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# SECTION 1: Course Requirements

## Design Scope

DAU is seeking development of a professionally branded and engaging/interactive continuous learning module that will be offered through the ATLAS Learning Management System to the acquisition workforce. The Contractor Proposal Preparation module (CLM 005) is a new courseware development effort intended for use in the program management curriculum.

All learning assets identified through program lesson review will be delivered per the schedule and no later than 30 June 2011.

### Scope

DAU subject matter experts will complete module content which will be provided as Government Furnished Information. DAU GLTC expects the development effort to follow the current module development process which will be provided as Government Furnished Information.

The final product will:

• meet SCORM 2.4 using e-learning development guide for additional requirements and DAU resources

• meet Section 508 standards as determined by the Web Accessibility Toolbar and Object Inspector testing

• comply with DAU branding requirements

• use logical navigation within the designated format

• use high level of interactivity – “Type 3”

Additional requirements for the development of CLM005 assets include:

* Addressing Change Requests (CRs) entered during DAU Quality Assurance (QA) reviews and the Beta review
* Delivery online via the ATLAS LMS

### Course Goal

The goal of the CLM005 module is to establish an understanding among the contracting community of the mutual benefits of involving contractors in the proposal development process early and often. From that understanding should come a change in behaviors and practices that will increase the buying power and efficiencies of offerors and the Government.

### Target Audience

This module is intended for Program Managers, Project Managers, IPT Leaders, Contracting Officers, Financial Managers, Engineers, Logisticians, Officers, Enlisted Members, Federal Civilians, Contractors, or anyone who wants to improve the quality of contractor proposals.

### Duration

The duration of the CLM005 online module is estimated to be approximately 2 hours but an accurate determination will be made during the Beta review.

### Infrastructure

CLM005 will conform to SCORM 2004 3rd edition. Final online course/module materials will be delivered to the Atlas Production server. Server deployed files and course/module source files will be .zip packaged and posted to BlackBoard.

### Hardware and Software Specifications

The course/module will run on the following minimum hardware and software specifications, based on DAU’s *eLearning Asset Development Guide*, Version 2.0, released 10/31/08 (posted 5 November 2008):

* Supported browser: Internet Explorer 6.0+
* Browser settings:
  + Pop-up blockers disabled
  + Cookies enabled at medium-low security level
* Java Runtime Environment 1.5.0
* Adobe/Macromedia Flash Player Version 7+
* Windows Media Player Version 7+
* Adobe Acrobat Reader Version 6+
* 400 MHz Processor
* 6 GB Hard Drive
* 64 MB RAM
* Screen Settings for Color Monitor:
  + 1024 x 768 minimum resolution
  + Font size or DPI set to normal or small
* Minimum Internet connection speed: 56 kbps

### Courseware Screen Resolution

The courseware will be designed with a screen resolution set at 1024 x 768.

# SECTION 2: Development Strategy

### Plan

The course materials furnished by the Government, in the person of the Performance Learning Director (PLD) and the Subject Matter Expert (SME) are rich in information and resources. However, these materials do not offer a clear instructional path nor the level of interaction that DAU has specified as absolute requirements. Therefore, the development strategy takes two paths: designing lessons to reflect a logical path of inquiry and incorporating practices for the learner which require application of knowledge presented.

#### Design

On 30 March 2011 a design strategy meeting was held with instructional designers, reviewers, production managers, and faculty and subject matter experts in attendance. A fruitful discussion yielded these understandings:

* The module is intended to change behaviors and practices of government contracting staff and others involved in the contract development process.
* The change in behavior is to be encouraged through enhanced understanding of what restrictions the government does and does NOT operate under in developing proposals. There are many misconceptions and flawed practices stemming from these misconceptions.
* The need for mutual (contractors and government) understanding of cost environments and real benefits of collaboration is acute.
* The change in practices and understandings will assuredly benefit both the government and the contractor, not least in cost efficiencies.

Based on these understandings, the module was in effect re-designed to a three-step instruction. First, the learner must understand the costs of doing business for the offeror and the government; particularly, the learner must understand the costs of inadequate proposal development. Second, the learner must understand the benefits to both government and contractor of changing the process. Third, the learner must understand what obstacles currently impede the contractor and the government from being more efficient and productive and what strategies can be employed to make the contractor and the government more efficient and productive.

Accordingly, the terminal learning objectives were revised, as reflected in the content outline below, and the lessons were re-arranged and re-combined so that the three steps drive the instructional flow.

#### Interaction

In earlier documentation, notably the statement of work (SOW) for this module, the government and GDIT identified characteristics of "richly interactive" features as encouraging self-directed learning, appealing to adult learners, and supportive of learning goals. Video is named as an instance of such interaction but in this recreation of the module, video will be regarded as one form of rich media that can, when properly situated within the instructional context, possibly directly focus the learner's attention to the content.

It is the intent of GDIT to manipulate the instructional materials provided by the Government (module PLD and SME) so that the learner is encouraged to engage intellectually, to apply knowledge, to rehearse the practices of the workplace (‘learn to work’). This may take the form of directed reading, or brief case study, or simply anecdotal examples drawn from the work world from which the learner is asked to deduce a practice or a precept. Interaction can also be promulgated by providing the learner a graph or table and asking him/her to deduce/identify the principle being illustrated rather than providing the information along with the graph. Interaction, in other words, can be simply removing the learner from being a passive receptacle of information.

This second prong of design and development will be evidenced first in the prototype and more fully in the programmed lessons.

# Section 3: Content Outline

In the instructional re-design of the module as drafted, consideration was given to the primary impetus of the module: to change behaviors of government staff and contractors through continual communication and involvement in the contract process. Accordingly, the four lessons were recombined so that they focus on three steps that the government could take to change behavior and practices: Understand Budget Realities, Communicate and Involve, and Remove Obstacles and Add Quality.

### Modules and Lessons Descriptions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
| Module Number and Title | Description | Current screens/lessons |
| Overview | Audience, TLOs, standard user information (settings, tools, accessibility features including keyboard shortcuts)  TLOs   1. Relate the Department of Defense (DoD) better buying power initiatives to budget realities of both DoD and industry. 2. Name techniques to be used in involving and communicating with industry in the contract development process. 3. Given the initiation of a contract process, identify actions the government can take to increase proposal quality. 4. Recognize typical obstacles generated by the government which affect proposal quality and efficiencies. | Overview |
| Understand Budget Realities | TLO: Relate the Department of Defense (DoD) better buying power initiatives to budget realities of both DoD and industry |  |
|  | Opening Scenario: news article re award to industry for Government pulling RFP  Such events are costly for contractors and costly for the government—on several levels. | Lesson Four screen 54 |
|  | Lesson One: Understanding Cost Drivers--Offeror   * Current Lesson 4 material explaining offeror costs up front. Add Learner exercise in reading and deducing from the data given in the link to IR&D and B&P Reports, emphasizing the continual increase in costs to the offeror up front. | Lesson 4 Proposal Preparation Costs text Lesson 4 DoD Contractor Bid and Proposal Costs Dollars in Millions chart |
|  | Lesson Two: Understanding Cost Drivers—Government   * Use Lesson 4 material on Protests, prefaced by current L4 text on how the fear of protest can drive costs when it is an unfounded fear * Add learner exercise to the L4 chart on protests vs contracts. Have learner deduce the low risk. | Lesson 4 Protests |
|  | Summary: Recap |  |
| Communicate + Involve = Benefit | TLO: Name techniques to be used in involving and communicating with industry in the contract development process. | Lesson Four Path to Improvement |
|  | John Krieger’s proposal development diagram |  |
|  | Stress the misguided focus on RFP and Contract phases. |  |
|  | Relate John Pritchard’s narrative about the admiral who solicited input, the decision NOT to move forward, and most importantly John’s explanation of how this decision was a Win Win for the government and the offerors. |  |
|  | What is meant by involving? | Lesson 2 Introduction, Early Industry Involvement (all) |
|  | When is optimal phase for involving? | Bid/No Bid Review Issues, Advisory multiple-step process. |
|  | What are involvement techniques? | Lesson 2 Approaches to Maximizing Industry Involvement , |
|  | Summary: Recap major lesson points |  |
| Remove Obstacles, Add Quality | TLO: Recognize typical obstacles generated by the government which affect proposal quality and efficiencies.  TLO: Given the initiation of a contract process, identify actions the government can take to increase proposal quality. |  |
|  | Lesson 4 video followed by transition text linking video message to lesson topic and objectives | Edited version of Lesson 4 Factors that can Drive Proposal Quality (highlight the use of Draft RFPs  RFP and supporting documentation, and Proposal Development Time) |
|  | The Process from the Offeror’s Point of View. Highlights of the major steps of the process flow, from the contractor’s point of view. Possibly compare John Krieger’s to this longer more complex one, to show how the simplifying the process can promulgate understanding of the process. | Lesson 4 Intro,  Lesson 3 Generic Proposal Process Flow Diagram (all, then use/ pull out relevant sections for each topic) Lesson 3 Proposal Complexities,  Lesson 4 Life Cycle of a System, Wickets and Hoops, The Gauntlet |
|  | Obstacles in Process  Name and describe obstacles/pain points | Lesson 4 RFP Issues,  Pleasures and Pains (all) |
|  | Quality Adds to the Process  Describe and **give examples** of  “Solutions” that remove the pain/obstacle and improve quality | Lesson 4 Draft Request for Proposals, Request for Proposals Issues, Draft Request for Proposals Proposal Plan of Action,  Proposal Checklist |
|  | Lesson Summary Recap of major points |  |
| Module Summary | Recap of the calls to action and revision of practices presented in the three lessons |  |
| Final Examination | Provided by PLD 30 March 2011. |  |

### Schedule

The schedule is intended at this point to provide a model for the phases of development and to guide the first four weeks of development. Adjustments will be made to reflect DAU’s requests for changes, but the end date for final delivery will remain 90 days from the start of the module development: 30 June 2011.

The schedule is attached.