

## Attachment 1

### STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) FOR FEMA FLOOD MITIGATION ASSISTANCE (FMA) SWIFT CURRENT INITIATIVE EVALUATION ISSUED UNDER THE *DHS PA&E EVALUATION SERVICES BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT*

BPA Order 70RDAD23FC0000099 (P000006)

#### 1.0 GENERAL

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Program Analysis and Evaluation (PA&E) Division within the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) coordinates, implements, and provides oversight for the Department's centralized and decentralized evaluation functions and is responsible for building knowledge and expertise for evaluation. PA&E works closely with all Headquarters Offices and Components throughout DHS to develop and implement evaluations that address priorities set by the Secretary and Components, and to fulfill requirements outlined in the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 ('Evidence Act'), Pub. L. 115-435, and associated Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance.<sup>1</sup> PA&E sponsors and conducts social science and evaluation research to advance understanding and disseminate knowledge on topics that can be used to inform program and policy decisions and helps to ensure that evaluations are conducted with scientific integrity, by upholding the five key principles of relevance and utility, rigor, transparency, independence and objectivity, and ethics of the Department's Evaluation Policy.<sup>2</sup>

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is an appropriated and premium/fee-revenue funded Component within DHS. FEMA supports the DHS mission to strengthen the Nation's preparedness and resilience. In FY 2022, through the Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Swift Current Initiative, FEMA made \$60 million available to four states impacted by Hurricane Ida or Remnants of Hurricane Ida for individual flood mitigation projects that mitigate the risk of flooding to National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)-insured structures identified as Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) or Repetitive Loss (RL) structures or deemed Substantially Damaged. The FMA Swift Current Initiative, funded using appropriations from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and aligned with the Administration's Justice40 Initiative, aims to expedite the obligation of funding and allows increased federal cost share for NFIP-insured properties located within a census tract with a Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) score of not less than 0.5001 to improve flood mitigation efficiency ~~and, effectiveness, and equity~~. Congress and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) required that FEMA evaluate the FMA Swift Current Initiative.

This SOW identifies the Government's objectives for evaluation services for PA&E and FMA Program Office. The formative evaluation will assess whether the FMA Swift Current Initiative is acceptable for addressing individual flood mitigation projects for beneficiaries, is feasible to implement, and meets desired measures for outputs ~~and, efficiency, and equity~~ to inform efforts for scaling/expansion of the funding mechanism from time of disaster declaration to funding obligation across the four states where the FMA Swift Current Initiative is available (Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi).

<sup>1</sup> "Phase 1 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Learning Agendas, Personnel, and Planning Guidance," M-19-23 (OMB, 2019); "Phase 4 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Program Evaluation Standards and Practices," M-20-12 (OMB, 2020); "Evidence-Based Policymaking: Learning Agendas and Annual Evaluation Plans," M-21-27 (OMB, 2021)

<sup>2</sup> DHS Management Directive 069-03 Program, Policy, and Organizational Evaluations, Revision 00 (DHS, 2021)

The evaluation will also examine select short term outcomes. The primary purpose is for process improvement, program development, and updates as the program expands.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

DHS is a Cabinet-level agency with broad responsibilities to safeguard the Nation against threats both foreign and domestic, respond to national emergencies and contingencies, and preserve the Nation's prosperity and economic security. The Department's complex homeland security mission requires close coordination and collaboration across the Operational Components and Headquarters (HQ) Offices are essential to achieve the six overarching homeland security missions that make up our strategic plan.<sup>3</sup> *A robust and coordinated evaluation function is essential to the Department's capacity to build rigorous evidence for better decision making.* The Department's use of evaluation and evidence is meant to support innovation, improvement, and organizational learning, while also fulfilling accountability requirements. The intent is to integrate the use of evidence and opportunities for further learning into all activities. Where an evidence base is lacking, evidence will be developed through systematic evidence building. Where evidence exists, it will be used to encourage replication and expansion of effective solutions. DHS uses many types of evidence and understands that a culture of organizational learning and continual improvement relies on multiple sources of information, including evaluation. The Department's ability to use evidence to drive business decisions, allocate resources strategically, and deliver effective homeland security programs depends upon access to credible, relevant, and timely evidence from evaluation and related research and analysis.

The DHS Evaluation Officer in PA&E provides leadership and oversight for the Department's implementation of evaluation; coordinates and issues the Department's learning agenda and annual evaluation plans; assesses and champions efforts to improve capacity for evaluation; sponsors social science and evaluation research; and facilitates dissemination and use of evidence for decision-making. PA&E led the development of the DHS evaluation policy,<sup>4</sup> learning agenda,<sup>5</sup> annual evaluation plans,<sup>6</sup> and capacity assessment<sup>7</sup> that provide a roadmap for producing and using credible, relevant, and actionable evidence to understand and improve the Department's program and policy effectiveness, assess progress toward outcomes, and ultimately, the extent to which it is achieving its mission. PA&E leads annual processes that support DHS HQ Offices and Components in documenting progress, identifying emerging priorities, updating plans, and disseminating findings from evidence building activities identified in its learning agenda and annual evaluation plans. PA&E supports the integration of evidence from evaluation into existing DHS business process, including strategic, program, and resource planning and management.

### 1.1.1 EVIDENCE ACT AND EVALUATION

Title I of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act ("Evidence Act") of 2018, Pub. L. 115-435, and OMB implementing guidance<sup>8</sup> create a statutory framework for evaluation, including

---

<sup>3</sup> [U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2020-2024](#) (DHS, 2020)

<sup>4</sup> [DHS Management Directive 069-03 Program, Policy, and Organizational Evaluations, Revision 00](#) (DHS, 2021)

<sup>5</sup> [U.S. Department of Homeland Security FY 2022-2026 Learning Agenda](#) (DHS, 2022)

<sup>6</sup> [U.S. Department of Homeland Security FY 2022 Annual Evaluation Plan](#) (DHS, 2021); [U.S. Department of Homeland Security FY 2023 Annual Evaluation Plan](#) (DHS, 2022)

<sup>7</sup> [U.S. Department of Homeland Security FY 2021 Capacity Assessment](#) (DHS, 2022)

<sup>8</sup> ["Phase 1 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Learning Agendas, Personnel, and Planning Guidance," M-19-23](#) (OMB, 2019); ["Phase 4 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Program Evaluation Standards and Practices," M-20-12](#) (OMB, 2020); ["Evidence-Based Policymaking: Learning Agendas and Annual Evaluation Plans," M-21-27](#) (OMB, 2021)

designating and developing roles and responsibilities for the Evaluation Officer and key planning activities, including:

- The creation of learning agendas that identify and set priorities for evidence building and related planning activities, in consultation with various stakeholders;
- Developing annual evaluation plans, which will summarize the specific evaluations an agency plans to undertake to address those questions;
- Undertaking capacity assessments, which, as part of agencies' strategic plans, will help agencies to assess their ability and infrastructure to carry out evidence-building activities like foundational fact finding, performance measurement, policy analysis, and program evaluation; and
- Identifying the data needed to answer those questions.

Evaluation (also referred to as program evaluation) is an assessment using systematic data collection and analysis of one or more programs, policies, or organizations or some aspect of these intended to assess their efficiency and effectiveness.<sup>9</sup>

OMB's implementation guidance outlines expectations for the conduct of evaluation. OMB M-20-12<sup>10</sup> outlines five evaluation standards (relevance and utility, rigor, independence and objectivity, transparency, and ethics) to guide agencies' evaluation activities. These standards apply not just to Federal evaluation offices, but also have applicability to other Federal units that carry out or sponsor evaluation and to individual evaluators, including Federal evaluation staff, outside partners, and recipients of Federal awards that are performing work on behalf of the agency. All DHS evaluations and related activities and those conducting them are expected to adhere to these standards.

~~OMB M-21-27<sup>11</sup> requires that equity must also be considered as agencies build and use evidence, and should be considered throughout the lifecycle of evidence building regardless of methodological approach. Robust stakeholder engagement should be used to advance equity and meet the needs of underserved communities, and cannot be accomplished without intentional interactions with diverse stakeholders. Engaging communities in this work can both promote equity and improve the rigor, relevance, and utility of evaluation and other forms of evidence. All DHS evaluations and related activities are expected to engage diverse stakeholders and consider equity in ways that are meaningful to the program, policy, or operation being evaluated.~~

### 1.1.2 FMA Swift Current Initiative

FEMA is an appropriated and premium/fee-revenue funded Component within DHS. FEMA supports the DHS mission to strengthen the Nation's preparedness and resilience. The Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) program is an annual competitive grant program that provides funding to states, U.S. territories, federally recognized tribal governments, and local governments to reduce or eliminate the risk of repetitive flood damage to buildings and structures insured under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Current FMA policies and procedures can inhibit the equitable and timely delivery of flood mitigation assistance to these repetitively flooded properties. Today, there are 23,000 NFIP-participating communities, which accounts for around 4 million flood insurance policies. There are

<sup>9</sup> Herein, evaluation does not refer to "test and evaluation" of material solutions and IT software/systems during the acquisition life cycle. Technology impact evaluation, for example, to understand users' reactions, adoption, and uses of technology as well as effectiveness of technologies on DHS mission operations and outcomes under realistic, operational conditions may be considered evaluation herein but may constitute only a small portion of the requirement.

<sup>10</sup> "Phase 4 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Program Evaluation Standards and Practices," M-20-12 (OMB, 2020)

<sup>11</sup> "Evidence-Based Policymaking: Learning Agendas and Annual Evaluation Plans," M-21-27 (OMB, 2021)



approximately 29,000 unmitigated Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL)/Repetitive Loss (RL) properties nationwide. FEMA recognizes that an annually offered FMA grant program does not deliver mitigation funding in alignment with the recovery cycles for flooded policyholders after a disaster. Thus, FEMA launched a disaster initiative called FMA Swift Current Initiative that will distribute funding in alignment with the survivor experience that seeks to shorten the time it takes for aid to be distributed to flood survivors.

In FY 2022, through the FMA Swift Current Initiative, FEMA made \$60million available to four states impacted by Hurricane Ida or Remnants of Hurricane Ida for individual flood mitigation projects that mitigate the risk of flooding to NFIP-insured structures identified as Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL), Repetitive Loss (RL) structures, or deemed Substantially Damaged. The FMA Swift Current Initiative, funded using appropriations from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and aligned with the Administration's Justice40 Initiative, aims to expedite the obligation of funding and allows increased federal cost share for properties located within a census tract with a Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) score of not less than 0.5001, among additional federal cost share options, to improve flood mitigation efficiency (timeliness) and effectiveness, and equity. Congress and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) required that FEMA evaluate the FMA Swift Current Initiative.

The objective of the FMA Swift Current Initiative is to obligate flood mitigation dollars for SRL, RL, and Substantial Damage properties insured under the NFIP as quickly and equitably as possible following a disaster event. Reducing the average number of days between the date of a disaster declaration and obligation for individual flood mitigation projects can be more impactful to communities if funds are made available to states more quickly following a disaster event. Mitigating SRL, RL, and Substantial Damage properties in obligated subapplications (i.e., projects) enables individuals and communities to not just repair, but to build back better immediately following a disaster, which improves the flood survivor experience, encourages more mitigation, and saves resources.

Under this initiative, funds were made available to Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi for individual flood mitigation projects. Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi received major disaster declarations from Hurricane Ida or Remnants of Hurricane Ida. Of states that received major disaster declarations from this event, Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi were selected because they have the highest SRL/RL insured unmitigated properties and total claims (by count) within their respective FEMA Regions.

For FY 2022, the FMA Swift Current Initiative's notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) was posted on March 21, 2022, and the application opened April 1, 2022. The application remained open for six months and closed October 3, 2022. Funds were available through non-competitive state allocations. For FY 2022 state allocations were available for four months, and after the four-month window any remaining funds could be distributed to applicants on a competitive basis. As of June 12, 2023, FEMA obligated a total of \$40.3 million of \$60 million (25 subapplications of 43 subapplications) to Louisiana (19 subapplications), Mississippi (2 subapplications), New Jersey (1 subapplications), and Pennsylvania (3 subapplications). Also FEMA will release a FMA Swift Current NOFO in 2023. The four participating states and subrecipients of awards from the \$60 million of initial FMA Swift Current funding are considered potential study sites and populations for the purpose of this evaluation study. Additional details about the initiative are provided in the evaluability assessment (Attachment 4).

## 1.2 SCOPE

PA&E seeks Contractor(s) to enhance the Government's production and use of rigorous evidence for decision-making. The Contractor will provide PA&E and FMA Program Office with evaluation services that result in a rigorously designed and executed evaluation(s) of the FMA Swift Current Initiative. The



Contractor shall assign a team of personnel with the proper skills, expertise, and recent experiences in carrying out rigorous evaluation services and developing the deliverables based upon the level of effort and requirements of this BPA Order. The contractor shall provide all qualified labor, expertise, supervision, materials, transportation, and operations to conduct the work under this BPA Order. Services provided by the contractor shall include, but not limited to

- Develop/refine an Evaluation Plan and methodology
- Design a sampling plan and develop data collection instruments and submitting clearance packages for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval (Paperwork Reduction Act requirements).
- Conduct primary data collection
- Analyze and interpret extant and primary data
- Produce technical- and nontechnical audience-friendly reports of findings and a presentation.
- Provide stakeholder engagement and communication throughout the evaluation process, including an internal steering committee, a Technical Working Group and other key stakeholders (e.g., program community members).

The work performed under this BPA order will result in the development and broad dissemination of evaluation frameworks, plans, reports, study findings and other documents in the listed task areas. Work performed may include site visits to DHS offices or sites and interaction with different DHS audiences. The vendor will be required to prepare and deliver presentations to DHS officials on the results of its work under this BPA order as established within BPA Order level requirements.

All evaluations and evaluation activities conducted under this BPA order, regardless of method, shall adhere to OMB guidance, the DHS evaluation policy, and widely accepted scientific principles and should apply the design and methods that are most appropriate for the evaluation's questions and objectives, while balancing its goals, scale, timeline, feasibility, and available resources. Evaluation activities shall be managed by qualified evaluators with relevant education, skills, and experience for the methods undertaken. Credibility of evaluation designs and methods (i.e., evaluation plans) and of evaluation reports shall be further strengthened by peer review or consultation from unbiased experts through one technical working groups (TWGs) or approved use of equivalent external review panels or third-party consultants, in addition to the Contractor(s) internal study quality assurance procedures to monitor data collection, entry, processing, analysis, and reporting.

### 1.3 OBJECTIVE

The objective of this BPA Order is to conduct a formative evaluation to determine if the FMA Swift Current Initiative is acceptable for addressing individual flood mitigation for beneficiaries, is feasible to implement, and meets desired measures for outputs and efficiency (timeliness), and equity. The evaluation will also examine select short term outcomes. This evaluation will provide OMB, DHS, FEMA, Congress, and other stakeholder groups with evidence to determine what, if any, changes are needed to improve program design and implementation to ensure efficiency and equity of future iterations of the FMA Swift Current.

#### 1.3.1 PROGRAM EVALUATION OF SWIFT CURRENT

The Contractor shall prepare the program evaluation research design, and requisite planning documents including but not limited to: methodology, sampling, data collection, and analysis for the formative evaluation. See deliverables noted under 2.0 for the Base Period Formative Evaluation.

This evaluation will focus on FMA Swift Current. FMA Swift Current Initiative distributes funding on a rolling basis to a limited pool of subapplicants; provides federal cost share to SRL, RL, and Substantial Damage properties on a sliding scale that is commensurate with the census tract CDC SVI score,

among additional federal cost shares options; cultivates new headquarters and regional support systems; enables development and delivery of trainings, webinars, and outreach to states and communities; and expands technical assistance to potential applicants and subapplicants during project formulation. These activities are intended to reduce the average number of days between the date of a disaster declaration and obligation for individual flood mitigation projects; and, mitigating the number of SRL, RL, and Substantial Damage properties included in obligated subapplications (i.e., projects), especially in socially vulnerable communities (based on the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) and communities with high saturations of repetitively flooded NFIP properties. Additional details about the initiative are provided in the evaluability assessment (Attachment 4).

FMA will undertake a formative evaluation of the FMA Swift Current Initiative. The formative evaluation will assess whether the FMA Swift Current Initiative is acceptable for addressing individual flood mitigation for beneficiaries, is feasible to implement, and meets desired measures for outputs and efficiency (timeliness), ~~and equity~~ to inform efforts for scaling/expansion of the funding mechanism from time of disaster declaration to funding obligation across the four states where the FMA Swift Current Initiative is available (Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi). The evaluation will also examine select short term outcomes. The primary purpose is for process improvement and program development and updates as the Swift Current initiative expands.

### 1.3.2 PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The formative evaluation, conducted in the base period, addresses the following key questions:

1. **Timeliness:**

- a. After the flooding disaster, on average, how long did it take to reach various milestones (e.g., development and posting of NOFO, obligate funding)?
- b. What barriers and opportunities were encountered and remain to reduce the timeline?

2. **Delivery:**

- a. How many hours of outreach and technical assistance were delivered?
- b. And to whom?

3. **Utility:** To what extent is outreach and technical assistance associated with high quality applications that are reviewed and funded?

4. **Short-term outcomes:**

- a. Are states and communities that receive outreach or technical assistance more likely to be knowledgeable about FEMA funding, confident in their ability to submit federal grant applications?
- b. Are they more trusting in FEMA's reliability, timeliness, and fairness?

5. **Equity:**

- ~~a. Is there evidence of equity in development of funding mechanism; outreach; technical assistance; and the number of applications submitted, qualified for review, funded, and federal cost share (e.g., delivery, utility, and short-term outcome measures as a function of CDC SVI of the community)?~~
- ~~b. What opportunities remain to ensure equitable distribution of flood mitigation funds?~~

Evaluation questions may be refined and additional questions may be identified and prioritized by stakeholders during the evaluation planning, implementation, and reporting. The Government does not



expect that additional questions will add substantially to the overall evaluative effort, else they be considered as Ad hoc research and analysis.

### 1.3.3. EVALUATION TYPE AND DESIGN

The planned study is a non-experimental formative evaluation that will assess whether FMA Swift Current Initiative can be feasibly implemented as intended to reduce the average number of days between the date of a disaster declaration and obligation for individual flood mitigation projects, and the quantity and utility of the technical assistance delivered. The evaluation will also assess whether the FMA Swift Current Initiative achieves acceptable outputs and short-term outcomes, ~~including, but not limited to, equitably obligating funds to mitigate the risk of flooding to NFIP-insured structures identified as SRL, RL, or deemed Substantially Damaged within a census tract with a CDC SVI score of not less than 0.5001, were acceptable.~~

The FMA Swift Current Initiative has undertaken an evaluability assessment (Attachment 4) to aid evaluators in planning for the formative evaluation. The Contractor may use the evaluability assessment to establish a feasible technical approach but should assume that no changes recommended in the evaluability assessment will be made by the initiative prior to award of this BPA Order. In the course of conducting this evaluation, the Contractor may support the establishment of new program indicators, measures, and data that address recommendations made in the evaluability assessment.

### 1.3.4 DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHODS

The evaluation will require the information for which longitudinal data are available, including but not limited to:

- Days to obligation for Individual Flood Mitigation Projects
- Number of SRL, RL, and Substantial Damage properties included in submitted and obligated subapplications
- Number of properties (SRL, RL, and Substantial Damage) in subapplications obligated within socially vulnerable communities defined by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) score at the census tract level not less than 0.5001
- Benefit to cost ratio for subapplications obligated
- Outreach activities (touchpoints) and technical assistance to disproportionately affected communities with high saturations of SRL/RL properties, and CDC SVI scores not less than 0.5001

The evaluation will require the following information for which new data collection is necessary including but not limited to:

- Staff perspectives on fidelity to concept of operations, including deviations and root causes of deviations
- Staff perspectives on beneficiary awareness, experience, and barriers encountered during touchpoints with them
- Beneficiary awareness of and perspectives of their experience accessing and using new flood mitigation resources (outreach, technical assistance) to secure funding for/within socially vulnerable communities
- Completed flood mitigation projects

For the evaluation, primary data sources include FEMA staff from headquarters and regional offices and beneficiaries (flood survivors who applied for and received mitigation assistance). Methods of

primary data collection may include *low burden* quantitative surveys, qualitative interviews or focus groups, and, possibly, observations. PA&E and FMA Program Office expect to require a generic Information Collection Request (ICR)<sup>12</sup> to support primary data collection and intends to create one ICR for all collections. DHS deliverable schedule anticipates 6 months for PRA clearance approval. Secondary data sources include applications and subapplications from communities seeking flood mitigation assistance (including through applications submitted via FEMA's eGrants management system), National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) PIVOT system data, and CDC SVI data.

### 1.3.5 DATA ANALYSIS METHODS

Descriptive statistical analysis will be used for quantitative data. Inferential statistical analysis will be used to compare groups where relevant. Qualitative analysis, such as content analysis, cross-site analysis, and theme identification, will be used for qualitative data.

### 1.3.6 ANTICIPATED CHALLENGES

Challenges and limitations include the following:

- Evaluation capacity of Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania state staff, local community staff, and at FEMA is limited. Additional outreach and technical assistance to support their participation in the evaluation may be needed.
- FEMA is unable to share NFIP policyholder information (e.g., SRL, RL data) without the community executing an Information Sharing Access Agreement. FEMA will identify and expedite data sharing agreements to conduct the evaluation.
- Only four states in four regions were selected and each state had a different disaster declaration date, so evaluation of timeliness will need to account for this variation.

### 1.3.7 PLAN FOR USE AND DISSEMINATION

Understanding whether the FMA Swift Current Initiative is feasible to implement and achieves acceptable outputs ~~and efficiency, and equity~~ of the funding mechanism from time of disaster declaration to funding obligation across the four states where the FMA Swift Current Initiative is available (Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi) will enable FEMA to determine how to improve and expand the initiative. The evaluation will inform FMA program development and updates, process improvements, and coordination and communication with stakeholders necessary to expand the Swift Current initiative.

This priority question will engage or inform OMB, the White House Infrastructure Implementation Task Force, the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), FEMA, and DHS PA&E. The evaluation may provide useful information to states, U.S. territories, federally recognized tribal governments, local governments, and NFIP-insurance holders in participating states of Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

## 1.4 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

All solutions provided under this BPA and its awarded BPA Orders shall comply with DHS policies and procedures, public laws, Executive Orders, federal regulations, and standards in order to support timely performance of DHS and Components' governance processes, including but not limited to:

---

<sup>12</sup> If the *DHS Generic Clearance for Formative Data Collections for Evaluation, Research, and Evidence Building* is not yet approved by OMB, a full ICR using the standard process may be required.



1. 9/11 Commission Act of 2007
2. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 794d), as amended by the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-220), August 7, 1998
3. Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Modernization Act of 2010
4. Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 ("Evidence Act")
5. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
6. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended
7. The Privacy Act of 1974 as amended

#### **1.4.1 COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTS**

The following documents provide specifications, standards, or guidelines that must be complied with in order to meet the requirements of this BPA:

1. OMB Circular A-11, Part 6, Section 290: Evaluation and Evidence Building Activities
2. OMB Memorandum 19-23 (M-19-23) Phase 1 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Learning Agendas, Personnel, and Planning Guidance
3. OMB Memorandum 20-12 (M-20-12) Phase 4 Implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018: Program Evaluation Standards and Practices
4. OMB Memorandum 21-27 (M-21-27) Evidence-Based Policymaking: Learning Agendas and Annual Evaluation Plans
5. Scientific Integrity Fast-Track Action Committee and National Science and Technology Council, Protecting the Integrity of Government Science
6. 45 CFR 46: Protections of Human Subjects (Common Rule)
7. DHS Management Directive 069-03 Program, Policy, and Organizational Evaluation, Rev 01 (internal only, will be provided post-award)
8. DHS Management Instruction 069-03-001, Rev 01 Program, Policy, and Organizational Evaluation, Revision 00 (internal only, will be provided post-award)
9. DHS PAE Evaluability Assessment Resource with Equity Addendum 4-5-2021 (internal only, will be provided post-award)
- ~~10.9.~~ DHS Tool 5.8 Evaluation Plan Review (internal only, will be provided post-award)
- ~~11.10.~~ DHS Tool 9.1 Evaluation Report Review (internal only, will be provided post-award)
- ~~12.11.~~ DHS Management Directive 047-01 Privacy Policy and Compliance
- ~~13.12.~~ DHS Management Directive 026-04, Protection of Human Subjects
- ~~14.13.~~ DHS Management Instruction 026-04-001, Ensuring Human Subjects Research Compliance (internal only, will be provided post-award)
- ~~15.14.~~ OCIO Memorandum Participation in the DHS Data Inventory Program (internal only, will be provided post-award)

#### **1.4.2 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

PA&E maintains a catalog of tools and resources to support internal evaluation managers and Contractor support provided in conducting evaluation that meets federal, DHS, and professional evaluation standards and widely adopted practices of the field.

### **2.0 REQUIREMENTS/TASKS – Base Period:**

#### **2.1 TASK ONE: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND EVALUATION RESEARCH DESIGN AND PLANNING**

The Contractor shall provide foundational support for the design and planning of a wide range of social science and evaluation research studies and other analysis.

### 2.1.1 DOCUMENT (“DESK”) REVIEWS

The Contractor shall prepare or assist in the conduct of document reviews to understand the history, goals and objectives, design as planned, and current status of a program, policy, or regulation, strategy, or operation to be evaluated. The Contractor shall:

- a. Design an appropriate document review.
- b. Gather, review, and synthesize key information from relevant documents, including government and non-government sources, such as strategic plans, budget justifications, annual operation or performance plans, program management plans, notices of funding opportunities (for financial assistance programs), monitoring and evaluation plans, prior evaluation reports, and websites.
- c. Conduct the document review as planned.
- d. Prepare and submit a memorandum describing the methodology, bibliography, and summary of the findings from the document review.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.1.1	Document Review Memorandum	60 days post award	PM, COR

### 2.1.2 EVIDENCE REVIEWS

The Contractor shall prepare or assist in the conduct of evidence reviews (e.g., literature reviews, systematic reviews, or meta-analyses) to determine what existing evaluations, research, or analysis from peer-reviewed research and gray literatures have been conducted relevant to the program, policy, strategy, or topic and provide an overview of prior results. The Contractor shall:

- a. Design an appropriate evidence review.
- b. Gather existing evidence from peer-reviewed research literature, other publications and reports (gray literature), clearinghouses, repositories, and public websites, as appropriate.
- c. Conduct the evidence review as planned.
- d. In the case of a systematic evidence review or meta-analysis, follow best practices in social science, including categorizing the quality of the research and attempt to explain discrepancies in findings across research studies (systematic reviews) and using appropriate statistical techniques to synthesize and summarize results of the studies (meta-analysis).
- e. Prepare and submit a memorandum describing the methodology, bibliography, and summary of the findings from the evidence review.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
2	2.1.2	Evidence Review Memorandum	75 days post award	PM, COR

### 2.1.3 INDICATORS, MEASURES, AND DATA REVIEWS, ASSESSMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT

The Contractor shall prepare or assist in the identification, review, assessment, and development of indicators, measures, and data—from government and non-government sources—that may be used for social science and evaluation research, evaluation activities, or other analysis, including performance monitoring. The Contractor shall:

- a. Identify from government and nongovernment sources the existing indicators, measures, and data that may be used for performance measurement or evaluation, including those designed and collected for program purposes, as well as recommend other indicators, measures, or data that may be appropriate for secondary use to address a given evaluation question or criteria.



- b. Conduct data quality assessments that examine concepts including but not limited to validity, reliability, precision, integrity, and timeliness of data in relation to intended use, and any limitations of data quality that may pose risks to the credibility of its use.
- c. Prepare and submit a final memorandum, including cross-walk(s) that present existing and recommended indicators, measures, and data for each corresponding evaluation question and indicates any limitations of data quality that may pose risks to credibility of the evaluation.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
3	2.1.3	Indicator, Measures, and Data Review and Development Memorandum	90 days post award	PM, COR

#### 2.1.4 DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (STUDY PLANS)

The Contractor shall develop and deliver a publishable methodology and study plan that will guide the program evaluation. Design and methodologies (study plans) shall address formative evaluation questions as described in 1.3.2; account for purpose, scope, available resources, ~~and evaluability, and equity considerations~~; and, minimally, document the following for each study question: information needed; evaluation design and sampling; primary and/or secondary data sources, data collection methods, data analysis methods and schedule, approach to interpretation or drawing conclusions, known limitations of the described approach, a plan for data documentation, management, and security, and a schedule for the proposed activities.

The Contractor shall:

- a. Assist DHS stakeholders in refining evaluation questions.
- b. Prepare and submit an evaluation design and methodology in the form of a plan which addresses the formative evaluation questions; accounts for the purpose, scope, available resources, ~~and evaluability, and equity considerations~~; and documents the following:
  - information needed (key performance and other indicators to be measured)
  - evaluation design including sampling
  - primary and secondary data sources, data collection methods
  - data collection strategy
  - data analysis methods and tools—for both qualitative and quantitative data to be collected
  - how interpretations or conclusions will be drawn, including any stakeholder engagement for co-interpretation
  - practical issues of data collection
  - a plan for data documentation, management, and security
  - any challenges or limitations related to answering *each* evaluation question.
- c. Propose a schedule for each of the following: (1) all data to be collected; (2) the compilation, storage, analysis and presentation of data collected and (3) development of a report outline and the draft and final reports with sufficient detail to enable DHS to provide feedback and ensure that planned work aligns with stakeholder expectations and benefits from stakeholder insights.
- d. Use matching techniques and other methodological innovations to develop well-matched comparison groups and conduct randomized control trials, as appropriate to answer evaluation questions.

- e. Solicit feedback from experts and stakeholders, including DHS Evaluation Officer (DHS EO) on draft evaluation design and methodology and include that feedback in the final evaluation methodology plan.
- f. Prepare and submit to DHS a final publishable evaluation methodology plan that reflects appropriate consideration of the Department's comments on the draft plan. The final plan shall be section 508-compliant and adhere to DHS requirements provided by the PM.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
4	2.1.4	<i>Draft Evaluation Methodology – Base period only</i>	105 days post award	PM, COR, DHS Evaluation Officer (EO)
5	2.1.4	<i>Final Evaluation Methodology– Base period only</i>	10 days after receipt of COR and TWG comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

### 2.1.7 TASK ONE DELIVERABLES

The Contractor(s) shall consider items in **BOLD** as having mandatory due dates. Items in *italics* are deliverables or events that must be reviewed and/or approved by the COR prior to proceeding to next deliverable or event in this SOW.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.1.1	Document Review Memorandum	60 days post award	PM, COR
2	2.1.2	Evidence Review Memorandum	75 days post award	PM, COR
3	2.1.3	Indicator, Measures, and Data Review and Development Memorandum	90 days post award	PM, COR
4	2.1.4	<i>Draft Evaluation Methodology – Base period only</i>	105 days post award	PM, COR, DHS Evaluation Officer (EO)
5	2.1.4	<i>Final Evaluation Methodology– Base period only</i>	10 days after receipt of COR and TWG comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

## 2.2 TASK TWO: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND EVALUATION RESEARCH CONDUCT, DATA COLLECTION, AND DATA ANALYSIS

The Contractor shall provide foundational support for data collection and analysis in a wide range of social science and evaluation research studies and other analysis.

### 2.2.1 INSTRUMENT AND PROTOCOL DESIGN AND PRETESTING

The Contractor shall develop, pretest, and deliver revised data collection instruments and protocols appropriate to gather existing and new information necessary to execute the design and methodology (study plan) developed in Task 1. Data collection instruments and protocols may be required for both quantitative (e.g., survey) and qualitative (e.g., interview, focus group, observation) data collections. The Contractor shall seek appropriate approvals for human subjects research protections, privacy protections, and administrative burden, including but not limited to the Contractor's Institutional Review Board, DHS and DHS Privacy Offices, DHS Compliance Assurance Program Office (CAPO), other



offices as needed (See Section 4.15 for more details on CAPO requirements), and OMB (e.g., Fast-Track Paperwork Reduction Act Submission Short Form for pre-testing). The Contractor shall:

- a. Draft instruments, including any scripts, introductions, disclaimers, confidentiality agreements, protocols for collection and use, and Fast-Track PRA Submission Short Form (if applicable for pre-testing).
- b. Prepare packages to seek appropriate regulatory and policy approvals.
- c. Revise these materials, based on feedback from multiple offices that need to clear the OMB Package, including DHS's Regulatory Compliance Division, Office of Chief Council, and DHS Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), and other offices affected by the data collection, prior to being submitted to the OMB for approval. The Contractor shall make as many revisions as is necessary until OMB approval is obtained.
- d. Pretest surveys, if needed according to the final methodology developed in Task 1, including but not limited to usability testing, focus groups, exploratory interviews, behavior coding, cognitive interviews, respondent debriefing to ensure survey quality, in accordance with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance for designing surveys for information collections.
- e. Revise the draft instruments and protocols informed by the analysis of pretesting results.
- f. Prepare and submit to DHS a summary of pretesting results, recommended changes and rationale for each change made (or not made) indicated by pretesting results, with the revised instruments, including any scripts, introductions, disclaimers, confidentiality agreements, and protocols.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.2.1	<i>Instrument and Protocol Design and Pretesting, including IRB, DHS Privacy, DHS CAPO, and OMB approvals</i>	456 days post award	PM, COR

## 2.2.2 OMB INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUEST (ICR) PACKAGES

The Contractor shall prepare and deliver all necessary documents to facilitate the approval of the Information Collection Requests from OMB, including but not limited to the draft OMB clearance package, summaries of public comments and responses, required revisions and edits to the package, draft presentations for OMB, and draft responses to questions from OMB. This is generally required when data will be collected from more than nine non-federal, members of the public.

### 2.2.2.1 Federal Register Notices

The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS draft and final versions of the Federal Register 60 Day Notice for publication that meet all the requirements of the Office of the Federal Register Document Drafting Handbook. The 60-day notice shall not be approved until it is published in the Federal Register.
- b. Summarize all public comments received in response to the published Federal Register Notice and draft responses to each comment to be sent by DHS, as needed.

The 60-day notice shall not be approved until it is published in the Federal Register.

### 2.2.2.2 OMB Clearance Package

The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS a clearance package that provides narrative addressing each of the supporting statements (Parts A and B) with all necessary appendices.
- b. Provide all the information necessary for completing OMB Form 83-I.
- c. Revise the OMB Clearance Package as is necessary until OMB approval is obtained. Revisions shall be based on feedback from multiple offices that need to clear the OMB Package, which may include but are not limited to DHS and DHS Offices of Privacy (PVCY), DHS Chief Council, DHS Chief Information Officer (OCIO), DHS CAPO, and other offices affected by the data collection prior to being submitted to OMB for review.
- d. Update the OMB package after each set of required revisions and edits, as necessary.
- e. Participate in a conference call presentation of the study to OMB and/or draft responses to questions from OMB, as needed.

The OMB Clearance Package shall be considered final and accepted by the Government at the point of OMB approval of the clearance package. Approval for full information requests typically require 10-12 months for approval.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
2	2.2.2	OMB ICR Package	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft within 366 days post award, Final within 10 days after receipt of COR comments; may be amended as needed to address issues raised during approval process	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

### 2.2.3 DATA COLLECTION

The Contractor shall collect quantitative and qualitative data, including primary and secondary data collection, data for linking/matching to rely on existing person level data, and data to develop well-matched comparison groups and conduct randomized control trials, as appropriate to support the objectives of social science and evaluation research, evaluation activities, or other analysis. During the base period, the contractor will only conduct data collection to support the formative evaluation. The Contractor shall:

- a. Conduct data collection in accordance with any approved plans, schedules, and protocols developed in Task 1 for the formative evaluation and the Information Collection Request.
- b. Monitor and mitigate risks to validity in data collection.
- c. Conclude data collection in accordance with the schedule included in the evaluation methodology or when enough data has been collected to meet evaluation objectives.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
3	2.2.3	Data Collection completion	91 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 19 mo post award)	PM, COR

### 2.2.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The Contractor shall compile, analyze, and interpret quantitative and qualitative data using descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, linking/matching, other specialized statistical methods (e.g., modeling, bibliometric analysis, portfolio analysis, network analysis) and non-statistical methods (e.g., content

analysis, thematic framework coding) as outlined in the approved methodology developed in Task 1 for the formative evaluation. The Contractor shall document all statistical and non-statistical data analysis and interpretation processes including procedures to address missing data, outliers, and any changes to the approved plans, schedules, and protocols. The Contractor shall:

- a. Compile, analyze, and interpret quantitative and qualitative data in accordance with the schedule included in the evaluation design methodology. Co-interpretation with DHS staff and relevant stakeholders is expected. Quantitative data analysis may include descriptive and/or inferential statistics, as well as other specialized statistical methods such as modeling, bibliometric analysis, portfolio analysis, and network analysis. Qualitative data analysis may include manual or automated content analysis, thematic framework coding, narrative analysis, discourse analysis, grounded theory, case study analysis, ethnographic analysis, interpretive phenomenological analysis, journey mapping, and document cluster analysis.
- b. Document all statistical and non-statistical data analysis and interpretation processes including procedures to address missing data, outliers, and any changes to the pre-approved methodology upon receipt of the actual data to the COR for approval.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
4	2.2.4	Data Analysis completion	159 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 22 mo post award)	PM, COR

## 2.2.5 DATA FILES AND DOCUMENTATION PRODUCTS

All data gathered or generated by this contract is exclusively owned by the DHS unless otherwise noted.

The Contractor shall prepare and deliver all data files (e.g., raw data files, cleaned and weighted analysis files, and associated programming code used to generate the files, output files) retaining all Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and Confidential Business Information (CBI) in the data files unless approved by DHS in advance. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver all documentation (e.g., file structures, codebooks, cleaning procedures, annotated code files for analysis, qualitative coding procedures) that was used by the Contractor when running analysis on these data files such that DHS can fully and accurately replicate all analysis presented as well as any analyses conducted as a preliminary step but not shown.

At the time of submission of each draft of the final report, the Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS all data files.
- b. Prepare and submit to DHS all documentation.
- c. Resubmit the data files and documentation to reflect any changes to data analysis between the draft and final report.

This deliverable and the associated report may be rejected if the analyses presented cannot be replicated by DHS.

### 2.2.5.1 Quantitative data

The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS electronic quantitative data files using the secure file transfer protocol, or other method approved by DHS, as outlined in the CQP. All raw data shall be included in the data files, in addition to any weights calculated by the Contractor and a detailed



description of how the weights were produced. These files shall be provided in digital format for use with PC SAS/STATA/PowerBI/Tableau/R, or another suitable analytic software approved by DHS.

- b. Prepare and submit to DHS full documentation for these quantitative data files including, at a minimum:
  - Identity (identifier, title, description, key word, access level, date issued)
  - File structure (data set name, record format, record length, and number of records);
  - Codebook (record layout including variable names, variable format, variable labels, value labels, and missing values);
  - Formulation of any calculated variables;
  - Computer code and output files (SAS/STATA/PowerBI/Tableau/R, etc.) used to clean the data, assemble the analytic databases, and generate all tables, graphs and figures that appear in the report. Submitted computer code shall be annotated and must indicate where file paths need to be re-mapped to run properly within the DHS computing environment. To allow analysts to follow what was done and replicate it, submitted computer code shall also contain notes that specify which research question each analysis is addressing and/or which step in getting to addressing the research question the intermediary analyses addresses.

#### **2.2.5.2 Qualitative data**

The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS electronic qualitative data files using the secure file transfer protocol, or other method approved by DHS, as outlined in the CQP. All observation notes and raw interview/focus group transcripts shall be downloaded into a qualitative software package and coded using state-of-the-science qualitative data review and analysis practices. Unless otherwise agreed upon, qualitative data shall be analyzed in an DHS-approved qualitative software program.
- b. Prepare and submit to DHS full documentation for these qualitative data files including, at a minimum:
  - Identity (identifier, title, description, key word, access level, date issued)
  - Complete listing of all data sources included in the qualitative analysis and any assigned attributes;
  - Coding outline (including all relevant nodes/ quotes organized under relevant themes);
  - Method and detailed description of any content analyses or alternate DHS-approved qualitative approach (e.g., grounded theory) for analyzing and interpreting qualitative data;
  - Records of contextual notes taken at each interview or focus group; and
  - Output files able to be opened with Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe Acrobat.
- c. Retain all audio recordings of focus groups or interviews until study completion. The COR can schedule a time to listen to the audio recordings to verify the accuracy of transcripts used in the qualitative data analysis. The audio recordings and transcripts shall not be transferred to DHS.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
5	2.2.5	Data Files and Documentation	Concurrent with submission of Task 2.3.2 (draft) and Task 2.3.3 (final)	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

## 2.2.6. TASK TWO DELIVERABLES

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.2.1	<i>Instrument and Protocol Design and Pretesting, including IRB, DHS Privacy, DHS CAPO, and OMB approvals</i>	456 days post award	PM, COR
2	2.2.2	<i>OMB ICR Package</i>	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft within 366 days post award, Final within 10 days after receipt of COR comments; may be amended as needed to address issues raised during approval process	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
3	2.2.3	Data Collection completion	91 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 19 mo post award)	PM, COR
4	2.2.4	Data Analysis completion	159 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 22 mo post award)	PM, COR
5	2.2.5	Data Files and Documentation	Concurrent with submission of Task 2.3.2 (draft) and Task 2.3.3 (final)	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

## 2.3 TASK THREE: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND EVALUATION RESEARCH REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION

The Contractor shall provide foundational support for reporting and dissemination of a wide range of social science and evaluation research studies and other analysis.

All reports and dissemination products shall use clear and concise English with proper spelling, grammar, capitalization, punctuation, levels of heading, and use of acronyms to meet Government Printing Office (GPO), OMB, DHS, and DHS standards. The Contractor shall professionally design and utilize professional copy-editing, graphics, and presentations. The Contractor shall provide all results using prose and graphics that are clear for a non-technical audience. Implement the Contractor's approved Quality Control Plan (QCP) before delivery to the Contracting Officer and Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). Deliverables that have not undergone editing for clarity, format, spelling, and grammar, are missing required sections, or do not adhere to the DHS-accepted work plan may be rejected without complete review of the deliverable by DHS reviewers. Any reports or other products that will be posted to government websites shall be section 508-compliant.

### 2.3.1 REPORTS

The Contractor shall prepare, seek stakeholder feedback on, and deliver annotated report outlines describing the proposed contents of reports and on draft reports containing the compilation, analysis, and presentation of information developed and gathered during a Contractor original social science and evaluation research, evaluation activities, or other analysis or the reformatting or repackaging information in reports created by other Contractor for dissemination to a broad, non-technical audience.

The Contractor shall prepare and deliver final reports that reflect appropriate consideration of stakeholders' comments on draft reports.

Reports shall address all study questions or provide an explanation for why a study question was not addressed, and, minimally, document the following: executive summary of the major social science or evaluation research or analysis findings, introduction and background to the study; study objectives and evaluation questions; overview of study design and methods; presentation of all findings of the study using tables and figures as appropriate, and descriptive and multivariate analysis (including sensitivity testing) as appropriate; discussion of the limitations; conclusions and implications (recommendations), technical appendices necessary to fully document all analytic procedures used, including all data collection instruments, and a detailed discussion of the methodology employed, such that another researcher could replicate the methodology without further consultation with the Contractor.

#### **2.3.1.1 REPORT OUTLINE**

The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS an annotated outline describing the proposed contents of the report, including table and figure shells to serve as a roadmap for the format and flow of the draft report document.
- b. Incorporate DHS comments on the outline into the development of the draft report. DHS's acceptance of the report outline does not preclude DHS from suggesting a different organization to the report upon review of the draft report.

#### **2.3.1.2 DRAFT REPORT**

In accordance with the evaluation methodology schedule, the Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS a draft report containing the compilation, analysis, and presentation of information developed and gathered during the evaluation and report sections planned for the final report in near-final form.
- b. Ensure reports contain the following minimum information when available:
  - Executive summary of the major evaluation findings;
  - Introduction and background to the study;
  - Delineation of study objectives and evaluation questions;
  - Overview of study design and methods;
  - Presentation of all findings of the study using tables and figures as appropriate, and descriptive and multivariate analysis (including sensitivity testing) as appropriate;
  - A discussion of the study limitations;
  - Study conclusions and implications (recommendations) that consider new data in the context of previous studies on closely related topics and questions; and
  - Technical appendices necessary to fully document all analytic procedures used, including all data collection instruments, and a detailed discussion of the methodology employed, such that another researcher could replicate the methodology without further consultation with the Contractor.
- c. Write in clear and concise English with proper spelling, grammar, capitalization, punctuation, levels of heading, and use of acronyms to meet Government Printing Office (GPO), Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and DHS standards.
- d. Professionally design and utilize professional copy-editing, graphics, and presentations.
- e. Provide all results in the final report, including all drafts and revisions, using prose and graphics that are clear for a non-technical audience.



- f. Implement the Contractor's approved Quality Control Plan (QCP) before delivery to the Contracting Officer and COR. Deliverables that have not undergone editing for clarity, format, spelling, and grammar, are missing required sections, or do not adhere to the DHS-accepted work plan may be rejected without complete review of the deliverable by DHS reviewers.
- g. Submit reports to DHS in two forms: Microsoft Word and a PDF file.
- h. Solicit feedback from experts and stakeholders, including DHS Evaluation Officer and grantee program staff, on findings and reports and include that feedback in the final report. The contractor should prepare for a minimum of four (4) rounds of progressive review from various stakeholders.

### 2.3.1.3 FINAL REPORT

The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and submit to DHS a final publishable report that reflects appropriate consideration of the comments on the draft report. The final report shall be section 508-compliant and adhere to DHS guidance provided by the PM.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.3.1.1	<i>Evaluation Report Outline</i>	146 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 21 mo post award)	PM, COR
2	2.3.1.2	<i>Draft Report</i>	202 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR, DHS EO
3	2.3.1.3	<i>Final Report</i>	15 days after receipt of COR and TWG comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

### 2.3.2 FACTSHEETS

The Contractor shall prepare, seek stakeholder feedback on, and deliver fact sheets summarizing social science and evaluation research, evaluation activities, or other analysis.

- a. Develop a publishable factsheet summarizing the evaluation purpose, questions, methodology, results and recommendations. The factsheet shall be written for dissemination to a broad, non-technical audience and should not exceed 3 pages. The factsheet shall be section 508-compliant.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
4	2.3.2	<i>Factsheet</i>	Concurrent with Final Report	PM, COR

### 2.3.3 ORAL PRESENTATIONS AND BRIEFINGS

The Contractor shall prepare and make oral presentations and briefings of the work completed. The Contractor shall

- a. Prepare and make no fewer than two (2) oral presentations and management briefings of the work completed for the contract at dates, times, and locations to be specified by the COR via technical direction. The presentation may be delivered in Washington, D.C. or virtually
- b. Prepare and submit to DHS appropriate briefing materials, specifically, a briefing memorandum and Power Point slides for the oral presentation.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
5	2.3.3	Oral Presentations/ Management Briefings	218 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR

#### 2.3.4 RECOMMENDATION ACTION PLANS

The Contractor shall prepare, seek stakeholder feedback on, and deliver written actions plan that suggests how to implement the recommendations documented in the final reports. The Contractor shall

- Prepare and submit to DHS a written action plan that suggests how to implement the recommendations documented in the final report prepared, with sufficient detail to enable DHS to provide feedback and ensure that plan benefits from stakeholder insights. DHS will use this memorandum to consider specific actions for performance improvement.
- Identify each recommendation the Contactor develops for the final report.
- Engage DHS stakeholders appropriately to consider the contextual factors that will affect the successful implementation of these recommendations in performance management decisions.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
6	2.3.4	Recommendation Action Plan	218 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR

#### 2.3.5 COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION PRODUCTS

The Contractor shall prepare, deliver, and seek stakeholder feedback on two additional high-quality, audience-appropriate products to communicate and disseminate findings of social science and evaluation research, evaluation activities to non-technical audiences (e.g., Congress, OMB, DHS Senior Leadership, National Board, program community members). May include but is not limited to visual reports, infographics, memos, briefs, slick-sheets, flyers, and multimedia presentations. Solicit feedback from experts and stakeholders on these deliverables and include that feedback in the deliverables.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
7	2.3.5	Dissemination Products	218 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR

#### 2.3.6 TASK THREE DELIVERABLES

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.3.1.1	<i>Evaluation Report Outline</i>	146 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 21 mo post award)	PM, COR
2	2.3.1.2	<i>Draft Report</i>	202 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR, DHS EO
3	2.3.1.3	<i>Final Report</i>	15 days after receipt of COR and TWG comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
4	2.3.2	<i>Factsheet</i>	Concurrent with Final Report	PM, COR

5	2.3.3	Oral Presentations/ Management Briefings	218 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR
6	2.3.4	Recommendation Action Plan	218 days post OMB ICR approval (est. 23 mo post award)	PM, COR

## 2.4 TASK FOUR: EVALUATION STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING

### 2.4.1 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Contractor shall engage and communicate with key stakeholders across project life cycles. Key stakeholders include but are not limited to a project steering committee (PSM) and other DHS partners, decisionmakers, implementers, and participants.

The Contractor shall

- Establish a stakeholder engagement and communication plan that specifies when, how, and for what purpose the Contractor will engage and communicate with key stakeholders across the evaluation or project life cycle.
- Facilitate and document stakeholder in-person and technology-mediated discussions, meetings, participatory work sessions, and crowdsourcing activities to obtain input, feedback, or build consensus on a variety of topics across the project life cycle.

Facilitate and document project after-action reviews, mid-course stocktaking, and pause-and-reflect sessions.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.4.1	<b><i>Stakeholder engagement and communication plan</i></b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft within 30 days post award, Final within 5 days after receipt of COR comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
2	2.4.1	Community engagement and Memoranda/meeting minutes	Quarterly; Memoranda/meeting minutes within 5 days after meeting or call	PM, COR

### 2.4.2 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS

The Contractor shall establish an external technical working group (TWG) to engage as an external expert panel or consultants with appropriate subject matter, methodological, technical, and program community member expertise to provide independent, external reviews of rigor, objectivity, transparency, relevance and utility of evaluation research during planning, implementation, and reporting stages. For select evaluation studies, the Contractor shall

- Establish a technical working group (TWG) plan, describing how the Contractor will engage an external expert panel or some equivalent to conduct independent, external review of rigor, objectivity, transparency, relevance and utility of the evaluation; assist the Contractor mitigate perceived bias; and assure the quality and integrity of the findings.
- Work with DHS to identify and select members to avoid or appropriately address conflicts of interest.
- Design agendas and facilitate TWG meetings and materials to gather obtain input, feedback, or build consensus on the evaluation (e.g., design and plan, implementation, and draft evaluation report)
- Record meeting minutes that capture feedback and decisions.



- e. Provide DHS will summary memoranda of TWG feedback and decisions and how the Contractor intends to respond in its evaluation planning, implementation, and/or reporting.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
3	2.4.2	<b><i>Technical Working Group plan</i></b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft within 30 days post award, Final within 5 days post COR comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
4	2.4.2	TWG feedback and decisions and Contractor response memorandum	5 days after receipt of comments	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

## 2.5 TASK FIVE: AD HOC RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

The Contractor shall be responsive to such requests, including but not limited to requests for ad hoc analyses, briefs, and presentations that may arise to meet the needs of important stakeholders such as DHS leadership, OMB, Congress, or the Government Accountability Office as they relate to the program evaluation conducted in this Order. This task shall not exceed 10% of the total effort required to complete this Order. These ad hoc tasks may include:

- Stakeholder identification and analysis
- ~~Equity analysis~~
- Grant portfolio analysis
- Context mapping or SWOT analysis
- Policy and regulatory analysis (e.g., benefit-cost analysis, break even analysis)
- Economic impact analysis
- Survey research data collection and analysis
- Survey and non-survey-based network analysis
- Text and data mining, analysis, and modeling
- Bibliometric analysis
- Agent-based and dynamic systems modeling and simulation
- Data linking/matching and analysis (e.g., typically with two or more administrative data sets or administrative data with statistical survey data)

The Contractor shall:

- a. Coordinate, facilitate, and report the results of focus groups or other equivalent human centered design activities to establish DHS requirements.
- b. Develop a plan for the Ad hoc analysis which identifies audience, strategy, content, delivery mechanism, schedule and metrics based on focus groups or human centered design activities.
- c. Iteratively develop, pilot, and refine the Ad hoc analysis, seeking and incorporating feedback from stakeholders at critical design/development milestones gathered through focus groups, human centered design activities, or pilots to inform revision.
- d. Facilitate or co-facilitate delivery of Ad hoc analysis.
- e. Conduct pre- and post-session assessments, to determine participant needs, reactions, and outcomes.

### 2.5.1 TASK FIVE DELIVERABLES

Examples of BPA Order level deliverables associated with Task 5 include but are not limited to the following:

- Draft and final memorandum, containing an overview of questions or objective, data collection and analysis approach, and findings with tables/figures

- Interactive models and simulations

Deliverables will be specified during the course of the BPA Order.

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	2.5.1	<b><i>Ad hoc analysis plan</i></b>	TBD	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
2	2.5.1	Ad hoc analysis deliverables (TBD)	TBD	PM, COR, Contracting Officer

### 3.0 CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL

The Contractor shall provide qualified personnel to perform all requirements specified in this SOW and as delineated within BPA Order level requirements. As such, the Contractor is encouraged to:

- Provide an experienced team that can fulfill the range of activities included here, including methodological, technical, subject matter, communication and facilitation expertise.
- Assign appropriate and flexible staffing plans that are tailored or adapted to needs and maintain continuity through a mix of experienced senior-, mid-, and junior-level staff.
- Establish continuous support and develop contingency plans to avoid work disruptions, delays, or threats to quality due to staff changes. This includes being proactive in establishing and maintaining operational guides that document DHS organization, responsibilities, and processes that can be used to train, transfer knowledge, and create the basis for Contractor knowledge management.

### 3.1 QUALIFIED PERSONNEL

The Contractor shall provide qualified personnel to perform all requirements specified in this SOW and as delineated within BPA Order level requirements.

Professional services and expertise are sought in the following areas:

**Social Science and Evaluation Research** – Demonstrated mastery of using scientific inquiry and program evaluation methods to improve social policy and programs.

- Experience-based familiarity with complex research and evaluation studies and designs, including multi-site, randomized controlled trials, and quasi experimental studies
- Strong quantitative analytical skills including expertise in inferential statistics, multivariate statistics, and multilevel statistical modeling
- Experience in sampling methods including statistical matching procedures
- Experience in survey research including achieving high response rates of treatment and comparison groups for diverse populations
- Experience with qualitative methods including traditional methods like focus groups, interviews, and site visits as well as non-traditional methods like photovoice, ripple effect mapping, experience journey maps, social network analyses and process tracing

- Experience in qualitative data analysis, including document review, thematic and other forms of manual coding, inductive and deductive data analysis, and developing processes for inter-rater reliability
- Experience using both quantitative and qualitative data to conduct mixed-method data analysis
- Professional program evaluation experience including familiarity with established evaluation philosophies and approaches
- Experience conducting systematic reviews and synthesis of the quality and design of research and evaluation plans and reports including both single studies or evaluation reports or multiple studies and bodies of research (e.g. meta-synthesis, meta-analysis, or comparative studies)
- Experience in implementation science and its practice applications (e.g., in replicating evidence-based interventions)
- Experience conducting economic analysis (ex ante) and evaluation (ex post), including cost, benefit-cost analysis, cost-effectiveness analyses, return on investment, and value for money analyses.
- Experience with scaling program models (e.g., expansion, replication, adaptation)
- Experience preparing OMB Paperwork Reduction Act packages.

**Stakeholder Engagement and Evaluation Capacity Building** – Experience providing non-evaluators with effective communication, training, and technical assistance in the area of program evaluation.

- Experience designing and implementing effective strategic evaluation communication to a range of audiences, with audience appropriate messages, formats, and channels to advance their awareness of, participation in, and use of evaluation to support decision-making.
- Experience with inclusive research and evaluation philosophies and approaches such as community-based participatory research and utilization focused evaluation
- Experience facilitating stakeholder discussions to obtain input, feedback, or build consensus on a variety of topics across the evaluation or evidence building life cycle

**Data Science** – Experience in data generation, standardization, management, governance, collection, analysis, reporting, protection, visualization, use, and dissemination, including with respect to any statistical and related techniques to protect and de-identify confidential data. These experiences would be in support of evidence-based decision making across different types of relevant entities (e.g. nonprofit organizations/grantees, public and private sector agencies and organization).

- Knowledge of data analytics and technology platforms and softwares for development, storage, use and dissemination of data, data bases, and data assets, in support of operations, program practice, policy, and organizational learning culture.
- Knowledge of architectural methodologies used in the design and development of information systems, including the physical structure of a system's internal operations and interactions with other systems.
- Experience producing complex financial reports using SQL or SQLPlus.
- Expert in understanding the relational database tables in Production.



- Experience managing data life-cycle through the following processes: Verify integrity of data; evaluate data using Oracle and Salesforce or equivalent systems; ingest relevant public and agency data from various formats into Oracle and other databases; perform data wrangling and feature generation on data, including null replacement, outlier detection, and other exploratory data analytics.
- Experience creating program deliverables and reports through data visualizations for both technical and non-technical audiences, including graphs, charts maps, and interactive dashboards.

~~Equity and Inclusion—The Contractor may be required to provide experts in cultural responsiveness/competence/humility and participatory approaches to build evidence with populations who have no experience with evaluation and/or for whom traditional approaches may be inappropriate. The agency seeks Contractor who can demonstrate experience with using inclusive approaches to evidence building as well as knowledge of equitable data and analysis issues.~~

## 3.2 CONTINUITY OF SUPPORT

The Contractor shall ensure that the level of support required at the BPA Order level is maintained at all times. The Contractor shall ensure that all support personnel are present for all hours of the workday. If for any reason the Contractor staffing levels are not maintained due to vacation, leave, appointments, etc., and replacement personnel will not be provided, the Contractor shall provide e-mail notification to the BPA Order level COR prior to employee absence. Otherwise, the Contractor shall provide a fully qualified replacement.

## 3.3 KEY PERSONNEL

Before replacing any individual designated as "Key" by the Government, the Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer no less than 15 business days in advance, submit written justification for replacement, and provide the name and qualifications of any proposed substitute(s). All proposed substitutes shall possess qualifications equal to or superior to those of the "Key" person being replaced, unless otherwise approved by the Contracting Officer. The Contractor shall not replace "Key" Contractor personnel without providing notification and receiving approval from the Contracting Officer and COR. The following Contractor personnel are designated as "Key" for this requirement.

Contractor Key personnel shall not be assigned by the Contractor to more than one key position for this BPA requirement.

## 3.4 KEY PERSONNEL FOR THIS BPA ORDER

Under the BPA, the Contractor is required to provide a BPA Project Manager who shall be responsible for all services performed under this BPA and shall be the single point of contact for the Contracting Officer and the COR. Under the BPA, the Contractor is also required to provide a Principal Director who will be responsible for the overall management of BPA Order level evaluations, their quality, the evaluation teams, any troubleshooting or adjustments, and communications between the evaluation teams, the BPA Project Manager, and the Government.

The following are Key personnel and highly preferred qualifications for this BPA Order:

### 3.4.1 SENIOR RESEARCHER

Oversees the planning, design, and execution of technical work on evaluation projects of all types. Provides broad methodological expertise in social science, evaluation, performance measurement, and

related subjects. Prepares and revises project deliverables prepared by other staff for technical quality and communication effectiveness. Manages projects to meet quality standards, deliverable schedules, and budgets. Highly preferred qualifications include:

- Currently holds, or is able to obtain and maintain, DHS fitness determination.
- Ph.D. with 5 years of work experience, or Master's with 8 years of experience in social science research, program evaluation, statistics, economics, public policy, or other related field.
- Demonstrated experience designing and implementing program evaluation studies of different types and using a range of qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods.
- Demonstrated ability to lead a multi-disciplinary evaluation team.
- Demonstrated ability to work effectively with project stakeholders.
- Strong evaluation management skills.
- Strong oral and written communication skills.

### **3.4.2 SENIOR SURVEY RESEARCHER**

Oversees the planning, design, and execution of technical work on survey research tasks, which may be part of larger evaluation projects or standalone projects. Provides methodological and other expertise in measurement, instrument design including for multi-modal surveys, respondent populations, sampling algorithms, strata, multi-stage data collection, data file construction, and data preparation. Supervises others and provides quality control for survey products, data collection, and processing. Highly preferred qualifications include:

- Currently holds, or is able to obtain and maintain, DHS fitness determination.
- Ph.D. in social science or related field with 5 years of work experience, or Master's in social science or related field with 8 years of work experience in survey research.
- Demonstrated experience including all phases of survey management and methodological research, interview development, and, in consultation with statisticians, design and management of sampling procedures.
- Experience with multiple modes of data collection, including computer assisted telephone and personal interviewing (CATI/CAPI), web, and use of innovative technologies for data collection.
- Strong oral and written communication skills.

### **3.4.3 SENIOR STATISTICIAN**

Oversees the planning, design, and execution for sampling for quantitative research and evaluation, including sampling frames, constructing probability samples, estimation systems, survey weights, imputation for nonresponse. Consults on statistical and quality issues with survey activities and may design and implement innovative methodological studies. Supervises others and provides quality control for statistical data analysis, preparation of tables and analytic reporting. Highly preferred qualifications include:

- Currently holds, or is able to obtain and maintain, DHS fitness determination.
- Ph.D. with 5 years of work experience, or Master's with 8 years of work experience in statistics
- Demonstrated experience in sample design and survey methodology or biostatistics.
- Demonstrated experience in inferential statistics, multivariate statistics, and multilevel statistical modeling, including experience linking/matching person level data and using matching techniques to develop well-matched comparison groups.
- Experience communicating statistical concepts to non-statisticians and/or communicating scientific ideas to non-scientists.
- Experience articulating research and analysis questions and using quantitative techniques to arrive at a solution using available data.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills.

### **3.4.4 SENIOR PROGRAMMER/DATA SCIENTIST**

Oversees the planning, design, and execution of technical work on programming and data science tasks, which may be part of larger evaluation projects or standalone projects. Identifies opportunities for leveraging agency, federal, and non-federal data to drive business solutions. Mines and analyzes databases, and develops processes and tools to model, analyze, visualize and monitor data and verify quality of data, models, analyses, and results. Provides expertise in data design, database architecture, metadata, and repository creation. Supervises others and provides quality control for data and analytic products. Highly preferred qualifications include:

- Currently holds, or is able to obtain and maintain, DHS fitness determination.
- Master's with 7 years of work experience in Computer Science, Information Systems, Statistics, or related field.
- Strong programming, graphical, and modeling skills in R and Python.
- Demonstrated experience in data analysis, explanatory and predictive modeling, data manipulation, analytical applications, big data engineering, algorithms, statistics, machine learning, natural language processing, and data visualization.
- Experience with application or system design and development, mobile development, relational databases, or related technologies.
- Experience communicating technical concepts to a non-technical audience.
- Experience articulating research and analysis questions and using quantitative techniques to arrive at a solution using available data.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills.

### **3.5 OTHER KEY AND NON-KEY PERSONNEL FOR THIS BPA ORDER**

The Contractor shall identify other key and non-key personnel to perform all requirements specified in this SOW, using BPA Labor Categories deemed by the Contractor as necessary. Relevant other key and non-key Labor Categories may include, but are not limited to:

- Subject Matter Expert
- Mid- and/or low-level Researcher
- Statistician
- Mid- and/or low-level Programmer
- Mid- and/or low- Survey Researcher
- Editor/Technical Writer/Communications Specialist
- Graphics/Data Visualization Specialist
- Clerical

Due to the provision of government furnished resources for this BPA Order, the Contractor shall provide the minimum staff needed to meet the Government's requirements.

### **3.6 EMPLOYEE IDENTIFICATION**

**3.6.1** Contractor employees visiting Government facilities shall wear an identification badge that, at a minimum, displays the Contractor name, the employee's photo, name, clearance-level and badge expiration date. Visiting Contractor employees shall comply with all Government escort rules and requirements. All Contractor employees shall identify themselves as Contractors when their status is not readily apparent and display all identification and visitor badges in plain view above the waist at all times.

**3.6.2** Contractor employees working on-site at Government facilities shall wear a Government issued identification badge. All Contractor employees shall identify themselves as Contractors when their



status is not readily apparent (in meetings, when answering Government telephones, in e-mail messages, etc.) and display the Government issued badge in plain view above the waist at all times.

### **3.7 EMPLOYEE CONDUCT**

Contractor's employees shall comply with all applicable Government regulations, policies and procedures (e.g., fire, safety, sanitation, environmental protection, security, "off limits" areas, wearing of parts of DHS uniforms, and possession of weapons) when visiting or working at Government facilities. The Contractor shall ensure Contractor employees present a professional appearance at all times and that their conduct shall not reflect discredit on the United States or DHS. The Project Manager shall ensure Contractor employees understand and abide by DHS established rules, regulations and policies concerning safety and security.

### **3.8 REMOVING EMPLOYEES FOR MISCONDUCT OR SECURITY REASONS**

The Government may, at its sole discretion (via the Contracting Officer or COR), direct the Contractor to remove any Contractor employee from DHS facilities for misconduct or security reasons. Removal does not relieve the Contractor of the responsibility to continue providing the services required under the contract. The Contracting Officer will provide the Contractor with a written explanation to support any request to remove an employee.

### **4.0 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE**

The period of performance for this BPA Order includes a two-year base period as represented immediately below.

Base Period	September 2023 – September 2025 <sup>13</sup>
-------------	---

### **4.1 PLACE OF PERFORMANCE**

BPA Order requirements may be performed at the awarded Contractor Facility with occasional and infrequent visits to the TSA Headquarters (current location of PA&E) in Springfield, VA or FEMA Headquarters in Washington, D.C.

### **4.2 HOURS OF OPERATION**

Contractor employees shall generally perform all work between the hours of 8AM and 5PM EST, Monday through Friday (except Federal holidays). In person requirements (such as oral briefings) will be conducted during these time periods.

### **4.3 TRAVEL**

Contractor travel is not anticipated to support this requirement. However, should travel become required, all travel required by the Government outside the local commuting area(s) will be reimbursed to the Contractor in accordance with the Federal Travel Regulations. The Contractor shall be responsible for obtaining COR approval (electronic mail is acceptable) for all reimbursable travel in advance of each travel event.

---

<sup>13</sup> Base Period accounts for the possibility of a PRA full ICR or "standard" process.

#### **4.4 POST AWARD CONFERENCE – BPA ORDER KICKOFF MEETING**

The Contractor shall attend a Post Award Conference, or BPA Order Kickoff Meeting, with the Contracting Officer, BPA Order COR, and PM no later than 5 business days after the establishment of the BPA Order. The Post Award Conference may be held at the Government's facility, located at TSA Headquarters (current location of PA&E) in Springfield, VA, via Microsoft Teams, or via teleconference.

The Post Award Conference will require the Contractor to submit a *Meeting Summary Memorandum* to include but not be limited to names of meeting participants, detailed notes of discussion, action items, and next steps within 3 business days of the scheduled BPA Order level Post Award Conference to the BPA Order COR.

#### **4.5 BPA ORDER PROJECT PLAN**

The Contractor shall provide a Project Plan (PP) that addresses the work to be performed to accomplish BPA Order level requirements. PP delivery includes first draft of the PP with the BPA Order level quotation, second draft within 15 business days post award, and final within 5 business days post-COR comments.

The contents of draft and final PPs should include the following:

- First draft of PP shall outline, describe, and include the purpose and scope, technical approach, resources, timeline and due dates for deliverables, a detailed cost estimate by task, and a staffing plan that shows the assigned staff has the skills and experience to complete the assigned work. The first draft of the Project Plan shall accompany a cross-walk that presents proposed data collection and analysis approaches for each corresponding study/analysis question. This shall include information on type of participants or other data sources, design and method(s) of data collection, data analysis method(s) for all study variables, and rationale for their selection.
- Second draft of PP shall incorporate information from the Post Award Conference(s) and written feedback from the COR, and add the following: customer and stakeholder management, project roadmap (work breakdown) and schedule management, resource management, and project management.
- Final PP shall incorporate COR comments. The PP shall later be appended with the final design and methodology (study plan) when approved by the COR.

The Government's BPA Order COR, Contracting Officer, and PM will review the PP. The PP will be adjusted as needed in consultation with the COR.

#### **4.6 BPA ORDER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN**

The Contractor shall provide a BPA Order level Quality Control Plan (QCP) that addresses how the Contractor will ensure high quality execution of the awarded BPA Order. The first draft of the QCP with the BPA Order level quotation, second draft within 15 business days post award, and final within 5 business days post- COR comments.

The contents of draft and final QCP should include the following:

- First draft of QCP shall document the plan or protocols for the contractor's internal deliverable review process, information management and security protocols, and risk identification and mitigation plans.
- Second draft of QCP shall incorporate information from the Post Award Conference.
- Final QCP shall incorporate COR comments.

The Government's COR, Contracting Officer, and PM will review the QCP. The QCP will be adjusted as needed in consultation with the COR.

#### 4.7 BPA ORDER PROGRESS REPORTS

By the 15<sup>th</sup> of every month, the Contractor's BPA Project Manager shall provide a *monthly* progress report (MPR) to the Contracting Officer, COR, and PM via electronic mail. The MPR shall summarize all Contractor work performed for the BPA Order, including a breakdown of labor hours by labor category, all direct costs by line item and any travel conducted, an assessment of technical progress, schedule status, and any Contractor concerns or recommendations for the reporting period for each BPA Order.

The progress reports shall be brief and factual and shall be prepared in accordance with the following format:

1. Section I: An introduction covering the purpose and scope of the awarded BPA Order level effort(s). This shall be limited to one paragraph.
2. Section II: A description of overall progress plus a separate description of each task or other logical segment of work on which effort was expended during the reporting period. The description shall include pertinent data and/or graphs in sufficient detail to explain any significant results achieved.
3. Section III: The current schedule with explanations and corrective actions to be taken for any difference between planned and actual progress.
4. Section IV: A description of current technical or substantive performance, and any problems which may impede performance along with proposed corrective action.

#### 4.8 BPA ORDER PROGRESS MEETINGS

The Contractor's BPA Project Manager shall be available to meet with the COR and PM upon request to present deliverables, discuss progress, exchange information, and resolve emergent technical problems and issues. These meetings shall take place weekly or biweekly at the discretion of the PM, via teleconference, in addition to other formal communications (e.g., monthly progress reports). In addition, ad-hoc open discussions with the COR and PM may take place for all major project decisions.

The Contractor shall submit a *Meeting Summary Memorandum* to include but not be limited to names of meeting participants, detailed notes of discussion, action items, and next steps within 3 business days of these meetings to the COR.

#### 4.9 BPA ORDER PROJECT MANAGEMENT DELIVERABLES

ITEM	SOW	DELIVERABLE / EVENT	DUE BY	DISTRIBUTION
1	4.4	<b><i>Post Award Conferences</i></b>	Within 5 days post award	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
2	4.5	<b><i>Project Management Plan</i></b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft with each Task Order proposal, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft within 30 days post award, Final within 5 days post COR comments; may be amended when study plan is fully approved (e.g., after all regulatory clearances).	PM, COR, Contracting Officer



3	4.6	<b>Quality Control Plan, including System Security Plan</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft with each Task Order proposal, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft within 30 days post award, Final within 5 business days post COR comments; may be amended when study plan is fully approved (e.g., after all regulatory clearances).	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
4	4.7	Progress Reports	Monthly by the 15 <sup>th</sup>	PM, COR, Contracting Officer
5	4.8	Progress Meetings	Weekly or Biweekly	PM, COR
6	4.8	Memorandum of understanding/meeting minutes	Within 3 days after meeting or call	PM, COR

#### **4.10 GENERAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS**

The Contractor shall provide all written reports in electronic format with read/write capability using applications that are compatible with DHS workstations (Windows XP and Microsoft Office Applications).

#### **4.11 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

The Government notes that FAR 52.227-16, Additional Data Requirements and FAR 52.227-17, Rights in Data - Special Works, shall govern the allocation of intellectual property rights for this Order.

#### **4.12 PROTECTION OF INFORMATION**

The Government will provide all necessary information, data and documents to the Contractor that are applicable for work as delineated within these Order requirements. The Contractor shall use Government furnished information, data and documents only for the performance of work as delineated within these BPA Order level requirements, and shall be responsible for returning all Government furnished information, data and documents to the Government at the end of the awarded BPA Order performance period. The Contractor shall not release Government furnished information, data and documents to outside parties without the prior and explicit consent of the Contracting Officer. Contractor access to information protected under the Privacy Act may be required under these BPA Order level requirements. Contractor employees shall safeguard this information against unauthorized disclosure or dissemination in accordance with the law and Government policy and regulation. The Contractor shall ensure that all Contractor personnel having access to business or procurement sensitive information sign a non-disclosure agreement (DHS Form 11000-6).

In the case of any new data collected or generated as a result of work delineated within these Order requirements, the Contractor shall be responsible for safeguarding this information against unauthorized disclosure or dissemination in accordance with the law and Government policy and regulation, and for providing all applicable information, data, and documents to the Government at the end of the awarded BPA Order performance period.

#### **4.13 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS**

The Contractor shall conduct all Research Involving Human Subjects in compliance with the requirements set forth in 6 C.F.R. 46 and 45 C.F.R. 46, Subparts B-E, DHS Directive 026-04,

*Protection of Human Subjects*, and DHS Instruction 026-04-001, *Ensuring Human Subjects Research Compliance*, prior to initiating any work with human subjects under this Award. Each Recipient and any Recipient institutions planning to perform research involving human subjects under this BPA Order must submit, through the DHS Program Manager, the documentation outlined in this section for Compliance Assurance Program Office (CAPO) review.

Requirements for Research Involving Human Subjects. Each facility conducting research involving human subjects under this Order is required to have a project-specific Certification Letter, a determination memo, or a memo of concurrence with an IRB's research or exemption determination issued by the CAPO. Each Recipient must submit the following documentation to the CAPO for compliance review and clearance prior to initiating research involving human subjects under this BPA and its awarded BPA Orders:

1. Research protocol, as approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB), for any human subjects research work to be conducted;
2. IRB approval letter or notification of exemption (see additional information below on exemption determinations), for any human subjects research work to be conducted. Ensure that the level of risk, review type, and if applicable, the review category is included in the IRB approval memo;
3. IRB-approved informed consent document(s) or IRB acknowledgement of a waiver or alteration of informed consent for projects involving human subjects research;
4. Any applicable IRB-approved surveys/questionnaires and recruitment materials;
5. Federal-wide Assurance (FWA) number from the Dept of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) for all Recipient institutions (including Sub-recipients) engaged in human subjects research;
6. IRB registry number for the IRB of Record (IRB0000XXXX) and the IRB Panel Number (if reviewed by the full board);
7. The DHS-approved Statement of Work (SOW) or Workplan; and
8. DHS CAPO's Cover Sheet and Document Checklist.

Exemptions for Research Involving Human Subjects. Exemption determinations for human subject research to be conducted under this BPA Order should only be made by authorized representatives of (1) an OHRP-registered IRB, or equivalent, or (2) DHS CAPO. Exemption determinations made by an OHRP-registered IRB, or equivalent, should be submitted to the CAPO for review and concurrence. Program managers, principal investigators, research staff, and other DHS or institutional personnel should not independently make exemption determinations in the absence of an IRB or CAPO review. DHS program managers (or institutions that do not have their own IRB conducting human subjects' research) seeking an exemption determination from the CAPO should submit a request to [REDACTED] that includes the following:

1. Research protocol or detailed description of planned activities to be conducted;
2. A complete CAPO Human Subjects Research Determination Request Form (HDRF);
3. The DHS-approved Statement of Work (SOW) or Workplan;
4. Any applicable informed consent document(s);
5. Any applicable surveys/questionnaires and recruitment materials; and
6. Identification of the exemption category that applies to the project(s) to be conducted and explanation of why the proposed research meets the requirements for that category of exemption

All documentation, as well as any questions or concerns regarding the requirements referenced above, should be submitted to the CAPO at [REDACTED] he submitted documentation will be retained by the CAPO and used to conduct a regulatory compliance assessment. Additional documentation and/or information may be required in some cases to complete

this assessment. The Recipient must provide this documentation and information upon request. All compliance issues or concerns raised by the CAPO must be addressed in writing and resolved before a certification letter, determination memo, or memo of concurrence is issued and prior to initiation of any activities involving human volunteers under this BPA Order. The CAPO will review all submitted materials and provide written confirmation to the DHS Program Manager and the Recipient once all documentation requirements have been met.

The Recipient and any Recipient institution shall submit updated documentation regarding ongoing research involving human subjects, as available and **prior to the expiration of previous approvals**. Such documentation includes protocol modifications, IRB renewals for ongoing research protocols ("Continuing Reviews"), reportable events, and notifications of study completion.

The Recipient must promptly report the following to the CAPO, along with any corrective actions taken: (1) any serious or continuing noncompliance with human subjects research regulations and policies adopted by DHS (as referenced above); and (2) suspension, termination, or revocation of IRB approval of any human subjects research activities conducted under this BPA Order.

## **5.0 OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ORDER LEVEL MATERIALS)**

As required and as represented within OLM funded Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) the Contractor shall seek Government approval in advance of incurring any costs associated with awarded BPA Order established Order Level Materials (OLMs). Government approval is provided by the BPA Order level Contracting Officer and COR, and approval shall be in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 8.403(b). The Contractor shall provide estimated costs, including any quotes, with its approval request. Allowable and reasonable costs incurred by the Contractor for OLMs will be reimbursed. The Contractor shall not charge the Government any associated fees or profit over actual costs incurred for OLMs. Allowable OLMs which are necessary and directly support awarded BPA Order work may include the following:

- Audio visual products and services
- Document services
- IT hardware, software, and services
- Language services
- Logistical services
- Mail management
- Telecommunications

The contractor shall provide invoice backup documentation for all non-labor OLMs in the following format. This backup can be included in one PDF document broken out with the following:

- Summary of COR approved OLMs for the billing period
- Detail of each OLM to include:
  - Invoice from supplier to Contractor
  - Proof of receipt / delivery (DHS Delivery Confirmation Form)

## **6.0 GOVERNMENT FURNISHED RESOURCES**

DHS will issue PIV Cards and laptops, connected to the DHS network and with access to DHS-issued software, to Contractor personnel as necessary to complete the requirements of this order. FEMA will provide access to FEMA IT systems and data, which may require issuance of additional PIV Cards, Derived Alternative Credentials (DACs), and laptops. No additional government furnished resources are anticipated.



## **7.0 CONTRACTOR TELECOMMUTING – REMOTE PERSONAL RESIDENCE WORK LOCATIONS**

Telecommuting allows contractor personnel to perform requirements outside of DHS office locations, typically at a contractor's personal residence or a corporate telecommuting office location. Telecommuting for contractor personnel provides the government flexibility to meet unique DHS organizational and facility needs and requirements. The goal of telecommuting for contractor personnel is to enhance the delivery of services that support the DHS mission. Telecommuting shall be allowed under this BPA Order.

Additionally, the provision to permit contractor telecommuting may be revoked at the BPA Order level at any time if the Government makes such determination. The telecommuting provision does not change awarded BPA Order level requirements.

### **7.1 CONTRACTOR LABOR RATES CHARGED WHILE TELECOMMUTING**

The contractor shall charge the same applicable fixed hourly rate as for a Government site for those contractor personnel when they telecommute at their designated telecommuting location.

## **8.0 CONTRACTOR FURNISHED PROPERTY**

This BPA Order requires the issuance of Government Furnished Property. Contractor personnel who require access to Agency internal data will be issued a PIV card and laptop. Contractor staff, even those who may have received security clearances at other federal agencies, must undergo suitability determination by DHS and/or FEMA.

### **8.1 PROPERTY INVENTORY**

The Contractor shall ensure personnel apply a DHS-supplied barcode to all property purchased for DHS. The Contractor shall establish and maintain an accurate master inventory of all property purchased or provided by DHS and/or FEMA in support of BPA Order level requirements.

### **8.2 NOTIFICATION OF PROPERTY RECEIPT**

The Contractor shall confirm receipt of DHS property purchased in support of BPA Order level requirements with the assigned DHS and/or FEMA Accountable Property Officer (APO) and COR within 5 business days of receipt.

### **8.3 BPA ORDER MONTHLY ASSET MANAGEMENT REPORT (MAMR)**

In support of awarded BPA Order level requirements, it is anticipated that the Contractor shall prepare a monthly Asset Management Report, which contains accurate information for all DHS and/or FEMA property located at their facility. At a minimum, this report must include:

- DHS/FEMA Barcode
- Acquisition Date
- Acquisition Status
- Asset Condition
- Manufacturer Name
- Manufacturer Model
- Asset Description
- Serial Number
- Asset Cost

- Location

The Monthly Asset Management Report requirements will be included as an appendix to the Monthly Progress Report.

## **9.0 GOVERNMENT ACCEPTANCE PERIOD**

The BPA Order level COR will review BPA Order deliverables prior to acceptance and provide the Contractor with an e-mail that provides documented reasons for non-acceptance. If the deliverable is acceptable, the COR will send an e-mail to the Contractor notifying it that the deliverable has been accepted.

**9.1** The BPA Order level COR will have the right to reject or require correction of any deficiencies found in the BPA Order deliverables that are contrary to the information contained in the awarded BPA Order level requirements. In the event of a rejected deliverable, the Contractor will be notified in writing by the COR of the specific reasons for rejection. The Contractor may have an opportunity to correct the rejected deliverable and return it per delivery instructions.

**9.2** All other review times and schedules for BPA Order deliverables shall be agreed upon by the parties based on the final approved Project Management Plan developed and delivered at the BPA Order level. The Contractor shall be responsible for timely delivery to Government personnel in the agreed upon review chain, at each stage of the review. The Contractor shall work with personnel reviewing the BPA Order deliverables to assure that the established schedule is maintained.

## **10.0 GOVERNMENT TERMS & DEFINITIONS**

*Evaluability assessment* – A pre-evaluation examination of the extent to which a program, policy, regulation, or organization can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion or to which an evaluation is worthwhile based on the evaluation's likely benefits, costs, and outcomes.

*Economic evaluation* – Theory-guided analytic methods of economics when results of interest are expressed in terms of economic metrics such as costs, benefits, transfer payments, distributional impacts, and return on investment. Common analysis includes break-even analysis, benefit-cost analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, economic consequence analysis, and economic impact analysis. Economic analysis can be used for formative purposes to estimate future results and costs to achieve them such as when conducting policy analysis or regulatory impact analysis to inform new policies and regulations. Economic analysis can be used for summative purposes in evaluations to estimate realized results and costs, typically compared to alternatives approaches for programs, policies, and regulations.

*Formative evaluation* – Formative evaluation assesses whether a program, policy, regulation, or organization approach (or some aspect of these) is feasible, appropriate, and acceptable before it is fully implemented. It may include process and/or outcome measures. However, it focuses on learning and improvement and does not aim to answer questions of overall effectiveness. It can help answer the questions, "Is the program, policy, regulation, or organization appropriate for this context," "Is the design and delivery acceptable to meet the identified needs," and "Can it be feasibly implemented as designed?"

*Impact evaluation* – Often used for summative purposes, impact evaluation assesses the causal effect or impact of a program on outcomes by estimating what would have happened in the absence of the program or aspect of the program. This estimation requires the use of experimental/randomized control trial (RCT) designs or quasi-experimental designs (QED) in which another group is compared to program participants. Impact evaluation can help answer the question, "Does the program, policy, regulation, or organization work, or did it lead to the observed outcomes?"

*Needs assessments* – Conducted for formative purposes to systematically assess the needs of its potential or actual customers and beneficiaries, examine the nature and causes of those needs, set priorities for the future, and consider the approaches and resources required for programs to achieve intended goals.

*Outcome evaluation* – Used for summative purposes, outcome evaluation assesses the extent to which a program, policy, regulation, or organization approach has achieved certain objectives, and how it achieved these objectives. Outcome evaluations use non-experimental designs characterized by the absence of a control or comparison group. Unlike impact evaluation, outcome evaluation cannot discern that outcomes result from or are a causal effect of the program. It can help answer the question, “Were the intended outcomes achieved?”

*Process/implementation evaluation* – Process/implementation evaluation assesses the extent to which essential elements of a program, policy, regulation, or operation are in place; conform to requirements, program design, professional standards, or customer expectations; and are capable of delivering positive outcomes. It can help answer the questions, “Was the program, policy, regulation, or organization implemented as intended?” or “How is it operating in practice?” In the learning agenda, several evaluations study process-related questions to understand underlying mechanisms of outcomes achievement.

## 10.1 GOVERNMENT ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

APO	-	Accountable Property Officer
BPA	-	Blanket Purchase Agreement
CAPO	-	DHS Compliance Assurance Program Office
CO	-	Contracting Officer
CONOP	-	Concept of Operations
COR	-	Contracting Officer's Representative
DHS	-	Department of Homeland Security
DHS EO	-	DHS Evaluation Officer
Evaluation Services	-	Range of professional support services to carry out Agency responsibilities, answer questions of interest, meaningfully engage stakeholders in evaluation and evaluation activities.
Evidence Act	-	Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018
FAR	-	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FEMA	-	Federal Emergency Management Administration
FMA	-	Flood Mitigation Assistance
FWA	-	Federal-wide Assurance
GAO	-	Government Accountability Office
GPO	-	Government Printing Office
HDRF	-	Human Subjects Research Determination Request Form
IRB	-	Institutional Review Board
MPR	-	Monthly Progress Report
OCFO	-	Office of the Chief Financial Officer
OHRP	-	Office for Human Research Protections
OIS	-	Office of Immigration Statistics
OLM	-	Order Level Materials
OMB	-	Office of Management and Budget
PA&E	-	Program Analysis and Evaluation Division, DHS
PII	-	Personally Identifiable Information
PM	-	Government's Project Manager
PP	-	Project Plan



PSC	-	Government's Project Steering Committee
QCP	-	Quality Control Plan
SOW	-	Statement of Work
TWG	-	External Technical Working Group