HE1254-26-Q-E070- Work Ethics Courseware - Attachment 10 - Questions and Answers

Question	Answer
If the proposed curriculum includes digital learning components, is the Government expecting the offeror to provide and host the learning platform (LMS), or is the requirement limited to developing and delivering the digital course content?	The Government is not requiring vendors to provide or host a standalone LMS. The requirement is for digital curriculum and instructional resources that can integrate with DoWEA systems, including LMS and SSO platforms such as ClassLink.
If an LMS is required, does DoDEA have a preferred or existing platform that the curriculum must integrate with, or is the offeror expected to provide a complete hosted solution?	DoDEA currently utilizes Schoology and Google Classroom. Vendors proposing digital solutions shall ensure compatibility with applicable DoWEA systems and technical requirements identified in the solicitation.
Is the Government seeking an existing, ready-to-use curriculum, or does it anticipate that the selected offeror will develop or customize the curriculum to meet the specific objectives and requirements outlined in this solicitation?	The Government is seeking an established, commercially available off-the-shelf (COTS) curriculum with a proven track record of successful implementation. While minor configuration or alignment may be necessary, the Government is not seeking development of a new or custom curriculum.
Attachment 1/Schedule includes separate CLINs for “MRW Toolbox IAW PWS,” but the PWS does not define “MRW Toolbox,” identify Mike Rowe Works as a required source, or provide brand-name-or-equal salient characteristics. Is “MRW Toolbox” a mandatory Government-required item, a suggested example, a placeholder, or an error? If it is mandatory, please clarify whether the Government intends this as a brand-name-or-equal requirement and provide the required salient characteristics and any applicable justification/documentation. FAR generally requires agencies to promote full and open competition, and brand-name-or-equal descriptions should include the salient characteristics that equal products must meet.	The Government is not seeking a brand-name requirement. The reference to "MRW Toolbox" is not intended to restrict competition to a specific vendor, product, or source. Offerors may propose their own commercial solution(s), provided the proposed solution meets the requirements and objectives set forth in the solicitation. The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in the solicitation.

If “MRW Toolbox” refers to Mike Rowe Works or a Mike Rowe Works-affiliated product, please clarify whether the Government has determined that only this product can meet the requirement. If so, will the Government amend the RFQ to include the appropriate brand-name, brand-name-or-equal, or sole-source/limited-source rationale? If not, will the Government amend the pricing sheet to remove the apparent vendor-specific reference and replace it with vendor-neutral language?	Pricing Sheet Amended.
The PWS states the course is “provisionally named Work Ethics First.” Are vendors required to use the title “Work Ethics First” in their proposed course identity, or may vendors propose their own course title while aligning to the PWS objectives?	No. Vendors are not required to use the title "Work Ethics First." The title is provisional and intended solely to describe the desired curriculum objectives. Vendors may propose their own course title provided the proposed curriculum meets the requirements and objectives of the solicitation.
What evidence will the Government consider sufficient to demonstrate a “proven track record of successful implementation” with high school students: customer references, implementation counts, student completion data, credential attainment data, case studies, or other documentation?	Relevant evidence may include, but is not limited to, successful implementation in high school settings, customer references, student completion data, case studies, credential attainment data, or other documentation demonstrating successful implementation of the proposed curriculum.
The PWS requires an industry-recognized certification that carries brand weight among employers in skilled trades. Please clarify what evidence is acceptable to demonstrate “brand weight,” such as employer recognition, workforce board usage, state adoption, national credential frameworks, or skilled-trades employer references.	Relevant evidence may include, but is not limited to, employer recognition, workforce board adoption or usage, state-level adoption, alignment with national credential frameworks, skilled-trades employer endorsements, or similar documentation demonstrating recognition and value within the skilled trades community.
The PWS deliverables table lists “Work Ethics Certification” under PWS reference 2.1.2, but PWS 2.1.2 addresses skilled-trades instructional resources, while PWS 2.1.3 addresses formative quizzes, summative assessment, and the industry-recognized certificate. Please confirm the correct PWS reference for the student certification deliverable.	The certification requirement is contained within PWS 2.1.3. The Government intends to provide instructional resources, formative quizzes, a summative assessment, and an industry-recognized certification aligned with the objectives of the solicitation.

The Objective #1 AQL states that at least 75% of students must pass the summative assessment, while the PRS later states that students must also “sign the document affirming the values presented in the course.” Is the signed values document a mandatory student completion requirement, an optional artifact, or an AQL surveillance element? Please clarify how vendors should address students who need alternative formats, accommodations, or non-signature methods of demonstrating engagement with course values.	Government's SMART goal is to have at least 75% of students to pass the summative assessment. Passing grades are C, B, or A. Students with D grades are considered not mastered the course competencies/objectives fully. The instructinal materials should allow teachers to differentiate the lessons/exams.
The PWS table shows projected school/enrollment/instructor assumptions, but the solicitation pricing CLINs appear to total 39 base-year school-tier quantities and 39 base-year instructor certifications. Please confirm the correct number of schools, instructors, above-school-level staff, and virtual school participants to price for the base year and each option year.	Vendors shall price in accordance with the quantities identified in the solicitation CLIN structure. The CLIN quantities represent the Government's estimated ordering requirements for evaluation purposes.
The PWS table appears to include option-year instructor assumptions, while the solicitation lists four instructor certifications in most option years. Is option-year instructor certification CLINs intended to cover only new instructors, annual refreshers, replacement instructors, or all instructors who will use the course during each option year?	The option-year instructor certification quantities represent the Government's estimated requirements for newly assigned instructors and replacement instructors expected to teach the course during each option year.
The schedule lists MRW Toolbox quantities of four in several option years and six in the final option year. Please clarify the basis for this quantity change and whether vendors should mirror the Government-provided quantity assumptions exactly.	Vendors shall price in accordance with the quantities identified in the solicitation
The PWS notes that DoWEA estimates 10–15% of students may take the course annually and references either per-student or per-school pricing, while the RFQ schedule is structured by school-size tiers. May vendors propose an alternate commercial pricing model, such as per-student, per-seat, per-school, or enterprise pricing, provided the quote maps clearly to the RFQ CLINs?	Yes. As stated in the solicitation, vendors may submit an alternate commercial pricing structure provided the proposed pricing clearly maps to the solicitation CLIN structure and allows for evaluation of all required items.
The PWS permits either multi-regional virtual onboarding or in-person delivery as determined by the COR in consultation with the Contractor. Should vendors price only virtual delivery unless in-person delivery is ordered separately, or should vendors include potential in-person travel costs in the base pricing?	No. For evaluation and pricing purposes, vendors shall assume professional learning activities will be delivered virtually.

The solicitation asks Volume 2 to include samples of professional learning, but Volume 2 is limited to 15 pages, and the page limit includes appendices, references, exhibits, graphics, and tables. May professional learning samples be included in Volume 1 as attachments, provided Volume 2 describes and cross-references them, or must all sample content fit within the 15-page technical volume?	Professional learning samples provided for evaluation purposes may be submitted as separate attachments. The narrative discussion of those materials shall remain within the Volume 2 page limitation.
The PWS requires support acknowledgment within two hours and resolution of 90% of requests within one business day, while liaison availability is stated as 9:00 AM–3:00 PM EST and regional business hours include Europe and Pacific windows. Please clarify whether the two-hour acknowledgment standard applies 24/7/365, during U.S. business hours, or during each DoWEA region's normal business hours.	The acknowledgment and resolution requirements identified in PWS 2.3.1 apply to contractor-provided technical support for the digital resources provided under the contract. Vendors shall describe in their technical approach how they will satisfy these requirements.
The RFQ allows past performance references for the vendor's own and/or subcontractor's past performance. Please confirm whether subcontractor references may be used to establish relevance for the COTS curriculum, credentialing platform, or implementation services when the prime contractor is responsible for overall integration and performance.	Yes. As stated in the solicitation, vendors may submit references from the prime contractor and/or subcontractor(s). The Government will evaluate the relevance and quality of the submitted past performance information in accordance with the solicitation.
SAM.gov appears to list the quote submission deadline as July 8, 2026 at 12:00 PM, while SF-1449 Block 8 in the solicitation package lists the offer due date/local time as July 8, 2026 at 12:00 AM. The RFQ instructions state that submissions must be received "on or before the closing date and time as identified on the SF-1449, Block 8." Please confirm the official quote submission deadline, including the correct date, time, and time zone, and clarify whether an amendment will be issued to reconcile the discrepancy between SAM.gov and the SF-1449.	The Government acknowledges the discrepancy. The submission deadline is July 8, 2026 at 12:00 PM EST.
26QE070_ATTCH9_PPQ: Present and Past Questionnaire – Should this form be provided to a currently implementing school. Would the expectation be one reference completion?	Yes. Vendors may provide Attachment 9 to a current or former customer for completion, provided the referenced effort is recent and relevant to this requirement. The Government anticipates one completed questionnaire for each reference submitted by the vendor. Vendors shall submit three (3) references in accordance with the solicitation instructions.