	7	26	454	119,390	107	0
	# OF CREDITS RECOMMENDED (IN SEMESTER HOURS)							
	VOCATIONAL		LOWER		UPPER		GRADUATE	
	COURSE POI	OCCUPATION	COURSE POI	OCCUPATION	COURSE POI	OCCUPATION	COURSE POI	OCCUPATION
ARMY	0	0	1,421	288	719	188	18	0
NAVY	0	0	193	774	84	1,158	0	0
MARINE CORPS	0	0	325	52	124	54	3	0
AIR FORCE	0	0	3	0	280	0	291	0
COAST GUARD	0	0	15	0	44	57	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	1,957	1,114	1,251	1,457	312	0

#### 4.1.2.4 Contract Performance Report

On a monthly basis, provide **Contract Performance Reports (CPRs)** that briefly summarize contract activities, cost data, progress on plans of actions, key milestones accomplished, challenges/risks regarding deliverables or project progression, and mitigation strategies. Administratively, this may be combined with the other reports as applicable.

#### 4.1.2.5 Information Technology and Data Security Report

On a monthly basis, provide **Information Technology and Data Security Reports (ITDSR)** to describe products, development schedules, security, etc. See Configuration Management, Data Management and Security, and Security sections of this PWS for details on reporting requirements.

#### 4.1.2.6 Accounting Data Report

Submit a monthly financial report as an attachment to the monthly invoice submitted through Wide Area Work Flow (WAWF). The Accounting Data Report shall provide data and accounts for the outcome of the requirements set forth by this contract, specifically:

- For IDIQ CLINs, detail events with corresponding levels of effort completed (e.g., preparation, virtual evaluation, onsite evaluations)
- Travel expenses for the ACE staff and evaluators. This shall include the name of each traveler, travel dates, travel location (from and to), purpose of trip, mode(s) of transportation, transportation costs, per diem, and total costs.
- The Contractor representative's signature and date.

The Contractor shall submit one copy of the Accounting Data Report to the COR by the 30th day of the month that follows that in which expenses are incurred. Include the contract number and any other required accounting information on Accounting Data Reports and invoices submitted.

4.1.2.6 Provide monthly **Course Planning Document (POI/CPD) Reports** listing CDPs received by the Contractor during the reported month. The POI/CPD Reports shall be provided to the COR and, as



applicable:

- Army—Army Credentialing and Continuing Education Services for Soldiers (ACCESS)
- Marine Corps—Marine Training and Education Standards Division (MTESD)
- Navy—Naval Education and Training Command (NETC, N74)
- Air Force—HQAF, Voluntary Education Branch, AF/A1DLV
- Coast Guard—USCG Education and Training Quota Center (ETQC)

#### 4.1.2.7 Ad Hoc Reports

Periodically, furnish performance data relative to requirements of this contract to the COR, the SPMs/TAs, or both. Examples of such data include but are not limited to: POI/CPD reports, recommendation end-date reports, team trip reports, budget reports, etc. Requests for such data on an ad hoc (unscheduled) basis shall not exceed two per quarter and six per 12-month performance period.

#### 4.1.3 Subject Matter Expert Reviewers

4.1.3.1 Secure the services of highly qualified academic subject matter experts (SMEs) qualified to cover each academic discipline and occupational cluster to support the evaluation methodology and quality control process. Evaluators shall be highly qualified professional educators, having at least five years of postsecondary teaching and curriculum development experience specific to the content area of the training course and occupational learning outcomes they will review. Qualifying experience (at least five years) shall come from work at an accredited college or university. In addition, distance learning courses shall be evaluated by SMEs who also have a background in distance learning curriculum development and delivery. The Contractor shall review the qualifications and establish that proposed evaluators are qualified.

4.1.3.2 Create and assemble evaluation teams of at least three highly qualified SMEs, recruited and selected by the Contractor, who are SMEs in the field to be evaluated. The Contractor shall provide the COR with the names of evaluation team members fifteen business days or as required by local or installation access rules, prior to conducting a site evaluation so the COR can furnish letters to identify official teams, manage security concerns, and facilitate installation access.

4.1.3.3 Evaluation teams shall represent a diverse and varied sampling of postsecondary academic institutions (e.g., diversity in terms of accrediting body, region of the country, institution type, Carnegie designations, tier/level, Ivy League, etc.). The diversity of academic institutions shall be reported in routine quarterly reports based on diversity measures that are meaningful and extend beyond accreditation body and institution type (public, private, not-for profit). The Contractor shall provide evaluation team members with an orientation and training on the Program's evaluation process.

4.1.3.4 Provide all necessary information to the host Service's designated Government official to satisfy security protocols on all Contractor personnel who require military installation and training resource access at least 15 business days in advance of scheduled reviews and staff assistance visits.

4.1.3.5 Leverage SMEs at various process points. This may include during pre-evaluation planning, out-briefs at the conclusion of reviews, curriculum summits, stakeholder engagement events, developing methodology transparency documentation, conducting virtual reviews, conducting on-site inspections, providing quality control on the evaluation process and its outputs, etc.

#### 4.1.4 Human Subjects Research Compliance

4.1.4.1 Adapt all applicable evaluation methodologies to adhere to:

- [Protection of Human Subjects](#) (32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 219)

- [Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards in DoD-Supported Research](#) (DoDI 3216.02)
- [Protection of Humans Subjects in Research Projects](#) (48 CFR Parts 207, 235 and 252)

4.1.4.2 Comply fully with 32 CFR Part 219 and DoD Directive 3216.02, applicable DoD component policies, and 10 U.S.C. 980. The Contractor shall not commence performance of research involving human subjects that is covered under 32 CFR Part 219 or that meets exemption criteria under 32 CFR 219.101(b), or expend funding on such effort, until and unless the conditions of either the following paragraph (c)(1) or (c)(2) have been met:

(1) The Contractor furnishes to the DoD Human Research Protection Officer (HRPO), with a copy to the COR and the Contracting Officer, an assurance of compliance and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and receives notification from the Contracting Officer that the HRPO has approved the assurance as appropriate for the research under the Performance Work Statement and also that the HRPO has reviewed the protocol and accepted the IRB approval for compliance with the DoD component policies. The Contractor may furnish evidence of an existing assurance of compliance for acceptance by the HRPO, if an appropriate assurance has been approved in connection with previous research. The Contractor shall notify the COR and the Contracting Officer immediately of any suspensions or terminations of the assurance.

(2) The Contractor furnishes to the HRPO, with a copy to the COR and the Contracting Officer, a determination that the human research proposed meets exemption criteria in 32 CFR 219.101(b) and receives written notification from the COR and/or the Contracting Officer that the exemption is determined acceptable. The determination shall include citation of the exemption category under 32 CFR 219.101(b) and a rationale statement. In the event of a disagreement regarding the Contractor's furnished exemption determination, the HRPO retains final judgment on what research activities or classes of research are covered or are exempt under the contract.

4.1.4.3 DoD staff, consultants, and advisory groups may independently review and inspect the Contractor's research and research procedures involving human subjects and, based on such findings, DoD may prohibit research that presents unacceptable hazards or otherwise fails to comply with DoD procedures.

4.1.4.4 Failure of the Contractor to comply with the requirements of this clause will result in the issuance of a stop-work order under Federal Acquisition Regulation clause 52.242-15 to immediately suspend, in whole or in part, work and further payment under this contract, or will result in other issuance of suspension of work and further payment for as long as determined necessary at the discretion of the Contracting Officer.

4.1.4.5 The Contractor shall include the substance of this clause, including this paragraph (f), in all subcontracts that may include research involving human subjects in accordance with 32 CFR Part 219, DoD Directive 3216.02, and 10 U.S.C. 980, including research that meets exemption criteria under 32 CFR 219.101(b).

#### **4.1.5 Contractor Personnel, Disciplines, and Specialties**

Provide the necessary resources and infrastructure to manage, perform, and administer the contract. Accomplish the assigned work by employing and utilizing qualified personnel capable of meeting the requirements of the PWS.

The following reflects desired Contractor personnel capabilities and experiences that will mitigate the performance risk for this effort.

- Demonstrated experience and specialization within higher education, workforce development, competency-based learning, and directly supporting DoD Voluntary Education.
- Experience conceptualizing frameworks and developing solutions to support the evaluation and mapping of knowledge gained by service members from military training and occupational experiences to higher education standards and requirements.
- Demonstrated experience directly supporting the development of technology solutions to enable the modernization of DoD, higher education, and/or workforce programs and strategic initiatives, applying Agile development methodologies.
- Key personnel with experience directly supporting DoD, the higher education community, and/or the workforce development landscape with program evaluation and modernization, strategic planning, concept development, Agile technology solution design, development and implementation, etc.
- Key personnel with experience working with higher education organizations on training, change management, program design, credit evaluations, prior learning assessment, curriculum development and assessment, and institutional or programmatic accreditation. Ph.D. or Doctoral Degree highly desired.

#### 4.1.5.1 Contractor Vacancy Management

Minimize disruptions caused by contract employee resignations and terminations by keeping the COR informed of contract employee departures. Expeditious hiring action by the Contractor is expected within 10 business days in order to mitigate any schedule interruptions. Inability to initiate hiring action within this time period shall be reported to the COR with supporting reason for the delay.

#### 4.1.6 Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure

4.1.6.1 This project and all materials provided to the Contractor by the Government and results, conclusions and recommendations obtained thereof should be considered confidential in nature and treated with the same level of care that the Contractor treats its own confidential business information. The information shall not be disclosed, copied, modified, used (except in the completion of this project) or otherwise disseminated to any other person or entity at any time to include, but not limited to inclusion in any database external to the Government without the Government's express consent. No data (digital or analog) provided to, or developed by, the Contractor shall be used for any purpose other than this contract.

4.1.6.2 Contractor personnel assigned to this project shall sign a **Non-Disclosure Agreement** prior to obtaining access to sensitive information. This effort, and all materials provided to the Contractor by the Government and their results, conclusions, and recommendations obtained, should be considered confidential and treated with care in accordance with applicable Government regulations. The information shall not be disclosed, copied, modified, used (except in completion of this project) or otherwise disseminated to any other person or entity at any time to include, but not limited to inclusion in any database external to the Government without the Government's express consent.

### 4.2 PRE-EVALUATION PREPARATION

#### 4.2.1 Annual Review Schedule Support and Risk Mitigation

4.2.1.1 Support the Military Training Evaluation Program Working Group (PWS 9.1.3) in the development of an annual review schedule. Conduct a Gap Analysis, in coordination with the military Services and the JST Operations Center, no less than on an annual basis, to determine eligible courses and occupations in need of evaluation due to review expiration dates, major course content revisions, newly created courses eligible for review, and/or major revisions to occupational fields. The **Gap Analysis Report** will include courses and occupations targeted for evaluation priority. Deliver the Gap Analysis Report electronically to the COR, the Working Group, and relevant military Service stakeholders within

three months of contract award and subsequently, no later than (NLT) beginning of month ten of each option year.

4.2.1.2 Include only courses and occupations meeting specified eligibility criteria for evaluation at the discretion of and in accordance with (IAW) prevailing priorities of the military Services. At minimum, to be eligible for academic evaluation courses must:

- a. Contain at least 40 hours of engagement in academic activity.
- b. Not contain “proprietary” material or the intellectual property of a Non-Federal Entity for purposes of academic a review.
- c. Not include accredited curriculum of a nationally or regionally accredited institution (e.g., Community College of the Air Force) as recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.
- d. Be developed and taught under the authority of a Military Service Training Command established to train military service personnel as established by appropriate authority of the applicable Military Department.
- e. Have undergone major changes in their curriculum, have not previously been evaluated, have moved to a new training location, or have reached their 10-year limit.
  - 1) The Contractor shall provide the training course/service occupations to be end-dated to the designated SPM no later than six months prior to the 10-year end-date.
  - 2) The 10-year limit, does not apply to courses in rapidly changing career fields such as highly technical and medical courses. The Working Group shall establish end-date policies by occupational fields and/or based upon the needs of the Services.
- f. Have an end-date-of-course and proctored assessment component if delivered by non-traditional instructional methodology (e.g., distance learning, CBT).
- g. Provide for firm identification of the student and rigid control of test conditions.
- h. Combine all blended learning components when course content objectives break into smaller units of learning to contain at least 40 hours of instruction, whether covered in a single setting or completed over a specified period using web-based or distance-learning modules. This includes emerging military training initiatives that deploy phased, ready relevant, or other just-in-time types of learning.
- i. Be evaluated from Service learning sites and military training centers geographically located within the continental United States for on-site (other than virtual) reviews.

4.2.1.3 Facilitate coordination, prioritization, and final confirmation of a **Schedule of Reviews** with the Working Group, at least annually, among the COR and Service stakeholders. This includes identifying courses to undergo virtual review readiness assessments and assigning eligibility for virtual or onsite reviews. The Schedule of Reviews will articulate the timeframe assigned for each course and occupation review based on the Gap Analysis Report, Service annual or emerging requirements, and the quantity of reviews ordered by the Government for the period of performance.

- a. Evaluations shall be scheduled and conducted in the following order of priority:
  - o First Priority: Courses for enlisted personnel and enlisted occupations
  - o Second Priority: Courses for limited duty, NEC, and warrant officer personnel and limited duty, NEC, and warrant officer occupations
  - o Third Priority: Courses for officer personnel
- b. When scheduling and coordinating evaluations, the Contractor shall give priority to schools attended by more than a single branch of the Armed Forces. The Contractor shall coordinate scheduling joint Services schools with the SPM or point of contact (POC) who represents the lead Service. The Contractor shall resolve scheduling conflicts and schedule with gaining the greatest volume and efficiency in mind.

4.2.1.4 Based on the schedule, course, and occupational review submissions provided by the SPM and the Working Group, submitted by a specified and agreed upon date each year, the Contractor shall coordinate and publish a review schedule, annually. A tentative schedule shall be published with enough lead time

for the Services and the Contractor to ensure review readiness with no break in service once new contract processes are established, but NLT 1 Aug in the base PoP and for each option PoP, thereafter. The Contractor shall ensure each SPM and the Working Group has 45 days to review and approve the tentative schedule and shall work within that time to resolve conflicts that the Government presents. After 45 days, the Contractor shall finalize a schedule that accommodates each Service to the greatest extent possible.

4.2.1.5 Publish the finalized Master Schedule of Reviews at least annually to training, education, and relevant Government stakeholders NLT six months before the earliest scheduled review within the period of performance.

4.2.1.6 Mitigate the risk of cancelled reviews by revising the Schedule of Reviews as situational changes may occur. Post coordinated revisions, agreed upon by the COR, Service Program Managers and Working Group stakeholders, to the Master Schedule of Reviews within two business days of the change(s). If for any reason a scheduled evaluation must be cancelled by the Government, the COR shall issue a 30-day notice to the Contractor in writing (email is acceptable).

- a. Postponed reviews shall be rescheduled no earlier than 60 calendar-days later than the original visit date to allow time for team adjustments, scheduling, and logistical arrangements.
- b. The Working Group shall establish Service-specific cancellation notification policies that require Service learning site locations to elevate review cancellation requests to increase accountability and transparency to training command and policy stakeholders.

4.2.1.7 The Contractor shall work to re-schedule, rather than cancel any scheduled evaluation the Contractor cannot carry out due to an unforeseeable conflict, outside the Government's control and inform the COR, SPM, and Working Group as early as possible. Scheduling adjustments or changes due to evaluation team member non-availability or other unforeseeable conflict shall be approved in advance by the COR.

#### 4.2.2 Training Site Readiness Evaluation Methodology

4.2.2.1 Establish, document, communicate, and execute a **Pre-Evaluation Preparation Process** to prepare for the review, evaluation, assessment, and award of college credit recommendations for military training courses and occupations. This process shall include a method to determine the stage of readiness nominated courses and occupations are in relation to qualifying for a virtual review. The process shall also include a level of effort determination needed for the virtual review, make recommendations for courses and occupations to be reviewed onsite, as well as determine the level of effort needed for the onsite review. The minimum lead-time for review preparation, from scheduling to execution, shall be 180 days\*. The Pre-Evaluation Preparation Process shall be documented, coordinated with pertinent Service stakeholders, and delivered to the COR and the Working Group for review, comment, and approval. Per the POA&M, the Contractor shall provide the following deliverable: **Pre-Evaluation Process Plan**.

\*Minimum lead-time requirement may be reduced, with COR approval, when both parties (Government and Contractor) state in writing that preparation can be expedited to fewer than six months without negative impact on evaluation effectiveness and outcomes.

The process must include, but is not limited to:

- a. Developing, disseminating, and supporting the completion of self-study/self-assessment to determine training facility/course/occupation readiness for the virtual review process.
- b. Conducting a series of trainings and/or meetings with military training facility/schoolhouse personnel to discuss the scope and intent of review as well as self-study requirements.

- c. Establishing a rubric to determine the type and scope of reviews based on statement of readiness, hours of instruction, the number of disciplines/content areas, and the amount of associated labs and/or practical exercises.
- d. Drafting a scoring matrix (submitted to the COR and reviewed and approved by the Working Group) based on three clearly distinguishable levels of readiness with corresponding levels of Contractor support needed by the training center to be ready for a virtual evaluation:
  - 1) Level 1 Preparation Event (example criteria may include course materials not in digital formats, curriculum needs substantial revisions, etc.). Self-studies resulting in Level 1 scores are not eligible for virtual reviews and will be considered for remediation and/or onsite reviews by the Working Group. Remediation activities shall be treated as a project with milestones that are reported to the Working Group on an agreed upon schedule based on the score of the project. Each remediation project shall be assigned a Government and Contract project management lead that will develop and ensure execution of a POA&M and corresponding activities that result in training site/course/occupation readiness for virtual review.
  - 2) Level 2 Preparation Event (example criteria may include curriculum is intact, course material in partial digital formats, etc.). Self-studies resulting in Level 2 scores are not eligible for virtual reviews until the identified areas remedied. Remediation activities shall be treated as short term projects with milestones that are reported to the Working Group on an agreed upon schedule based on the score of the project. Each remediation project shall be assigned a Government and Contract project management lead that will develop and ensure execution of a POA&M and corresponding activities that result in training site/course/occupation readiness for virtual review.
  - 3) Level 3 Preparation Event (example criteria may include course materials in digital formats, curriculum needs little to no revisions, etc.). Self-studies resulting in Level 3 scores shall be included on the annual schedule for virtual reviews.
- e. Conducting Staff Assistance site visits (on an as needed basis, but can be conducted virtually or via video teleconference when possible) to aid school houses in understanding self-study assessment results. With the school houses, develop a **Remediation POA&M** to improve readiness with corresponding activities and other support recommended/agreed upon with the Working Group.
- f. Evaluating all courses and occupations scheduled for reviews under this contract. Courses that are unable to undergo remediation may be scheduled for onsite reviews at the direction of SPMs and the Working Group. As the process and training site readiness matures over option periods, the intent is for no more than 10% of reviews to be scheduled for onsite reviews at the end of option period four. The Contractor shall develop a similar rubric for determining the level of effort needed for onsite course reviews based on three clearly distinguishable levels, according to the hours of instruction, the number of disciplines/content areas, and the amount of associated labs and/or practical exercises.
- g. Preparing training site personnel who have a role in upcoming reviews. Establish an adequate timeframe for site personnel training, collecting and analyzing Course Planning Documents (CPDs), and coordinating necessary system, installation, and data access. Training site personnel preparation may include coordinating with Service liaisons, training site personnel, course managers, instructors, etc.; explaining the evaluation process, the importance of CPDs, and the role of supporting documentation; providing evaluation rubrics, guidelines, and standards that support the evaluation process; providing demonstrations; asking and answering questions; submitting requests for additional materials; etc.
- h. Arranging transportation, lodging, honoraria, per diem, and miscellaneous travel expenses for the review team SMEs so that they are in place at the appointed time and location, when on-site inspections, staff assistance visits, or face-to-face evaluations are necessary. When staff assistance, on-site inspections, or evaluations are necessary, verify no later than two weeks in

advance, that military installations and learning centers are prepared and that required personnel will remain available for review activities. Report preparedness concerns directly to the COR and the Working Group. Only the Contracting Officer or the COR can cancel a review once it is scheduled. If canceling is unavoidable and necessary due to unforeseen events, suggest alternative evaluation options to the Service representatives and the COR.

The Government will order review preparation in advance according to the proposed evaluation methodology.

Due to the variability of course content, scope, magnitude, and delivery format, the Contractor may include rubrics that recommend to combine virtual and onsite review methodologies in order to maximize efficiencies. For example, after self-study by the training center yields scores that indicate a Level 2 Preparation Event and a Level 2 Virtual Review, both preparations may be combined with a Level 1 On-site Evaluation Review.

#### **4.2.3 Training Site Readiness Virtual and Onsite Support**

Establish, document, communicate, and execute a means of providing **Training Site Readiness Virtual and Onsite Support** through onsite or remote staff assistance visits/meetings. The provision of staff assistance aims to assist Service training centers as they progress through their identified stage of readiness for qualifying for virtual course and occupational reviews. This may include, but is not limited to conducting a series of trainings and/or meetings with military training facility/schoolhouse personnel to discuss the scope and intent of reviews; supporting self-studies to determine training facility readiness for review process; facilitating data gathering; requesting additional information as needed to support assessment; supporting the upload of course materials into a secure system for reviews; and establishing a rubric to determine the type and scope of reviews.

Deliverables to support course and occupation evaluation type determination and preparation shall be a **Pre-Evaluation Preparation Process Plan, Training Center Self-Study Assessment, Statement of Readiness Rubric, Staff Assistance and Remediation Project POA&M with reports, and an Onsite Review Level of Effort Rubric.**

### **4.3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION, ASSESSMENT, AND REFINEMENT**

#### **4.3.1 Virtual and On-site Course and Occupational Reviews**

4.3.1.1 Evaluation reviews encompasses both **Virtual and On-Site Reviews** of courses and occupations. It is the Government's intent for the majority of reviews to be completed through virtual means by the end of the fourth contract option period. To the fullest extent possible, video teleconferencing shall be used to replace face-to-face service member interviews and or focus groups to gather occupational information at each successive occupational level. In certain circumstances, some courses and occupations may not lend themselves initially to virtual reviews. In those instances, reviews of courses and occupations shall be conducted onsite at the Government learning center's location. Virtual evaluation methodology may combine remote subject matter expert review of material (virtual review) with onsite validation according to matrix-indicated level of readiness. Onsite reviews encompass SME and contract team travel to Service training locations for the review of courses or occupations.

4.3.1.2 All reviews, whether by means of virtual, onsite, or hybrid of both methodologies, shall:

- a. Identify learning gained by service members as a result of military training courses and military occupational experiences applicable to postsecondary academic credit award (from vocational to graduate level college credits).

- b. Be based on a documented assessment process supported by publically available rubrics that support college credit recommendations. Digitally document and make publically available **Academic Rubrics** that are the basis for academic credit award that distinguish levels of proficiency and include evidence to support the credit award.
  - 1) Rubrics for academic credit must be publically available for transparent course and occupation evaluation criteria for stakeholder use in developing automated academic course mapping to degree requirements.
  - 2) Therefore, rubrics need to include widely recognized academic nomenclature (e.g., CIP Codes, Consortia Course Numbering Systems, etc.).
  - 3) Given the pivotal role of these rubrics, they shall be empirically validated by experts across postsecondary education. The proposed validation methodology (e.g., use of existing rubrics, Delphi study, focus groups, etc.) shall be approved by the COR and relevant Government stakeholders.
- c. Include support by a secure virtual environment available for upload, transmission, and storage for course planning materials that is accessible to relevant Government, Contractor, and SME review personnel.
- d. Not compromise evaluation integrity nor diminish academic recommendation credibility.
- e. Be ordered in advance by the Government and categorized according to the estimated level of support based on historical data.
- f. Include the review of occupations at each successive level for enlisted personnel. At a minimum each Service shall have occupations that are reviewed at levels E-4 through E-9 for college credit and proficiency level award.

#### 4.3.1.3 Evaluation Types and Number of Reviews

Implement the training site self-assessment to determine the most effective and efficient ways to evaluate courses submitted by the Services for review. The average number of courses (POIs/CPDs) reviewed per year, over the past three fiscal years (FY16-FY18) is 395, averaging 247 hours of academic engagement per course. An average of 64 occupations are evaluated per year. For the base year, the Contractor should expect to dispatch evaluation teams to military sites for approximately forty (40) to forty-five (45) face-to-face reviews. Sites are defined as Learning Centers, training schools, or training activities. Generally, an onsite evaluation should cover at least 12 courses. It is anticipated that for each option period the number of onsite visits will gradually diminish and the number of virtual evaluations shall increase at a rate agreed upon by the COR and the Working Group according to the progression of training site readiness.

Conduct occupational evaluations to assess experiential learning. Occupational evaluations are expected to be conducted over the course of approximately 20 site visits, usually in conjunction with course reviews. Total occupational reviews per 12-month period of performance shall not exceed 120 occupations unless either of two exceptions apply:

- All occupations within a job family (e.g., Aviation, Logistics) are collectively reviewed by subject area
- Review will focus on U.S. Coast Guard occupations and designators

#### 4.3.3.4 Post Evaluation Workshops

Develop feedback loops to facilitate learning among Service training commands as a result of evaluating military training courses and occupations in the form of **Post Evaluation Workshops** held within 15 business days of the review completion. This includes establishing a list of gaps in course planning documents (if any); post evaluation briefs with credit recommendations, by subject area; etc. Outputs of course and occupational reviews should yield a comprehensive framework that Service training sites can use for continuous improvement. This includes: offering rationale for recommendation decisions, providing evaluation rubrics, guidelines, and standards that support the evaluation process; identify gaps



in content, criterion, and construct validity and reliability of assessments; identify areas for improvement in instruction materials, course curriculum, etc. Feedback may yield actionable items (e.g., scorecard) that military training facilities can use for continuous improvement to academics in areas such as curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

#### 4.3.4 On-site Inspections

Provide a methodology to conduct periodic onsite inspections of training courses and occupations reviewed virtually. It is the Government's intent that on-site inspections be limited in scope to encompass periodic reviews of training sites and validation of occupational levels. These inspections will augment the Quality Control process to ensure quality and transparency among stakeholders. Inspections will include reviews of instruction, curriculum, assessments, proficiency demonstrations, occupational competence and levels of distinction, facilities, and applicable equipment. Inspections, if any, will be ordered as Level 1 Onsite Reviews by the Working Group, via the COR during the development of the annual review schedule.

In limited circumstances, some courses and occupations may not lend themselves initially to the virtual evaluation process. In those instances, reviews of courses and occupations shall be conducted on-site in conjunction with a scheduled inspection. These on-site evaluations may use a hybrid of virtual and onsite subject matter expert review of courses and occupations. The Contractor shall adapt the proposed virtual evaluation processes to the on-site review of COR- and Working Group-approved courses and occupations.

#### 4.3.5 Evaluation Outputs

4.3.5.1 Courses and occupations reviewed under this contract may be completed using virtual, on-site, or a hybrid approach. Regardless of the review methodology, the output of each evaluation shall align to evaluation rubrics, be formatted to be stored within the Digital Catalog/Military Guide and, at a minimum, include:

- a. College credit recommendations that clearly demonstrate quality, transparency, and portability.
  - 1) College credit recommendations, in terms of semester hours, noting academic course equivalents
  - 2) Alphanumeric course identifiers that accompany each credit award that include information such as prefix, level code, century digit, decade digit, unit digit, lab code, skill level, etc.
- b. Standardized scorecards that provide actionable items that military training facilities can use for continuous improvement to academic rigor in areas such as curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Key to the success of all evaluations shall be the feedback loops created to facilitate learning among Service training commands.
- c. **Post Evaluation Summary Reports** that provide qualitative and quantitative answers to the following Key Evaluation Questions:
  - 1) What college level learning was gained from the course(s) and occupational reviews conducted that demonstrate and document academic learning objectives service members achieve as a result of these learning experiences?
  - 2) What are the college credit equivalents to the academic competencies gained from the course(s) and occupational reviews conducted?
  - 3) What is the rationale for the resulting credit award recommendations? What artifacts are available to support this rationale?
  - 4) What gaps, if any, exist in course planning documents, instructional support materials, or assessments of learning that impact credit recommendations/awards? If found, what recommendations to Service training sites could increase the credit awards? This includes: the identification of gaps in content, criterion, construct validity and reliability of assessments, areas for academic bolstering in instruction materials, course curriculum, etc.

4.3.5.2 The Evaluation Team shall submit a preliminary report to the Contractor that will include the Evaluation Team's credit recommendations along with the composition of the Evaluation Team, including their subject area background. A draft copy of the preliminary evaluation report may be provided to the visited Learning Center/Site, training school, or training activity prior to the team's departure.

4.3.5.3 Within thirty days of evaluation completion, the Contractor shall forward a final report on the evaluation to the evaluated Military Service(s)--a **Credit Recommendation Report** (CRR) that details the Contractor determinations and provides official Digital Catalog/Military Guide information. The report shall include a list of all POIs/CPDs and Service occupations evaluated, installation(s) visited, evaluation results and credit recommendations, composition of the evaluation team and the Post Evaluation Summary Report. The CRR shall be provided to the COR and, as applicable:

- Army—Army Credentialing and Continuing Education Services for Soldiers (ACCESS)
- Marine Corps—MTESD
- Navy—NETC, N74
- Air Force—HQAF, Voluntary Education Branch, AF/A1DLV
- Coast Guard—USCG ETQC

#### 4.4 DATA MANGEMENT AND SECURITY

*\*Final system, data security, and reporting requirements are pending review and decision by DHRA Chief Information Officer*

##### 4.4.1 Data Repository

4.4.1.1 Develop, maintain, and be responsible for all entries posted in the web-based Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services, henceforth referred to as **Military Guide, Digital Catalog, or both**.

a. Digitally document and make publically available **Academic Rubrics** that are the basis for academic credit award. Codify the output of academic valuations in an information management system (Digital Catalog/Military Guide) with a comprehensive data dictionary.

b. Infrastructure must include publicly available search functions; business intelligence capability for reporting and modeling; and digital exportability for academic institution utilization.

c. The Digital Catalog shall serve the need of a variety of stakeholders: the military Services, the postsecondary community, employers/industry groups, and service members/veterans.

d. The system shall function as an interactive, interoperable repository to store credit recommendations data in separate data elements, vice a continuous text stream.

e. The system shall include academic rubrics, learning outcomes, evaluation outputs in terms of college credit recommendations, documentation to support and justify credit awards, and standardized course identifiers (including 2-digit CIP codes) for academic course equivalencies to assist with credit mapping, etc.

f. The system shall serve postsecondary community stakeholders for automated academic course mapping for satisfying degree and academic requirements. Therefore, rubrics need to include widely recognized academic nomenclature (e.g., CIP Codes, Consortia Course Numbering Systems, competency frameworks, etc.).

g. System data must adhere to Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) standards. Alphanumeric course identifiers must include information in electronic data string such as prefix, level code, century digit, decade digit, unit digit, lab code, etc.

4.4.1.2 Ensure the Digital Catalog is constantly accessible to service members, veterans, academic institutions and other stakeholders (except during reasonable downtime for system maintenance and refresh). An online electronic format shall be available to users twenty-four hours a day, every day, on the Contractor's website.

4.4.1.3 Service member outputs should align to DoD's college and career planning system of choice to help service members understand how their training and experience aligns to credentials, career pathways, and degrees. The overall out-puts of all evaluations should be able to automatically communicate to an external system (e.g., whole of government solutions such as OPM eLearning Competency Management System) to pre-populate tailored electronic documents on service members' behalf. This includes: career pathway guidance worksheets, academic transcripts, draft resumes, etc.

4.4.1.4 The catalog shall include archives and historical data that the Contractor shall capture and verify. The catalog shall include all valid and applicable evaluations, including all evaluations made under this statement of work.

4.4.1.5 Feature robust search and query capabilities with user interface/user experience features simple enough for inexperienced or infrequent users to navigate successfully.

4.4.1.6 Publicize how and where to access catalog information to potential users, including military and postsecondary institutions.

#### 4.4.2 **Data Transmittal for Military Transcripts**

Provide the data necessary to post credit recommendations and descriptions on the JST or other Government-identified information system used to produce transcripts for military learning.

Electronically disseminate immediate electronic updates to the Government identified system to coincide with changes made to the on-line Military Guide, in a format compatible with the Government system as specified by the Government.

4.4.2.1 Conduct third-party **quality assurance and audits** to validate the accuracy of the data elements and the transcript registries to include the following tasks:

- a. Define and deliver the criteria for validation in advance of an audit.
- b. Approve procedures for matching the data from the evaluation output database and the Service databases within acceptable margins of error for omission or commission.
- c. Approve JST/other Government identified system record correction procedures to ensure academic integrity of the document.
- d. Permit Government approved corrections to master data files.
- e. Present issues and concerns annually to the Military Evaluation Working Group for resolution, review and approval of standards for establishing an academic record, for transmission of the record, and security required for the record-producing system.
- f. Contribute to discussions, data summits, and working groups focused on improving content, delivery, and clarity of the JST.
- g. New credit recommendations that refer to other exhibits for additional credit shall include the additional credit in the body of the referencing exhibit recommendation.
- h. Convene committees of subject-matter specialists to maintain a common taxonomy of terms (and across evaluation exhibits) in selected fields to ensure standardization.
- i. Conduct Data Summits with all Services represented and other organizations such as the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) to resolve data issues. This Data Summit may convene in conjunction with Military Evaluation Working Group meetings.
- j. Provide third-party quality assurance and endorsement on the JST document or other Government system transcript output. Publish the on Contractor's recommended credit on every document produced in order to ensure acceptance by colleges and universities.

4.4.2.2 Conduct continuing and periodic surveys (at a minimum, annually) to determine the utilization of the Military Transcript in the award of college credit to include the following tasks:

- a. Recommended an actionable **Feedback and Performance Methodology** for measuring how

colleges, universities, and industry organizations are applying evaluation data to service member degree attainment and to inform continual improvement of these performance measures.

- b. Develop the capability to use degree completion data from the JST or similar system or from the network of schools that agree to accept the college credit recommendations.
- a. Within the capability of actionable Feedback and Performance Methodology, assess and document the application of prior learning assessment credits in terms of student outcomes. These outcomes include: number of courses and credits satisfied by prior learning assessment credits, number of credits applied to degree completion, categories of program areas where prior learning assessment credits were applied, impacts on persistence rates, time, cost to degree completion for the application of prior learning assessment credits, etc.

4.4.2.3 Grant permission to the applicable Defense organization to publish the Contractor endorsement of the military transcript. Provide written authorization for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and the Coast Guard to publish the Contractor imprimatur of the military transcript by the title: Joint Services Transcript until or unless another Government system is named and provided.

4.4.2.4 Summarize specific transcript task activities within 15 days after the end of each quarter of performance and submit the summary to the COR. The Quarterly JST or similar system summary may be included in the Quarterly Military Programs Report. Upon the Period of Performance's end, submit an assessment of the full period of performance regarding the JST or similar system.

#### 4.4.3 Interoperability for Stakeholder Data Exchanges

4.4.3.1 Provide evaluation output data by electronic file transfer to the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) on a quarterly basis for updating ACE-related data housed in the DMDC database.

4.4.3.2 Within six months of contract award, submit an **Institutional Access Plan** whereby DoD MOU schools and state-sponsored consortia of schools approved by written Government consent may obtain credit recommendation electronic data string through an automated transfer application programming interface (API) framework. Implement the Government approved Institutional Access Plan.

4.4.3.3 Apply open-source frameworks and standards capable of making evaluation data and information more universally accessible. Line itemized, open, sharable, and interoperable credit recommendation data string shall migrate with other DoD VoEd and Service-level VoEd systems using API. Where possible, the system shall leverage the Defense's initiative to widely adopt whole of government information management solutions (for example OPM's USA Learning cloud-based Competency Management System).

4.4.3.4 Data produced by this contract are property of the U.S. Government. The data shall be used for purposes stated herein and are nontransferable to any other potential user without the Government's written consent and not for commercial gain.

#### 4.4.4 Data Security

Adhere to all data security requirements identified by the Government, including the Security section of the PWS.

4.4.4.1 Establish levels and secure methods of access that align with the complexity of the evaluation process and stakeholder interactions with data for virtual, and onsite reviews/inspections.

#### 4.5 CUSTOMER AND STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT

Provide support to customers and stakeholders in support of PWS requirements. Deliver a **monthly update** to the COR outlining activities, interactions, inquiries, complaints, resolutions, etc. This report

shall include recommendations for program, process, or information communication improvements to address trends. This information may be combined with the other monthly reports as applicable.

#### 4.5.1 Customer Support

4.5.1.1 Establish and maintain a call center capability to address and respond to customer inquiries in real time during established business hours and within one business day for after-hours inquiries. Track and report the number and types of inquiries and from which stakeholder group they originate. Anticipated stakeholder groups for customer inquiries include service members, veterans, registrars and advisors from academic institutions, military education counselors/advisors, Service-level training personnel, etc. Historically more than 5,000 inquiries by phone or emails requiring response are typical each year. Call center contact information (e.g., toll-free telephone numbers, email addresses, and hours of operation) shall be posted on a publicly facing website and on all program related promotional material.

4.5.1.2 Promptly work to resolve PWS task-related issues to the customer's satisfaction. Recommend courses of action for avoiding future issues. Refer inquiries unrelated to contract requirements to the COR/program manager or other appropriate POC (e.g., JST program manager, training center personnel).

4.5.1.3 Monitor Contractor personnel responses to customer inquiries to ensure acceptable customer service standards are met.

#### 4.5.2 Stakeholder Support

Fulfill a variety of customer support services for meeting the training and informational needs of stakeholders who utilize and directly support PWS requirements, herein.

4.5.2.1 Execute the Communication Management Plan (PWS 1.2) to govern the process of providing stakeholders with program information.

4.5.2.2 Conduct **Curriculum Summits**, on a bi-annual basis or more often if requested or approved by the COR, with military Service schools to discuss trends and practices that impact course and occupational evaluation outputs (e.g., academic credit award, assessment of learning, etc.), challenges and improvements to the evaluation process, and lessons learned during contract execution that will foster an environment of shared learning among the Contract team, Government stakeholders, and training site personnel. Facilitate shared learning that improves course and occupational evaluation processes, procedures, and outcomes. When feasible, align summits with regularly scheduled Service training command events (e.g., conferences, training events, webinars, etc.).

4.5.2.3 The contractor shall provide digital marketing materials (web graphics, web banners, info graphics, short program descriptions, flyers, pamphlets, etc.) to include materials that can be printed locally to the DANTES Voluntary Education Enterprise Support Division via email to [dantes\\_outreach@navy.mil](mailto:dantes_outreach@navy.mil) for central hosting and ongoing digital marketing activities. At the discretion of the contractor, digital and printed materials may be disseminated directly to education, family support, and wounded warrior centers across the globe to support education outreach events, group workshops, and individual counseling. The contractor shall ensure any digital marketing materials align with the Communication Management Plan, in support of the program with items tailored to each external audience group (e.g., service members, institutions, etc.).

4.5.2.4 Engage academic faculty and related experts through workshops, working groups, webinars, forums, symposia, etc. The purpose **Community Engagement** is to provide transparency on the evaluation process, provide familiarity with evaluation outputs, and solicit stakeholder feedback on issues/needs/concerns regarding the evaluation process and its outputs. These engagements shall focus on encouraging and facilitating acceptance of evaluation outputs. Feedback received from stakeholders shall be validated and used to support continuous improvements of the evaluation process and its outputs.

Include planned engagements in the annual schedule of reviews and submit to the COR for review and approval. The COR will either recommend and/or approve virtual customer support events, in advance. The Government reserves the right to review and edit presentation materials (e.g. slides, handouts, training agenda) at least 10 days prior to delivery of engagement events.

**5.0 DELIVERABLES** *The Contractor shall:*

5.1 Submit deliverables provided under this contract to the COR. The Government shall review deliverables and provide comments, recommended changes, etc. to the Contractor within the time period determined by the COR. Within ten working days after receiving Government comments, the Contractor shall incorporate agreed upon changes and submit revised deliverables to the COR.

5.2 Style written deliverables as desired, unless otherwise directed. All written deliverables including imbedded documents, shall be provided as a Microsoft Office Suite product/document. Any exceptions must be approved by the COR.

5.3 All reports specified in PWS 4.1.2 **Reporting Requirements** shall be accompanied by a meeting providing an overview of report contents. Meetings may be conducted via teleconference.

**5.4 Schedule of Deliverables**

The Contractor shall provide the deliverables in accordance with the delivery schedule reflected in the following table:

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>PWS Reference</b>	<b>Delivery Date</b>
Post-Award Conference with Written Summary	4.1.1.1	Within 7 business days of contract award. A written summary of this meeting is due within 5 business days following Post-Award Conference.
Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&M)	4.1.1.1	Within 14 calendar days of Post-Award Conference
Communication Management Plan	4.1.1.2	Per POA&M
Risk Management Plan with Risk Watch List	4.1.1.3	Per POA&M; Risk Watch List reviewed monthly
Quality Control Plan with Surveillance Report	4.1.1.4	Per POA&M; Risk-based Surveillance Report provided quarterly
Configuration Management Plan with Configuration Baseline Information	4.1.1.5 4.1.1.6	Per POA&M
In-Process Reviews (IPRs) 1) Briefing Materials – IPR Summary and PowerPoint slide deck	4.1.1.7	No later than 5 business days prior to presenting the review.
Corrective Action Plan with Report	4.1.1.8	Per POA&M

Deliverable	PWS Reference	Delivery Date
Routine Reports A. Quarterly Status Report (for IVEB) B. Quarterly Military Programs Report C. Military Programs Data Report (annual by FY) D. Contract Performance Report E. Information Technology and Data Security Report F. Accounting Data Report G. Ad Hoc Reports	4.1.2	A. 15 days prior to scheduled IVEB B. 15 October, 15 January, 15 April, and 15 July, each year C. NLT 15 October, each year D. Monthly E. Monthly F. Monthly by the 30 <sup>th</sup> day of the following month G. As needed
Human Subjects Research Compliance (Forms to establish compliance)	4.1.4	Per POA&M
Gap Analysis Report	4.2.1.1	Within three months of contract award and no later than (NLT) beginning of month ten of each option year.
Schedule of Reviews	4.2.1.3	NLT 1 Aug, annually
Pre-Evaluation Preparation Process Plan	4.2.2.1	Per POA&M
Training Site Readiness Methodology and Support: A. Training Center Self-Study Assessment B. Statement of Readiness Rubric C. Staff Assistance (Self-Assessment) D. Remediation Project POA&M E. Onsite Review Level of Effort Rubric F. Staff Assistance (Site Readiness)	4.2.2 4.2.3	Per POA&M
Virtual and Onsite Reviews with Evaluation Outputs A. Academic Rubrics B. Post Evaluation Workshops C. Onsite Inspections D. Evaluation Outputs E. Post Evaluation Summary Reports: Credit Recommendation Report, Program of Instruction Report	4.3	Per Schedule of Reviews
Data Management and Security A. Digital Catalog/Military Guide B. Data Transmittal C. Quality Assurance D. Feedback and Performance Methodology E. Quarterly JST Summary F. Stakeholder Data Exchanges G. Institutional Access Plan H. Data Security	4.4 8.0	Per POA&M and as specified in the PWS

Deliverable	PWS Reference	Delivery Date
Customer and Stakeholder Support Quarterly Update A. Customer Support B. Stakeholder Support C. Curriculum Summits D. Digital and Print Publications E. Community Engagement	4.6	Per POA&M; Updates within 10 business days of month's end

## 6.0 CONTRACTOR MANPOWER REPORTING

The Contractor shall report ALL Contractor labor hours (including subcontractor labor hours) required for performance of services provided under this contract for DHRA/DANTES via a secure data collection site. The Contractor is required to completely fill in all required data fields using the following web address: <http://www.ecmra.mil/>. Reporting inputs will be for the labor executed during the period of performance during each Government fiscal year (FY), which runs October 1 through September 30. While inputs may be reported any time during the FY, all data shall be reported no later than October 31 of each calendar year, unless a later date is otherwise authorized by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness). Contractors may direct questions to the help desk at help desk at: <http://www.ecmra.mil>

## 7.0 TRAVEL

Travel will be required in performance of this contract. Travel expenses incurred by the Contractor for authorized travel shall be reimbursed by the Government. All travel required during performance of this contract shall be approved in advance by the COR. The Contractor shall conduct authorized travel in accordance with FAR 31.205-46. Travel expenses reimbursed by the Government shall not exceed those authorized under the Federal Travel Regulations (for travel in 48 contiguous states), the Joint Travel Regulations, Volume 2, DoD Civilian Personnel, Appendix A (for travel to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Territories and possessions). The Contractor is encouraged to obtain federal discounts to the maximum extent practical. The Contractor shall notify the COR when travel funds expended reach 80% of the funded amount. Contractor invoices for travel shall include complete documentation to support actual expenses incurred (e.g., airfare, lodging receipts). Failure to provide supporting documentation may result in the non-payment of travel expenses. The Government's liability for reimbursement of travel expenses is limited to the funding expressed as a Not-To-Exceed amount available under the Travel Reimbursement Line Item of the contract.

## 8.0 SECURITY *The Contractor shall:*

8.1 Establish appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect any and all nonpublic Government data to ensure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of government data. The Contractor and all Contractor personnel with access to or responsibility for nonpublic Government data under this contract shall:

### 8.1.1 Comply with:

- DoD Instruction (DoDI) 8500.1, Cybersecurity
- The Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a)
- DoD 5400.11-R, and DoD Directive 5400.11, DoD Privacy Program
- DoD 6025.18-R, DoD Health Information Privacy Regulation
- DoD 5200.2-R, Personnel Security Program
- HSPD-12, Homeland Security Presidential Directive.



8.1.2 Comply with HSPD-12 Personal Identity Verification (PIV) issuance requirements, known as the Common Access Card (CAC) and:

8.1.2.1 Obtain CAC- or PIV-ready status prior to reporting for work. At a minimum, all Contractor personnel must obtain/maintain a favorable FBI National Criminal History Check (fingerprint check), two forms of identity proofed identification (I-9 document), and submit a Tier 3 (T3) investigation vetting package for processing.

8.1.2.2 Be citizens of the United States.

8.1.2.3 Maintain favorable FBI National Criminal History checks and ensure completion and successful adjudication of a Tier 3 investigation as required for Federal employment.

8.2 If at any time, any Contractor personnel requiring a CAC is unable to obtain/maintain an adjudicated Tier 3 investigation, immediately notify the Requiring Activity's Information Systems Security Group (ISSG) and remove such person from work under this contract.

8.3 Immediately report the discovery of any Privacy breach first to the Requiring Activity's CIO/Privacy Office and secondly to the COR.

8.4 Acknowledge and ensure all Information Systems (IS), Platform Information Technology (PIT) and Information Technology (IT) Services or Products under this requirement, that receive, transmit, store, or process nonpublic government data must be accredited in accordance with Department of Defense (DOD) Instruction (DoDI) 8510.01 "Risk Management Framework (RMF) for DoD Information Technology (DIT)" issued March 12, 2014 (formerly the DOD Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process (DIACAP)). IS and PIT systems must be categorized in accordance with Committee on National Security Systems Instruction (CNSSI) 1253, implement a corresponding set of security controls from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication (SP) 800-53, and use assessment procedures from NIST SP 800-53A with additional DoD-specific assignment values, overlays, implementation guidance, and assessment procedures as required.

8.5 Acknowledge and ensure DoD-Controlled IS and PIT Systems operated by a Contractor or other entity on behalf of the DoD; to include Contractor owned IS and PIT systems that are dedicated to DoD processing, must be authorized as DoD IS or PIT systems. The Requiring Activity's Authorizing Official (AO) must render an authorization decision for this type of a DoD system prior to DoD use of the capability.

8.6 Acknowledge and ensure IT services provided by a commercial or other non-federal government entity under this requirement must ensure the security protections of the IS delivering the service is appropriate to the confidentiality, integrity, and availability needs of the Requiring Activity's information and mission in order to be approved for acceptable use. The Government will assess the adequacy of security proposed by potential service providers, and accept the proposed approach, negotiate changes to the approach to meet DoD needs, or reject the offer. The accepted security approach will be documented and included as attachments to the resulting contract.

8.7 Acknowledge and ensure any commercial cloud computing services used for this requirement must comply with DoD cloud computing policy and procedural guidance as published.

8.8 Acknowledge and ensure Information Security Continuous Monitoring (ISCM) is defined as maintaining ongoing awareness of information security, vulnerabilities, and threats to support

organizational risk management decisions. All IS and PIT under this requirement must maintain ongoing monitoring, analysis and incident response procedures as defined and documented in NIST SP800-137 as a critical part of the risk management process to ensure that IS and PIT operations remain within an acceptable level of risk despite any changes that occur. In addition, all systems under this requirement must comply with all annual Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) security control testing and reporting requirements. The Contractor shall provide evidence of these compliance activities.

## **9.0 GOVERNMENT FURNISHED PROPERTY/EQUIPMENT/INFORMATION (GFP/GFE/GFI)**

*The Government will:*

### **9.1 Service Facilities and Resources**

Provide facilities and access to resources for the evaluation of course and occupational information, as required for the performance of this task order. When onsite evaluations are required, the Government will provide temporary facilities and access to non-portable resources (e.g., curricula information, assessments) in a timely manner for course evaluations required for the performance.

#### **9.1.1 Headquarters Location**

Designate each of the military Service Headquarters listed below as the agency from which a Service Program Manager (SPM) shall be appointed for the purpose of executing this Contract:

Army - Army - Army Credentialing and Continuing Education Services for Soldiers (ACCESS), Army University, 1600 Spearhead Division Avenue, Dept. 310, Fort Knox, KY 40122-5401;

Marine Corps - Commandant of the Marine Corps, Lifelong Learning and Professional Development Branch, CMC (MFR) and Training and Education Command (TECOM), Marine Air-Ground Taskforce (MAGTF) and Training and Education Standards Division (MTESD), 2079 Barnett Avenue, Quantico, VA 22133-5103;

Navy - Naval Education and Training Command (Attn: NETC N74), Bldg.199, Walker Hall Rm 132, 1905 Regulus Ave, Virginia Beach, VA 23461;

Air Force – Air Force Voluntary Education (AF-A1), Jones Bldg., 1500 Perimeter Road, Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762-6603;

Coast Guard – USCG Education and Training Quota Center (ETQC), 1430-D Kristina Way, Chesapeake VA 23326; and

Joint Services Transcript (JST) - Naval Education and Training Command (Attn: N643 Branch (JST)), 6390 Saufley Field Road, Pensacola, FL 32509.

#### **9.1.2 Service Program Managers**

Each Service shall appoint or otherwise designate a Service Program Manager (SPM) to represent and manage the Service's interests and responsibilities to execute the MilEval Program as outlined within this PWS. Service interests and responsibilities include the following duties in accordance with internal procedures as coordinated and outlined by the DANTES Program Manager:

- a. Accept an appointment of Technical Advisor (TA) to monitor Contractor performance and assist with contract surveillance.
- b. Audit their respective schoolhouses or Learning Centers to determine evaluation needs for the forthcoming fiscal year according to established qualifications and need.
- c. Abide by the review priorities established by the Working Group or in absence thereof, as stated below:
  - o First Priority: Courses for enlisted personnel and enlisted occupations

- Second Priority: Courses for limited duty, Navy Enlisted Classification (NEC), and warrant officer personnel and limited duty, NEC, and warrant officer occupations
- Third Priority: Courses for officer personnel
- d. Engage in annual and quarterly webinars and conference calls to validate and rectify fiscal year scheduling.
- e. Ensure and conduct intra-service liaison and collaboration.
- f. Ensure official and required documentation to prepare for evaluations reaches the Contractor within the pre-established lead time.
- g. Provide materials required for onsite evaluations at no cost to the Contractor by direction of the SPM.
- h. Coordination with representatives of the Service's Reserve Component may be required.
- i. Coordinate with representatives of a Joint-Service military training command where the Service represented by the SPM is the Joint Service activity's Executive Agent.

#### 9.1.3 Military Training Evaluation Program Working Group

The Government will form a Military Training Evaluation Program Working Group to support program administration and policy direction recommendations. A charter shall be established by the Government and provided to the Contractor.

### 10.0 PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

The Contractor is responsible for providing workspace(s) that shall serve as the primary place of performance for requirements herein; however, Contractors may travel temporarily to work at various service learning sites and schools geographically located within the continental United States when conducting onsite evaluations. Work at the government site shall not take place on Federal holidays or weekends unless directed by the Contracting Officer.

### 11.0 ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Contractor acknowledges that it is familiar with FAR Subpart 9.5, Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest, and agrees to avoid, neutralize or mitigate such conflicts of interest in accordance with the principles set forth in the FAR. If the performance requires the Contractor (to include Subcontractors) to supply technical support related to systems or projects with which the Contractor is already directly concerned, either by prime or subcontract, the Contractor shall immediately inform the Contracting Officer. The PWS may be withdrawn if a conflict is found. The Contractor shall not undertake performance of any PWS requirements which requires it to supply technical support regarding such systems until the notice is given, and written consent to proceed is issued by the Contracting Officer.

### 12.0 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

Document	Web link
DoDD 1322.08E	<a href="http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodd/132208p.pdf">http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodd/132208p.pdf</a>
DoDI 1322.25	<a href="http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/fdodi/132225p.pdf">http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/fdodi/132225p.pdf</a>

### 13.0 MANDATORY TRAINING REQUIREMENT FOR CONTRACTOR

Contractor employees performing under this contract shall complete the following mandatory trainings within 30 days of contract award and date of any option exercised. If additional mandatory training is required, amendment or modification will be issued to incorporate the changes.

1. DoD Training on Unauthorized Disclosures IAW OSD Memorandum dated September 19, 2017 and the training is currently available at <https://securityawareness.usalearning.gov/disclosure/index.html>
2. Privacy Act and Personally Identifiable Information IAW DoDD 5400.11 dated October 29, 2014 and the training is currently available at <https://iatraining.disa.mil/eta/piiv2/launchPage.htm>
3. IT Security Awareness IAW 5 CFR 930.301 and the training is currently available at [https://iatraining.disa.mil/eta/disa\\_cac2018/launchPage.htm](https://iatraining.disa.mil/eta/disa_cac2018/launchPage.htm)
4. National Insider Threat IAW Executive Order 13587 and the training is currently available at <https://securityawareness.usalearning.gov/itawareness/index.htm>
5. Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting Training IAW DoDD 5240.06 and the training is currently available at <https://securityawareness.usalearning.gov/cidod>

The Contractor program manager shall provide a copy of its employee(s)' training certificate to the COR to meet the mandatory training requirements. This training must be completed and submitted on an annual basis. The CORs shall maintain the Contractor's certificate(s) in the COR file or CORT.

#### 14.0 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY (PRS)

Performance Objective	PWS Reference	Performance Standard/Acceptable Quality Level
Program and project management establishes and maintains an orderly workflow	4.1.1	Performance is acceptable when the program and project management plans, procedures, and timelines enable and produce required deliverables and outputs
Reporting to gage progress and informs data-driven decisions	4.1.2	Performance is acceptable when: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) reports are delivered to intended recipients in the specified manner;</li> <li>b) reports are on time;</li> <li>c) reported data are accurate;</li> </ol> AND <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) all specified data points are addressed</li> </ol>
Personnel are fully qualified, trained, and able to accomplish work assigned to their area of responsibility	4.1.3 4.1.5	Performance is acceptable when properly vetted and assigned subject matter experts and personnel perform the requirements herein and meet applicable personnel qualifications (unless previously waived by the CO)
Confidential information is protected from unauthorized disclosure	4.1.6	Any unauthorized disclosure renders performance as unacceptable

Performance Objective	PWS Reference	Performance Standard/Acceptable Quality Level
Effectively forecast and manage schedules	4.2.1	Performance is acceptable when: a) gaps in reviewed courses and occupations are forecasted and inform strategic scheduling practices; b) schedules are coordinated with specified parties; AND c) schedules are published on time and adjustments effectively managed and approved (in writing or as otherwise directed by the CO)
Effectively ready training site personnel for scheduled reviews	4.2	Performance is acceptable when training site personnel have been prepared to fulfill their role so that scheduled reviews may be successfully executed as planned
Increasingly, evaluate training and occupational experiences using virtual collaboration methodology	3.0 4.2.2	Performance is acceptable when: a) each period of performance sees an increase in virtual evaluation outputs (i.e., credit recommendations); AND b) with each period of performance virtual reviews as a percentage of total reviews increase
Academic Rubrics are the basis for academic credit award	4.3.1	Performance is acceptable when: a) Academic Rubrics support and correspond to credit recommendation produced under this contract; AND b) corresponding rubrics are validated, include required nomenclature, digitized, and made publically available by NLT the 10 <sup>th</sup> month of the first period of performance

Performance Objective	PWS Reference	Performance Standard/Acceptable Quality Level
Recommended subject area credit aligns to learning outcomes at appropriate postsecondary level	4.3.5	Performance is acceptable when: a) learning outcomes are defined and documented in final evaluation reports and applicable data repositories; b) subject area credit awards are aligned at appropriate postsecondary levels and accurately reflect academic learning outcomes; AND c) credit recommendations are accompanied by evidence statements and sample artifacts
Post Evaluation Summary Reports inform desired improvements in academic credit-worthiness	4.3.5	Performance is acceptable when the Service training sites understand evaluation rationale and strategies for improving academic rigor following reviews
Stakeholders can find any valid military credit recommendations by searching the open source Military Guide/ Digital Catalog	4.4.1	Performance is acceptable when: a) catalog is complete (including archives); b) catalog searches are intuitive to users and filters accurately narrow search results--users generally find information in 5 minutes or less, on average (as indicated by user/interface testing) c) content includes detailed information required for each evaluated course or occupation d) catalog availability is at least 95% per month
Evaluation data transmit to supported networks and to the JST	4.4.2	Performance is acceptable when: a) data transfer successfully to JST at least once every 24 hours AND b) quality assessment is systematic and effectively identifies and addresses quality issues
Data portability expands to provide API framework, system-to-system electronic data string portability	4.4.3	Performance is acceptable when an Institutional Access Plan is Government-approved and ready for immediate implementation by NLT the 10 <sup>th</sup> month of the first performance period

<b>Performance Objective</b>	<b>PWS Reference</b>	<b>Performance Standard/Acceptable Quality Level</b>
Resolve customer inquiries from a managed call center	4.5.1	Performance is acceptable when: a) inquiries are tracked and reported with 90% of customer inquiries resolved within 3 business days AND b) no more than 2 valid customer complaints (as determined by the Government) per performance period elevate beyond call center level due to unsatisfactory resolution
Meet informational program application training needs of key stakeholders	4.5.2	Performance is acceptable when evidence (responses on surveys, increases in credit acceptance of award by individual institutions that attend training, planned actions of Service-level training sites based on evaluation scorecard, etc.) supports the understanding and acceptance of recommended credit.
Meeting Government tracking needs of stakeholder engagement and support	4.5.2	Performance is acceptable when college credit awards are tracked for academic institutional credit acceptance, award, and application to satisfy course requirements by general education, major/minor area of study, and elective credit designations
Develop and submit required deliverables	5.4	Performance is acceptable when: a) 100% of deliverable requirements are met and on time rate is at least 95%; AND b) critical information is accurate and complete
Administrative, technical, and physical safeguards protect nonpublic Government data	8.0	Performance is acceptable when: a) nonpublic Government data is protected at all times from unauthorized disclosure; AND b) contractor remains 100% compliant with cited security policy instructions and directives