



**Request for Proposal
Contractor Support for
Evaluation Services of the
State Intensive Services Initiative**

Circulation Date

February 11, 2019

Bidders' Conference

February 14, 2019 – 3:00 PM ET

Proposal Submission Date

March 11, 2019 – 11:59 PM ET

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
State Intensive Services Project Overview and Goals.....	2
State Intensive Services Evaluation Purpose.....	6
State Intensive Services Evaluation Questions.....	7
Evaluation Tasks and Deliverables	8
Evaluation Schedule	15
State Intensive Services Evaluator Qualifications.....	16
Place of Performance.....	16
Travel	17
Project Requirements and Budget.....	17
Basis for Award of Contract	18
Proposal Structure.....	18
Bidders' Conference and RFP Timeline	24
Proposal Description and Process.....	24
Confidentiality.....	24
Instruction and Response Guidelines.....	25
ATTACHMENT 1: EVALUATION SERVICES PRICING DETAIL.....	26

Introduction

The Unemployment Insurance (UI) Integrity Center (Center) was established to develop, “innovative UI program integrity strategies to reduce improper payments, prevent and detect fraud, and recover any improper payments made”.¹ The efforts of the Center are managed by the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA), under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL).

The Center is undertaking an initiative to work with select states to reduce their UI improper payment rates focused on the root causes of improper payments. The initiative, **State Intensive Services (SIS)**, will provide comprehensive technical assistance to selected states, leveraging the Center’s tools and UI subject matter expertise (SME) to address state-specific root causes of improper payments over the next two years. The Center is seeking professional evaluation services from qualified organizations with the experience and capability to execute an evaluation of the SIS Project.

Background

Since 2010, the UI program has had an improper payment rate above or close to 10 percent.² From July 2017 to June 2018, the most recent year for which data is available, the national improper payment rate determined by the UI program’s Benefit Accuracy Measurement (BAM) was estimated at 13.05 percent.³ This represents an estimated \$3.7 billion in improper payments nationally. Over the past eight years, USDOL’s Employment and Training Administration (ETA) and state UI agencies have worked aggressively to address the root causes of overpayments. The top three causes of overpayments are:

- Work search errors (39.97%), which refer to the failure of claimants to comply with the states’ laws and policies in the requirement to actively search for work, as a condition of receiving UI benefits;
- Benefit year earnings (BYE) (26.65%), which occur when claimants continue to claim UI benefits after returning to work; and
- Separation issues (15.89%), which result from the failure of employers or their third-party administrators to provide timely and adequate information on the reason for a claimant’s separation from employment.

All together, these three causes accounted for approximately eighty-three percent (83%) of all overpayments from July 2017 to June 2018.⁴

¹ http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/UIPL/UIPL_28_12_Acc.pdf

² In 2013, the improper payment rate was 9.32 percent and included an offset for recovered payments.

³ U.S. Department of Labor (2018). Agency Financial Report Fiscal Year 2018. Retrieved December 11, 2018, from <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OPA/reports/2018annualreport.pdf>

⁴ U.S. Department of Labor (2018). Agency Financial Report Fiscal Year 2018. Retrieved December 11, 2018, from <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OPA/reports/2018annualreport.pdf>

State Intensive Services Project Overview and Goals

The Center, in December 2018, created the SIS Project to provide in-depth technical assistance to state UI agencies focused on reducing UI improper payment rates. The goal of the SIS Project is to reduce state-specific root cause improper payment rates in selected states. The Center, in consultation with USDOL, will identify up to ten (10) high improper payment rate states and invite them to participate in the SIS Project. The Center plans to formalize agreements with participating states for the SIS Project with the initial five states by the end of March 2019 and the remaining five by the end of June 2019.

The SIS Project will engage each of the up to 10 selected states in the development and execution of Improper Payment Reduction Plans (IPRPs). The Center plans to use a multi-phase process to work with each state to develop, implement, and evaluate the IPRP.

- **Phase I: Pre-Visit Team Assembly and Research** –The Center will assemble a core SIS Team to conduct advance research and analysis on the root causes underlying the improper payment rate in each participating state. The SIS Team will include Center staff members responsible for coordinating the Scope of Work (SOW) between the state and the Center and completing all advance research in preparation for the on-site state assessment described in Phase II. The advance research conducted by Center staff members will include a review of state BAM data and efforts to date on reducing their improper payment rate, state UI policies, UI technology platforms, state UI agency training programs, external and internal UI communications, and the utilization of Center tools and services (i.e. Integrity Data Hub and National Integrity Academy). The advance research conducted by the Center's SIS Team also will develop and request the state to complete a preliminary scoping questionnaire to provide additional information to prepare for the on-site assessment described in Phase II. At the end of this phase, the Center and each state will agree in principle to a SOW, customized to each state's needs, outlining the nature of the SIS technical assistance provided.
- **Phase II: On-Site State Assessment** - Informed by the advance research completed in Phase I, the Center SIS Team will work with each state to conduct a week-long on-the-ground assessment of the factors contributing to, and directly responsible for, the state's high improper payment rate. The SIS Team, during the on-site assessment, will conduct interviews with key state UI agency staff to develop an in-depth understanding on the underlying causes for their high improper payment rates in each root cause area. The SIS Team will discuss current improper payment reduction strategies that each state is engaged in to inform the IPRP developed in Phase III. The SIS Team also will review and discuss state UI agency business processes and procedures, policies, and technology platforms that also might affect the improper payment rate. The goal of the pre-visit research and on-site assessment completed in Phases I and II will be to develop a complete understanding of all relevant factors responsible for the state's high improper payment rate. This understanding will allow the SIS Team to develop an initial IPRP

that can be feasibly implemented in each state. Additionally, during Phase II, the Center will seek to get buy-in from all levels of state UI agency staff (leadership to front-line workers) for the SIS Project in their state. This is intended to improve the likelihood of success in implementing the IPRP described in Phase III.

- **Phase III: Improper Payment Reduction Plan Development** – After the on-site assessment is completed, the Center's SIS Team will review the interview notes, documentation and reports, and performance data provided by each state to develop, in conjunction with the state UI agency, an operational IPRP. The goal of the IPRP will be to detail the proposed strategies each state UI agency should implement to reduce their improper payment rate across all identified root cause areas. The IPRP also will seek to develop a realistic process and timeline for the state to implement the improper payment reduction strategies, with technical assistance from the Center SIS Team. The Center envisions the following broad categories of improper payment reduction strategies that will be included in each state's IPRP, as relevant:⁵
 - **Procedures and Skill Development Analysis:** The Center's SIS Team will document any gaps in each state's training procedures or skill deficiencies across different UI functional units that might be contributing to the state's improper payment rate. To address these identified gaps in training procedures or staff skill deficiencies, the SIS Team may define in the IPRP a customized training and skill development strategy to ameliorate these issues that may be impacting the state's improper payment rate.
 - **Policy Analysis:** Using the information obtained from Phases I and II, the SIS Team will identify state UI agency policies (statutes, regulations, and agency rules) that contribute to, or are directly responsible for, a state's high improper payment rate in each root cause area within the agreed SOW between the state and the Center. The SIS Team will develop guidance to each state UI agency on how their policies could be revised to reduce their improper payment rate.
 - **Strategic Messaging Analysis:** Recent advances in the field of Behavioral Insights has shown great promise in improving outcomes in the public and private sector by developing a better understanding of the individual, environmental and design, and social factors that influence the decisions individuals make. The Center's SIS Team will work with two Behavioral Insights vendors to develop behavioral interventions with each state to address the underlying behavior of UI claimants and employers contributing to a state's improper payment rate. The SIS Team, working with the Behavioral Insights vendor and state UI agency, in the IPRP will identify and develop behavioral interventions to implement that are specific to each state's improper payment root causes. The IPRP also will provide a timeline for implementing the behavioral interventions and a strategy for measuring their impact on

⁵ Each state's IPRP will be customized to the unique realities of the state and underlying root causes of improper payments.

- individual-level UI claimant and employer behaviors. The Center intends to have the Behavioral Insights vendors develop strategic messaging interventions and strategies as part of the IPRP. The Behavioral Insights vendors will independently evaluate the impact of the interventions on UI claimant and employer behavior (i.e. responding to information requests, interactions with claims system, reporting new hires, etc.). The evaluation activities completed by the Behavioral Insights vendors will be separate from the evaluation services sought under this request for proposal (RFP). The Center will be responsible for ensuring any necessary coordination between the two vendors.
- **Technology Analysis:** Using the information obtained from Phases I and II, the SIS Team will document and catalog in the IPRP the current technology platforms used by the state UI agency (benefits systems, tax systems, state labor exchange, etc.). The technology analysis will identify any areas where a state's UI technology may be contributing to, or responsible for, the high improper payment rate, and propose possible solutions to address identified technology issues.
 - **Organizational and Business Process Analysis:** Informed by the research and information collected in Phases I and II, the SIS Team will review and identify any areas of the state UI agency organizational structure contributing to, or responsible for, high improper payment rates. The SIS Team will review and analyze state UI business processes across all functional units that may impact the improper payment rate. The IPRP will detail and provide recommendations to each state UI agency on changes to their organizational structure and UI business processes that could reduce their improper payment rate in different root cause areas.
- **Phase IV: Improper Payment Reduction Plan Implementation** – After the state UI agency and the Center have agreed to and finalized the IPRP developed in Phase III, the SIS Team will provide ongoing and intensive support to assist each state UI agency with implementing the recommendations provided. The assistance the SIS Team will provide to each state UI agency will vary. However, the SIS Team is prepared to provide the following assistance to each state UI agency:
 - In-person project management assistance in the execution of the IPRP;
 - Center and Behavioral Insights vendor support in the design, implementation, and evaluation of strategic messaging strategies;
 - Policy guidance related to the implementation of recommended state UI policy changes;
 - Assistance in developing and implementing customized training related to improper payment rates for state UI agency staff; and
 - Funding for UI personnel and limited technology enhancements to implement plan recommendations.
 - **Phase V: Improper Payment Reduction Plan Evaluation** – The prospective vendor to this RFP for evaluation services will work with the Center and be responsible for

conducting an evaluation on the overall collective impact of each state's IPRP on their improper payment rate and other key UI integrity outcomes. Additionally, the Center is interested in potential outcome analyses that examine the impact of specific component strategies of the IPRP on state improper payment rates. The prospective vendor also will be responsible for evaluating the extent to which states successfully implemented their IPRPs. The remainder of this RFP provides more detailed information on the scope of the evaluation, questions to be answered, tasks and deliverables, and proposed evaluation schedule.

State Intensive Services Project Proposed Schedule

The Center intends to focus the organization's collective efforts on the implementation of the IPRPs in each of the selected states over the next two years. The Center has developed a preliminary timeline in Figure 1, providing a proposed schedule of activities the Center's SIS Team intends to follow for the project overall. This schedule is likely to change once the states are selected and agree to participate in the SIS Project. The proposed SIS schedule in Figure 1 is intended to provide the starting points of activities. The end dates will be variable based on state implementation of IPRPs.

Figure 1: State Intensive Services Proposed Project Schedule

Calendar Quarter	SIS Project Activities
2019-Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase I: Initial Research for 5 States (R1) ▪ Phase II: Visits in 3 States (R1) ▪ Phase III: Draft IPRPs (R1) ▪ Phase V: Onboard Evaluation Contractor
2019-Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase I: Initial Research for 5 States (R2) ▪ Phase II: Visits in 4 states (R2) ▪ Phase III: IPRPs for R1 States Final ▪ Phase IV: Begin Implementing R1 States IPRPs ▪ Phase V: Begin Evaluation Plan Development for R1 States
2019-Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase I: Done ▪ Phase II: Visits in Final States (R3) ▪ Phase III: IPRPs for R2 States Final ▪ Phase IV: R1 Plan Implementation Ongoing; Begin Implementing R2 States IPRPs ▪ Phase V: R1 State Evaluation Plans Complete; Begin Evaluation Plan Development for R2 States
2019-Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase I: Done ▪ Phase II: Done ▪ Phase III: IPRPs for R3 States Final ▪ Phase IV: R1 and R2 States Plan Implementation Ongoing; Begin Implementing R3 States IPRPs ▪ Phase V: R1 State Evaluation Activities Begin; R2 State Evaluation Plans Complete; Begin Evaluation Plan Development for R3 States
2020-Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase I: Done

Calendar Quarter	SIS Project Activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase II: Done ▪ Phase III: Done ▪ Phase IV: R1-R3 States IPRP Implementation Ongoing ▪ Phase V: R1 and R2 States Evaluation Activities Ongoing; R3 State Evaluation Plans Complete
2020-Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase IV: R1-R3 States IPRP Implementation Completed ⁶ ▪ Phase V: R1-R3 States Evaluation Activities Ongoing
2020-Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase V: R1-R3 States Evaluation Activities Ongoing
2020-Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase V: R1-R3 States Evaluation Activities Ongoing
2021-Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase V: R1-R3 States Evaluation Activities Ongoing
2021-Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase V: R1-R3 States Evaluation Activities Ongoing
2021-Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase V: Begin Drafting of Final Evaluation Reports for R1-R3 States
2021-Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase V: Final Evaluation Reports Finished for R1-R3

The Center is currently planning for evaluation activities to be ongoing throughout the SIS Project period of performance. Specifically, the Center will request regular and ongoing evaluative information on the status and impact of the implementation of state IPRPs during the project period, as detailed later in the RFP. The Center envisions all evaluation activities will end by December 2021. However, in a scenario where there is the need for additional evaluation activities and services beyond December 2021 due to delays in state implementation of IPRPs, the Center may choose to amend the contract with the selected vendor for evaluation services past the proposed schedule end date.

State Intensive Services Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the SIS Project Evaluation is to determine the impact that the implementation of state IPRPs had on state UI improper payment rates during the project period. The evaluation of the SIS Project will document the extent to which states were able to implement the recommendations provided in their IPRPs. The evaluation of the SIS Project also seeks to develop an evidence-base on effective UI integrity strategies for other states not participating in the SIS Project. The results of the evaluation will be used to inform future state decision-making on UI integrity strategies relevant to reducing UI improper payment rates. The results of the evaluation also will be used to inform the tools and services the Center makes available to the entire UI system that can assist states in reducing the national improper payment rate. The principle objectives of the evaluation are to:

- **Estimate** the impact of IPRP implementation in each state on the state BAM improper payment rate, and other UI integrity performance measures;

⁶ The Center is currently planning on having all IPRPs implemented in each state by June 30, 2020. However, the in-depth technical assistance the SIS Team will continue past this date if it is necessary to fully implement each state's IPRP.

- **Determine** the extent to which state UI agencies were able to implement IPRPs;
- **Document** the processes and steps the SIS Team and some state UI agencies followed to develop the IPRPs, including challenges and lessons learned encountered during implementation;
- **Provide** actionable recommendations to the Center that can shape future programming and service offerings to the UI system.

State Intensive Services Evaluation Questions

The prospective evaluation contractor will manage and execute the evaluation of state implementation and impact of their IPRPs as part of the SIS Project. The Center envisions that the SIS Project Evaluation will consist of an outcomes study for all states engaged and involved in the initiative. The Center also seeks that the SIS Project Evaluation will document the extent to which each state implemented the recommendations provided in their IPRP.

The Center is also considering a more intensive in-depth implementation study component in three states engaged in the SIS Project. However, as described below, the Center does not have enough information about prospective vendor costs for conducting an in-depth implementation study in three states to determine if the resources provided for the entire evaluation effort would be sufficient. Summarized below in Figure 2 are the primary evaluation questions the Center seeks to be answered for each evaluation component.

Figure 2: State Intensive Services Primary Evaluation Questions

Study	Evaluation Questions
<p>Outcomes Study (required for all states)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the changes in the state's UI improper payment rate and other key UI integrity outcomes before and after the implementation of the IPRP? 2. Did the implementation of the state's IPRP contribute to the reduction of its UI improper payment rate and improvements in other key UI integrity outcomes? 3. To what extent can changes in the state's improper payment rate and other key UI integrity outcomes be attributed to the implementation of their IPRP? 4. How did each component of the state's IPRP contribute to the reduction of its improper payment rate and improve other key UI integrity outcomes?

Study	Evaluation Questions
	5. What was the influence of other factors that might result in or contribute to changes in the state's improper payment rate and other key UI integrity outcomes?
IPRP Status Assessment (required for all states)	1. To what extent was the state UI agency able to implement the recommendations and guidance provided in the IPRP?
In-Depth Implementation Study (option)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the recommendations and strategies provided in each state's IPRP implemented with fidelity to their intended design? 2. What were the processes and steps the SIS Team and the state UI agency followed to develop IPRP? 3. What were the underlying factors and reasons that contributed to or restricted implementation of the recommendations provided in the IPRP? 4. Were there any other changes to the state's UI program that occurred before, during, or after implementation of the IPRP?

Evaluation Tasks and Deliverables

The Center seeks the services of an independent evaluation firm to design, implement, and report on the evaluation that analyzes the impact the SIS Project had on each state's UI improper payment rate during the project period. The initial term of the evaluation contract would be through December 2021.⁷ In reviewing proposals for evaluation services, the Center is looking for innovative evaluation designs that will provide a cost-effective and a rigorous path forward to understand and answer the key evaluation questions stated earlier. The Center wishes to include all relevant stakeholder groups (state UI agencies, Integrity Center, USDOL, etc.) throughout the implementation of IPRPs and subsequent evaluation reporting.

The Center has identified five core evaluation tasks for the prospective evaluation contractor to complete in order to successfully execute the SIS Project Evaluation. The identified activities include: 1) Project Management, 2) Evaluation Design and Planning, 3) Conduct Evaluation, 4) Evaluation Reporting, and 5) Quality Control. As described in the previous section, the Center has not decided whether there will be an in-depth implementation study conducted in three states due to uncertainties around prospective vendor costs to execute such a study and available resources for the entire evaluation. Given these uncertainties, and for the purposes of evaluating vendor

⁷ In the event state UI agencies are delayed in their implementation of their IPRPs or more time is needed to analyze state implementation and outcomes data to answer the evaluation questions stated in this RFP, the Center may choose to extend the period of performance for the selected evaluation vendor beyond December 2021.

proposals, the Center has separated out the activities for each study component for Activities 2-4 described below.

In the event the Center decides to execute all three evaluation components, including the in-depth implementation study option, the Center would request the prospective evaluation contractor to complete Activities 2-4 in an integrated manner for the three selected states. The evaluation activities performed by the prospective evaluation contractor will be customized at an individual state level.

The Center intends to have the Behavioral Insights vendors developing strategic messaging interventions and strategies as part of the IPRP independently evaluate the impact of the interventions on UI claimant and employer behavior (i.e. responding to information requests, interactions with claims systems, reporting new hires, etc.). The evaluation activities completed by the Behavioral Insights vendors will be separate from the evaluation services sought under this RFP. However, the Center intends for there to be collaboration and consultation between the prospective evaluation contractor and the Behavioral Insights vendors on the extent to which behavioral interventions were implemented as designed, and the timing of implementation to inform analyses of the potential impact on state improper payment rates. Provided below are the identified evaluation activities and deliverables the Center seeks from the prospective evaluator to perform during the period of performance.

Activity 1 – Project Management

The Center seeks proposals from prospective evaluation firms that provide a comprehensive approach to project management of the SIS Project Evaluation. This includes specifying how the contractor will plan, schedule, and organize project team members and evaluation activities, and collaboratively engage with the Center and state UI agencies. Throughout the life of the project, the evaluation contractor and Center staff will meet weekly via teleconference, so that the contractor project team can present status updates, discuss any questions or emergent issues, and plan, as needed. The contractor also will submit to the Center's Director of Research and Evaluation a written monthly report on or by the fourth of each month, detailing meeting dates and topics, completed work, planned work, project risks and challenges, success stories, and best practices. These more structured communications will be supplemented by phone calls, emails, online chat, and/or ad hoc meetings, whenever needed.

Activity 2 – Evaluation Design and Planning

The Center envisions the evaluation contractor being an integrated member of the SIS Team where they can develop an understanding of the challenges each state UI agency faces in reducing UI improper payment rates and underlying root causes. At the beginning of the evaluation, the Center Evaluation Team will facilitate discussions (via webinar or telephone) between the evaluation vendor and each state UI agency. The Center intends for these initial conversations to focus on current data captured related to improper payment rates and UI integrity measures reported to USDOL that

can be used for the outcomes study. These discussions also will identify any state-specific data and reports used to manage program integrity that can be used for the outcomes study. The discussions between the evaluation contractor and the state UI agencies will allow the Center and evaluation contractor to determine if there are any gaps in data availability that might require primary data collection activities to complete the evaluation.

The Center will request the prospective evaluation contractor to develop evaluation design reports (EDRs) for each participating state UI agency. The Center envisions that the development of EDRs will begin once the initial draft of the IPRP is completed for each state. The Center intends for the EDRs to be customized to each state UI agencies' goals and strategies outlined in their respective IPRPs. Evaluation Design Reports developed by the evaluation contractor for each state UI agency should include the following items, at a minimum:

- **Improper Payment Reduction Plan Overview and Logic Model:** The EDR developed by the evaluation contractor should provide an overview of the components of the IPRP, along with a logic model detailing the theory of change proposed to impact the state's improper payment rate.
- **Evaluation Purpose and Key and Detailed Research Questions:** The EDR should articulate the specific purpose of the evaluation for each state. The evaluation contractor, in their development of the EDR, also should refine and suggest additional evaluation questions to be answered for each state's specific improper payment context.
- **Evaluation Methodology Type:** The EDR should describe the evaluation methodology, where applicable, providing justification and support for the approach selected and how it will allow the Center to reach its overarching evaluation goals.
- **Data Collection Plan:** The data collection plan should cover the primary outcome measures, and any qualitative information collected. Data sources and collection methods should be described for each measure and for each qualitative line of inquiry, including new (primary data collection) or existing administrative sources. The data collection plan should include processes and schedules for collecting the data from each source. This includes detailing when certain BAM and other UI integrity outcomes measures reported to USDOL or maintained by the state would be available to complete the necessary data analyses for the outcomes study evaluation. The evaluation contractor also should identify any necessary steps needed to uphold data security and human subject protection protocols such as Institution Review Board (IRB) approval, and approval for surveys or other data collection needs, if needed.
- **Data Analysis Plan:** The data analysis plan of each state's EDR should be focused on answering the evaluation questions listed in this RFP and identified after consultation with each state. The evaluation contractor, in their data analysis plan of the EDR, should plan to discuss threats to internal and external validity the

evaluation may encounter, ways to mitigate these threats, and limitations the design may have in providing information to answer to evaluation questions.

- **Reporting:** The EDRs developed by the evaluation contractor should provide a timeline for the completion of each step of the evaluations and detail when reports will be sent to the Center for review and approval.

Activity 2.1– Develop Outcomes Study Evaluation Design Reports

The outcomes study EDR for each state participating in the SIS Project should detail an approach that compares the state-level improper payment rates and other UI integrity outcome measures⁸ to determine if the implementation of the IPRP resulted in, or contributed to, reduced improper payment rates. The Center is initially considering two design options for the outcomes studies to assess the impact of the SIS Project in each state: 1) pre-post analysis, and 2) a comparative interrupted time series (CITS). However, the Center is interested in proposals from prospective vendors on alternative outcomes analyses that meet the goals of the evaluation and answer the outcomes evaluation questions, if applicable.

The Center also is interested in outcomes evaluation designs that examine the impact of specific strategies of the IPRP (i.e. procedure and skill development, policy analysis, strategic messaging, technology analysis, and organizational and business process analysis) on the state's improper payment rate. The Center wishes to receive proposals from prospective vendors on potential estimation techniques that would allow for an examination of how each component of the IPRP impacted the state's improper payment rate or other key UI integrity outcomes. Considerations on limits to these types of analyses should be included when estimating the impact of specific components of IPRPs on the state improper payment rate. The outcomes study EDRs should detail the process the evaluation contractor would follow to answer the research questions articulated and meet the goals of the outcomes study evaluation in each state.

Activity 2.2 – Develop IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation Design Reports

The IPRP status assessment EDR should describe how the prospective evaluation contractor will compile and track the implementation status of recommendations contained in each state's IPRP. The Center envisions a simple data collection process where participating state UI agencies would complete a brief survey (or other data collection method) in specified intervals reporting on its progress in implementing specific recommendations contained in the IPRP. However, the Center is open to other data collection methods that will answer the IPRP status assessment evaluation question and meet the goals of this evaluation component. The IPRP status assessment EDR should describe the methodological approach and timeline prospective vendors would follow to successfully execute the evaluation component in each state.

⁸ Other key UI integrity outcome measures include those identified by USDOL's UI PERFORMS Core Measures related to benefits and program integrity, appeals, and tax.
https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/pdf/Core_Measures.pdf

Activity 2.3 (Option) – Develop In-Depth Implementation Study Evaluation Design Reports

If the Center determines there are sufficient resources to conduct a more in-depth and comprehensive implementation study in three SIS states, based vendor cost projections, the Center will request the selected evaluation contractor to develop an in-depth implementation study evaluation design that answers the evaluation questions listed in Figure 2. The in-depth implementation study component should document the process a selected state went through to implement the improper payment rate reduction strategies defined in state IPRPs. Specifically, the in-depth implementation studies should examine the different components of improper payment reduction strategies detailed in the IPRPs to assess whether the recommendations were implemented with fidelity to their design. The in-depth implementation studies will be a key component to identify and catalog the challenges and lessons learned encountered by selected states in their implementation of IPRPs.

Activity 3 – Conduct Evaluation

After the EDRs for each state UI agency have been completed and are approved by the Center and states, the evaluation contractor will be responsible for carrying out and executing their proposed evaluation design. The evaluation contractor should first plan on developing the necessary data collection protocols and instruments for the research questions specified in each state's EDR. The Center is open to a variety of data collection methods (site visits, phone interviews, virtual meetings, web surveys, etc.) deemed necessary to answer the evaluation questions provided in this RFP and refined in state-specific evaluation design reports, in line with the resources the Center intends to provide for the evaluation. The Center also is open to other data collection instruments prospective evaluation contractors may have in mind that can reduce the burden on the state UI agencies. Summarized below are the specific activities requested from prospective evaluation contractors for each evaluation component.

Activity 3.1 – Conduct Outcomes Study Evaluation

For the outcomes study component in each state, the evaluation contractor should be prepared and have the capacity to receive the UI performance outcome data that include, but are not limited to, state and national quarterly BAM estimates of improper payment rates, case-level BAM microdata for each state, UI PERFORMS data reported to USDOL, and any state-specific data related to UI program integrity.

It is intended and likely that the state UI agencies engaged in the SIS Project will focus their resources on the development and implementation of their IPRPs. The Center assumes that no other major changes to the UI program (within the state's control) during the evaluation period will occur that are outside the scope of their engagement with the Center and the SIS Project. Therefore, the implementation of each state's IPRP will represent a significant intervention and policy change at a point in time that can allow for a comparison of outcomes before and after. While the Center recognizes this approach may not allow for a clear causal connection of the implementation of the

IPRPs and any changes in improper payment rates and UI integrity outcomes, there should be some degree of confidence that the initiative contributed in some manner to any observed changes in the outcomes of interest.

Prospective vendors in their proposals also should discuss how they would deal with exogenous factors during the evaluation period, such as an increase in the unemployment rate, staffing levels, and other variables that might affect the ability to determine the overall impact of state IPRPs and its specific strategy components on a state's improper payment rate or other key UI integrity outcomes. The Center wishes to receive proposals from prospective vendors on estimation techniques on how each component of the IPRP impacted the state's improper payment rate or other key UI integrity outcomes.

The Center envisions a rapid-cycle approach to the outcomes study evaluation, where the evaluation contractor will conduct ongoing outcomes analyses before and after the implementation of IPRPs in each state. The rapid-cycle methodology could detect significant changes in the trajectories of state improper payment rates and other UI integrity outcomes after the IPRPs have been implemented. This rapid-cycle and ongoing outcomes assessment during the evaluation period is intended to meet the information needs of Center stakeholders on the progress each state is making towards reducing their improper payment rates and improving other key UI integrity outcomes. To develop the rapid-cycle outcomes study component, the prospective evaluation contractor will work with each state UI agency to set up data collection processes that will allow for ongoing assessment of outcomes before and after the implementation of IPRPs. The Center encourages proposals from prospective vendors on alternative outcomes evaluation designs beyond the two described in this RFP that could meet the goals of the evaluation and answer the outcomes evaluation questions more effectively, if appropriate.

Activity 3.2 – Conduct IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation

For the IPRP status assessment evaluation, the prospective evaluation contractor should develop a data collection approach to assess the extent to which each state UI agency implemented the different components of the IPRP. Additionally, the data collection approach should capture information as to when specific components of the IPRP were implemented to inform the outcomes analyses in each state. Information on challenges and lessons learned could also be considered as part of the data collection strategy for the IPRP status assessment.

The Center envisions that states would provide information to the evaluation contractor on the status of the IPRP on a monthly or quarterly basis. As stated above, the Center envisions a simple data collection process where participating state UI agencies would complete a brief survey (or some other data collection method) reporting on its progress in implementing specific recommendations contained in the IPRP. A key consideration the Center will take into account when considering vendor proposals is the balance between the reporting burden on states and the necessary information needed to successfully capture where states are in implementing their IPRP.

Activity 3.3 (Option) – Conduct In-depth Implementation Study Evaluation

The in-depth implementation study that would be completed in three SIS Project states would occur during and after the implementation of each state's IPRP. The Center is open to a variety of data collection and analysis methods that will allow the evaluation contractor to answer the evaluation questions listed in Figure 2 and additional questions articulated in each state's EDR. The Center will request the prospective evaluation contractor to conduct site visits and/or virtual interviews with state UI staff on the process and experience they had in implementing the IPRP, in addition to the IPRP status assessment described in Activity 3.2. The Center intends for there to be only one round of site visits to the three states. However, the Center is open to evaluation vendor proposals that propose additional site visits or other types of interviews if it will allow for successful execution of the in-depth implementation study in each state aligned to the Center's goals. The findings from the in-depth implementation study component conducted in three states will be a key component to cataloging and describing the various integrity strategies implemented so non-participating SIS states may learn from the experiences of those states participating.

Activity 4 – Evaluation Reporting

Given the short timeframe to develop and implement the IPRPs, the Center seeks ongoing reporting and communication of evaluation findings throughout the period of performance. The ongoing reporting and communication of evaluation findings is intended to meet the information needs of the Center, its stakeholders, and states on the progress SIS states make in implementing their IPRP, reducing their improper payment rate and other UI integrity outcomes, and overall project performance. The Center will request the evaluation contractor to prepare a monthly progress report on the evaluation activities completed, deliverables produced, upcoming activities, and any challenges facing the evaluation across all states, as described in Activity 1.

Activities 4.1 and 4.2 - Outcomes Study and IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation Reporting

The Center will request the evaluation contractor to develop two primary reports detailed below for the outcomes study and IPRP status assessment evaluation components by state after the IPRPs and EDRs have been finalized:

- **Quarterly Plan Implementation and Outcomes Progress Reports and Dashboard:** The quarterly status reports should provide a summary of the implementation status of recommendations contained in each state's IPRP and an analysis of each state's improper payment rate and other UI integrity outcomes identified in their EDR. The Center is interested in proposals from prospective contractors on the development of user-friendly dashboards that allow the SIS Team to examine the extent of implementation of IPRPs and UI integrity outcomes by state. This will allow the Center to inform and possibly revise the suggested strategies to better assist states in reducing their improper payment rates.

- Final Evaluation Reports:** The Center will request the evaluation contractor to develop final evaluation reports answering the evaluation questions listed in the RFP and additional questions identified in each state's EDR. The final evaluation reports should document the extent to which states implemented their IPRPs, and whether the implementation of the plans contributed to, or were responsible for, changes in a state's improper payment rate or other key UI integrity outcomes. It is intended that the final evaluation reports will be completed by December 2021, providing summative judgment on the effectiveness of the SIS Project in each state. In the event state UI agencies are delayed in their implementation of their IPRPs or more time is needed to analyze state implementation and outcomes data to answer the evaluation questions stated in this RFP and state EDRs, the Center may choose to extend the period of performance for the selected evaluation vendor beyond December 2021.

Activity 4.3 (Option) – In-depth Implementation Study Evaluation Reporting

If the Center decides to execute the in-depth implementation study in three states, it would request that the findings from the study be incorporated and detailed in the final evaluation report described under Activities 4.1 and 4.2 above. The Center does not anticipate any additional reporting requirements for the in-depth implementation study beyond the final evaluation reports.

Activity 5 – Quality Control

The Center seeks an evaluation contractor who will perform continuous quality control activities to ensure success in managing and implementing the SIS Project Evaluation. The Center expects the evaluation contractor to adhere to the highest professional standards in the interactions with states, execution of the data collection and analysis plans, and reporting of project deliverables.

Evaluation Schedule

The SIS Project Evaluation in selected states is scheduled to take place over the 33 months, from March 2019 through December 2021. The timeline for the evaluation will coincide with the development and implementation of each state's IPRP, starting in March 2019 through plan implementation (June 2020). The timeline for the evaluation should be regarded as urgent. Prospective evaluation contractors should be aware that the Center intends to condense some task timeframes, if it is possible to do so without impacting evaluation quality. However, the proposed evaluation schedule in Figure 3 should be regarded as preliminary and subject to change; it may be extended, based on overall project and state needs. Summarized below is the proposed schedule for evaluation activities the Center intends to follow.

Figure 3: Proposed State Intensive Services Evaluation Schedule

Evaluation Activities	Timeline (Calendar Quarter)
Execute Contract with Evaluation Vendor	2019-Q1
Develop and Finalize Evaluation Design Reports	2019-Q2 to 2020-Q1

Evaluation Activities	Timeline (Calendar Quarter)
Conduct Evaluation Activities	2019-Q4 to 2021-Q2
Complete Monthly Project Management Reports	2019-Q2 to 2021-Q4
Complete Quarterly Plan Reports and Dashboard	2019-Q4 to 2021-Q4
Complete Final Evaluation Reports	2021-Q3 to 2021-Q4

State Intensive Services Evaluator Qualifications

The Center seeks proposals from qualified evaluation firms with experience implementing evaluations of complex and multi-site projects, as is envisioned with the SIS Project. Specifically, the Center seeks proposals from vendors with experience executing evaluation studies with similar stakeholder groups as those identified in the RFP. The Center seeks evaluation vendors who also have the capacity and resources to negotiate necessary data sharing agreements, data collection, data analysis, and report writing.

The Center also will strongly consider proposals from evaluation vendors with previous experience working with state agencies, that performed research on UI and other public assistance programs, and who are familiar with performance and program integrity reporting systems for the UI and other public assistance programs. The Center is interested in receiving innovative proposals that describe the organization of the project team to conduct the evaluations of each state's IPRP. Proposed evaluation staff should include a mix of seniority levels (detailed in Figure 4) of senior-level, mid-level, and junior-level staff with proficiency in the evaluation skills needed to complete the scope of work describe in this RFP.

Figure 4: Evaluator Qualifications and Roles

Evaluation Project Role	Years of Experience	Education-Level
Project Director	8-10 years of evaluation experience	Master's or above
Principal Investigator(s)	10+ years of evaluation experience	Master's or above
Senior Analyst(s)	5-7 years of evaluation experience	Bachelor's or above
Analyst(s)	2-4 years of evaluation experience	Bachelor's or above
Quality Control	5-7 years of evaluation experience	Bachelor's or above

Place of Performance

Work for this project will be done primarily at the evaluation contractor's facilities and in the selected states, as appropriate. With the exception of proposed evaluation site visits (if applicable), other meetings will be managed through conference calls and webinars.

Travel

The Center will directly reimburse the selected evaluation contractor for all approved travel costs incurred and deemed necessary to successfully complete all evaluation activities. This includes travel for items such as in-person meetings with Center and state UI agency staff.⁹ Anticipated in-person meetings may include: a project kick-off meeting, and evaluation site visits (if applicable). Some meetings may be held at the NASWA office in Washington, D.C., but the majority of travel will be to the selected state UI agencies.

Publications

The Center understands that contractors may have interest in publishing reports and other specific information on their evaluation work related to the SIS Project Evaluation. The Center is open to the possibility of such publications to the extent practicable and with written permission from the affected state UI agencies and approval by the Center.

Project Requirements and Budget

Prospective evaluation contractors shall provide qualified resources with demonstrated expertise in program evaluation to execute the evaluation of state UI agency's IPRPs. The selected contractor must have experience with implementing program evaluations for complex government programs similar to the SIS Project. The assigned contractor's staff resources must be personable, professional, collaborative, and diplomatic in demeanor, as a large percentage of the contractor's work will involve interacting with NASWA's members (state UI agencies). Contractor staff may be exposed to sensitive or confidential UI data and may be required to sign non-disclosure agreements with the state UI agencies. The contractor's design and execution of the SIS Project Evaluation shall include Activities 1-5 described above.

The final project deliverables, deliverables acceptance criteria, and payment schedule will be included in the contract during the contract development process with the selected vendor. In order to effectively implement the evaluation described in this RFP, the Center has allocated up to \$750,000 to perform all the services requested over the evaluation period. This includes the in-depth implementation study evaluation component option described above in Activities 2.3, 3.3, and 4.3. The Center intends for the contract to be a firm-fixed price agreement.

⁹ Prospective evaluation contractors should not include the cost of any staff travel to successfully complete the scope of work in their cost proposals as it will be directly reimbursed if approved by the Center. The Center will reimburse prospective evaluation contractors in accordance with General Services Administration rates and regulations.

Basis for Award of Contract

The Center will evaluate all proposals using the following criteria and issue an award to the contractor(s) that represent(s) the best value and best fit for the Center. While the Center anticipates extending the award to a single contractor for evaluation services for the SIS Project, the Center reserves the right to award multiple vendors for parts of the project.

Figure 5: Evaluation Services Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Weight
Corporate Experience/Expertise	25 points
Technical Approach	35 points
Key Personnel	20 points
Pricing	20 points
Minority and Women-Owned Businesses	Up to 5 bonus points

Proposal Structure

The following table details the required response outline and specifies the content of the response sections.

Figure 6: State Intensive Services Evaluation Services Proposal Outline and Requirements

Required Response Outline		
Section Number	Section Title	Section Content
1	Executive Summary (Max 3 pages)	Summarize your proposal.
2	Project Proposal (Max 30 pages)	Describe your company's/organization's proposed approach and project management process, including the following: 1) Company Overview Provide a brief description of your company or organization; services provided; business size (in terms of revenue and number of employees and current clients/customers); and length of time in business conducting program evaluation projects. Please indicate the extent of your organization's experience in program evaluation in the public sector and highlight any prior experience with projects with any state or federal UI program, or program integrity in other public benefits programs.

		<p>2) Project Management Approach Please provide information on your project management approach by addressing the points listed below.</p> <p>a) Please describe your organization's approach to the overall management of the evaluation of the SIS Project to meet the stated evaluation goals.</p> <p>b) Please describe your organization's approach to the development of EDRs for each state UI agency. Include information on how your organization will leverage economies of scale in the development of EDRs across states, while also customizing to each state's improper payment reduction strategy. Describe the initial methodological framework and evaluation design your organization would use to answer the evaluation questions. Identify any additional evaluation questions your organization thinks could be relevant to meeting the goals of the evaluation. Describe how your organization would generally design the evaluation as described in the RFP to meet the goals of the evaluation.</p> <p>For the outcomes study, describe how your organization would design the pre-post, CITS, or other appropriate outcomes evaluation designs (as identified by prospective contractors) in each state. Include a discussion on how the outcomes evaluation design could estimate the impact of each component of a state's IPRP on the state's improper payment rate or other UI integrity outcomes, if feasible. Identify any considerations and limitations of these approaches to meeting the goals of the evaluation.</p> <p>For the IPRP status assessment evaluation component detailed in the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>body of the RFP for all states, describe your design to compile and track the implementation status of recommendations contained in each state's IPRP.</p> <p>For the in-depth implementation study component described in the RFP, please describe your organization's approach and design to answer the stated research questions in Figure 2 in three states. Additionally, please discuss the feasibility and any challenges of conducting in-depth implementation studies given the stated project resources.</p> <p>c) Please describe your organization's approach to the execution of the evaluations after the EDRs are finalized. Include information on the process your organization would follow to develop data and information collection instruments, conduct data and information collection, and analyze the data collected for each evaluation component. Include a description of how your organization would assess the extent to which all states implemented their IPRPs.</p> <p>Include a description of the methodology your organization would follow to identify changes and/or impacts in state improper payment rates or other key UI integrity outcomes before and after implementation of IPRPs. Include a description of how your organization would deal with exogenous factors during the evaluation period, such as an increase in the unemployment rate, staffing levels, and other variables that might affect the ability to determine the overall impact of state IPRPs and its specific strategy components on a</p>
--	--	---

		<p>state's improper payment rate or other key UI integrity outcomes.</p> <p>Include a description of the methodology your organization would use to document the steps states followed to implement their IPRP, and internal and external factors that impacted implementation.</p> <p>Identify any areas where it may be necessary to develop primary data collection instruments, if there are not already existing data sources needed to answer the evaluation questions.</p> <p>d) Please describe your organization's approach to completing the reporting requirements related to the evaluation for each study component, including the monthly project management reports. Include information on how your organization will provide ongoing reporting and communication of evaluation findings throughout the period of performance via user-friendly dashboards or reports. Describe your organization's approach to producing summative final evaluation reports on evaluation findings at the end of the period of performance.</p> <p>e) Please describe how your organization will perform continuous quality control activities to ensure success in managing and implementing the SIS Project Evaluation.</p> <p>f) Please provide a detailed timeline, summarizing planned evaluation activities consistent with overall SIS Project and evaluation timeline provided in Figures 1 and 3.</p> <p>g) Explain how your organization would manage its role with respect to the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Center, including communications with the Center and project responsibilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h) Explain how your organization would manage the approach to interacting with the state UI agencies or stakeholders. i) Please describe how you would ensure the availability of key staff proposed throughout the life of the project. j) Please describe any sub-contractors for this project your organization plans to work with. Provide details on their expertise, as well as your past experience with them. <p>3) Experience and Approach to Managing Sensitive Information</p> <p>Through the SIS Project Evaluation, the selected contractor may be exposed to, at a minimum, sensitive and possibly confidential UI program information. Depending on the exposures and strategies proposed in the IPRPs, the evaluation may require the contractor to sign non-disclosure agreements (NDAs), along with Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and/or information-sharing agreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please describe any experience your organization has in managing sensitive or confidential information for prior evaluation projects. b) Please explain the process your organization has used or would use to manage sensitive or confidential information, including your proposed process to allow you to access and share data in a secure environment to perform the necessary statistical analysis for the evaluations.
--	--	---

		<p>4) Publications Please indicate whether your organization would intend to seek publication in any academic journals or other media with respect to work on the SIS Project Evaluation. If so, please explain how you would protect confidential and/or sensitive information.</p>
3	<p>Previous project experience and references (1 page per reference)</p>	<p>Include three (3) project summary citations that outline your organization's experience in conducting evaluations for projects of similar content, size, and scope to the SIS Project. For each project summary citation, please include the following: brief project summary, project size/scope, project budget, evaluation design, project outcomes, agency/organization, agency/organization point of contact, agency/organization phone number, and e-mail address. Cited organizations may be contacted as references for the purposes of this RFP.</p> <p><i>Please limit response to one page for each of the three references.</i></p>
4	<p>Key Personnel Resumes (3-page max per key personnel)</p>	<p>Please provide resumes or curriculum vitae (no more than three pages each) for key personnel to be assigned to the project. Resumes/CVs should include: name, position within your organization, proposed project role, proposed percentage of time allocated to the SIS Project Evaluation, education, related work experience, and any other details deemed relevant. Provide information on experience working with the UI system or issues related to program integrity in other public benefit programs.</p>
5	<p>Cost Estimates</p>	<p>Complete Attachment (1) Pricing Detail.</p>
6	<p>Additional Information</p>	<p>Confidentiality requirements and other information the contractor deems appropriate.</p>
7	<p>Minority and Women-Owned Businesses (MWBEs)</p>	<p>If your organization is a MWBE, or is partnering with a MWBE, please include documentation certifying your/their status as such to receive up to five (5) bonus points.</p>

Bidders' Conference and RFP Timeline

The Center will hold a Bidders' Conference on February 14, 2019 at 3:00 PM Eastern Time. The Bidders' Conference is designed to afford the opportunity for interested contractors to attend a presentation on the overall project, ask questions, and provide any comments. Questions submitted in advance via email will be answered during the conference call; additional questions not submitted in advance may be posed during the conference call. Webinar registration, a PDF copy of this RFP, and RFP questions and answers will be posted at http://www.itsc.org/Pages/sis_evaluation_services.aspx. Questions may be submitted electronically to: Tim Griffith, Director of Research and Evaluation, tgriffith@naswa.org. The RFP timeline is shown below in Figure 7.

Figure 7: RFP Timeline

RFP Activity	Timeline
▪ SIS Evaluation RFP Issued	February 11, 2019
▪ SIS Evaluation Bidders' Conference	February 14, 2019
▪ Final Clarification Questions	February 19, 2019
▪ Questions and Responses Posted	February 22, 2019
▪ Proposals Due	March 11, 2019
▪ Applicant Presentations (optional)	Mar 18-22, 2019
▪ Best and Final Offer Pricing (optional)	March 25, 2019
▪ Award (anticipated)	March 29, 2019

Applicant presentations will be conducted with selected contractors determined to be within the competitive range for awards. Contractor presentations, if held, will be conducted virtually. The Center reserves the right to invite contractors to participate in detailed discussions, clarifications to responses, and presentations/demonstrations after the proposal due date.

Proposal Description and Process

Participation in this RFP process is voluntary. All costs incurred in responding to or participating in this RFP will be the responsibility of the contractors (or other third-party organizations participating in the RFP), and not of the Center.

Confidentiality

Any document submitted in response to this RFP containing confidential information must include a "Confidential" watermark on the appropriate pages. The confidential information must be clearly identifiable to the reader as confidential. All other information will not be treated as confidential. Note: All confidential information is for the Center's use in evaluating proposals in response to this RFP.

Instruction and Response Guidelines

Responses to this RFP shall adhere to the page limits specified in the Proposal Structure section above, must be in narrative form, and must provide details on contractor capabilities. Responses must be viewable with Microsoft Word or Adobe Acrobat and printable on 8.5" x 11" paper, must use 12-point font, the margins of each page should be at least ½ inch, and each page should contain a page number in the footer.

All responses must be submitted electronically to: tgriffith@naswa.org. Responses must be received electronically by 11:59 PM Eastern Time on March 11, 2019. The Center's responses will be sent to the email address of the sender, along with any additional company/organization email addresses included in the submittal. Telephone calls regarding this RFP will not be accepted. Questions may be submitted by email up to 11:59 PM Eastern Time, February 19, 2019. As noted previously, the Center will post questions and answers to the RFP website.

ATTACHMENT 1: EVALUATION SERVICES PRICING DETAIL

The Center requests prospective evaluation contractors complete the evaluation services pricing detail tables below. Contractors do not necessarily need to use the same table format, as long as the information requested is provided. Contractors may also provide additional pricing detail related to direct and indirect costs, if they deem it necessary.

As described in the body of the RFP, the Center has not decided whether there will be an in-depth implementation study conducted in three states due to uncertainties around prospective vendor costs to execute such a study and available resources for the entire evaluation. Given these uncertainties, and for the purposes of evaluating vendor proposals, the Center has separated out the activities for each study component for Activities 2-4.

Prospective evaluation contractors should provide cost estimates for each evaluation activity described in the RFP and listed in Figure 8 below. Proposals should provide estimates of the necessary costs needed to complete the SIS Project Evaluation in all 10 states as envisioned and described in the RFP. Prospective evaluation contractors must submit a cost proposal for the in-depth implementation study component option as described in the RFP. Cost proposals for the in-depth implementation study component option should be priced assuming three states would be selected to participate.

The Center will directly reimburse the selected evaluation contractor for all approved travel costs incurred and deemed necessary to successfully complete all evaluation activities. Prospective evaluation contractors in their cost proposals should not include the cost of any staff travel to successfully complete the scope of work outlined in their proposal as it will be directly reimbursed if approved by the Center. The Center will reimburse prospective evaluation contractors in accordance with General Services Administration rates and regulations.

Cost Proposal Summary

Please summarize the total costs of each evaluation activity in the table below. Please price these activities for the costs needed to execute the evaluation activities as described in the RFP and in this attachment.

Figure 8: Evaluation Activity Proposal Cost Summary

Evaluation Activity	Price
Activity 1 – Project Management	
Activity 2.1 – Develop Outcomes Study Evaluation Design Reports	
Activity 2.2 – Develop IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation Design Reports	
Activity 2.3 (Option) – Develop In-Depth Implementation Study Evaluation Design Reports	
Activity 3.1 – Conduct Outcomes Study Evaluation	
Activity 3.2 – Conduct IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation	
Activity 3.3 (Option) – Conduct In-Depth Implementation Study Evaluation	
Activity 4.1 – Outcomes Study Evaluation Reporting	
Activity 4.2 – IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation Reporting	
Activity 4.3 (Option) – In-Depth Implementation Study Evaluation Reporting	
Activity 5 – Quality Control	
TOTAL	
TOTAL WITH OPTIONS	

Staff Labor Hours

Contractors should assume the Level of Effort (LOE) to be comparable to their own prior experience on other similar evaluations of government projects that included multiple stakeholders and significant stakeholder involvement. Please provide the level of effort needed to complete the evaluation activities as described in the proposal for all states participating in the SIS Project.

The Center has developed two tables for prospective contractors to complete. Figure 9 requests prospective evaluation contractors to provide LOE and cost estimates to complete the SIS Project outcomes and IPRP status assessment evaluations as described in the RFP for all 10 states. Figure 10 requests prospective evaluation contractors to provide LOE and cost estimates to complete the in-depth implementation evaluation option activities described in Activities 2.3, 3.3, and 4.3 in three states.

Figure 9: Staff Labor Hours – SIS Project Outcomes and IPRP Status Assessment Evaluation

Labor Category (Position Title)	Education & Experience	Loaded Labor Rate	Total Hours	Total (Labor Rate x Total Hours)
TOTAL				

Figure 10: Staff Labor Hours – SIS Project In-Depth Implementation Study Option

Labor Category (Position Title)	Education & Experience	Loaded Labor Rate	Total Hours	Total (Labor Rate x Total Hours)
TOTAL				