EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Attachment 2 to Request for Quotes (RFQ) M67854-27-Q-0500

1.0 EVALUATION OVERVIEW

Award will be made to the responsible offeror providing the best value to the Government, price, and other factors considered. The Government may or may not award to the lowest price offeror if an award to a higher price offeror is determined to be of best value to the Government when evaluated against the Mentor Program Characteristics listed in section 2.2 below.

2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Offerors will be evaluated to determine the extent to which they meet, exceed, or approximate the Mentor Program Characteristics in 2.2 below in a manner that provides the best value to the Government. Vendors are responsible for submitting sufficient information to address all items in 2.2 below such that the Government can perform the evaluation.

2.1 PRICE

To be considered for award, quotations must clearly show the total price of the quotation, inclusive of all charges to include travel, with training performed at the specified locations. The Government will make a determination that quoted prices are fair and reasonable.

2.2 MENTOR PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

2.2a.) <u>Mentor and Mentee Matching</u>: The quoted process for collecting and analyzing application information (to include a description of the quoted application platform or equivalent secure electronic intake process), the format and methodology for a structured Matching Event, and the methodology used to assign final matches.

2.2b.) <u>Mentor Program Curriculum & Master Schedule</u>: Quoted curriculum and schedule suitable to maintain participant engagement and satisfy program objectives throughout the program's duration; including, Program Orientation, Mentor Training, Mid-Point Check-In, options for Career Development Events, and Program Completion/Celebration.

2.2c.) <u>Mentor Program Support</u>: Quoted strategy for providing proactive support for sustaining effective mentoring partnerships and the plan for distributing supplementary resources or support (e.g. templates, partnership agreements, guides, microlearning, videos, recordings, informal check-ins, etc.) to maintain engagement.

2.2d.) <u>Mentor Partnership Troubleshooting:</u> The methodology for proactively monitoring partnership wellbeing (e.g. establishing expectations, informal check-ins) and intervention process for resolving relationship challenges prior to consideration of reassignment.

2.2e.) <u>Delivery Options for Programming:</u> The options for virtual and hybrid delivery (programming delivered to in-person and virtual attendees simultaneously). The methodology for ensuring an equitable experience for in-person and virtual attendees at hybrid events.

2.2f.) <u>Key Personnel Qualifications:</u> Qualifications of key personnel (Program Coordinator and Lead Facilitators) provided in Matrix B:

- Years of Relevant Experience
- Professional Credentials
- Hybrid and Virtual Facilitation Expertise
- Prior Experience Delivering or Supporting Similar Requirements

2.2g.) <u>Program Administration:</u> Quoted management of program logistics and events, participant communication, material distribution, and information security.

2.2h.) <u>Program Add-on Options:</u> Available catalog or detailed descriptions of commercial-off-the-shelf options for supplemental stand-alone mentoring skills workshops and new supervisor mentoring options, including any associated customization fees.

2.2i.) <u>Digital Compliance:</u> The description of how any quoted platforms or digital materials comply with Section 508 digital accessibility standards. Submission of any Terms and Conditions and/or End User License Agreements, or other binding service agreements if a proprietary or third-party online platform is quoted. Vendors are not required to submit Terms and Conditions, EULAs, or binding service agreements for Zoom or Microsoft Teams.

2.3 PAST PERFORMANCE

The Government will evaluate up to three recent, relevant past performance references provided by the quoter to determine whether past performance is favorable, unfavorable or neutral. The Government may or may not contact these references. The Government may also use available Contractor Performance Assessment Rating System (CPARS) ratings or Government personnel's personal knowledge of quoters' past performance. A lack of references, CPARS ratings, or Government personnel knowledge will not be viewed as favorable or unfavorable and will result in a neutral assessment. A favorable assessment will carry more weight than a neutral assessment.