

IMAP Questions

1. What performance criteria are available to us to establish evidence of predictive validity?
 - a. The offeror should propose performance criteria that will meet project objectives in line with their design.
2. Given the cognitive nature of the information management competency, what amount of discriminant validity evidence do you expect to see with other cognitive measures?
 - a. Some evidence of discriminant and convergent validity should be present but should not be given precedence over evidence of predictive validity. The offeror should take other design factors into account like time required to complete the assessments when planning the strategy to obtain evidence of validity.
3. Is there a platform besides MARS that might be available to host more technologically involved measures (e.g., game-based assessments)?
 - a. Currently, assessments that are technologically involved are planned to be hosted on MARS.
4. Should we be focusing on the overall competency for the assessment or on lower-level KSAOs? Both? If the KSAO level, are there particular ones you are more interested in than others for each construct?
 - a. The offeror should ensure coverage of the competencies and KSAs under each competency to the extent feasible.
5. Can you anticipate how much time will be given for soldiers to take each assessment, either individually or in concert with other assessments (e.g., convergent measures)?
 - a. There are generally no limits on how long Soldier participation can be requested, but as the time requested for participation increases, the likelihood of the request being supported decreases.
6. We were unable to locate the following report: Dickson, J. N. (2025). *Data Governance and Information Management to Improve Operational Effectiveness* (Report No. FA8075-23-F0030). Booz Allen Hamilton. Would it be possible to receive a PDF copy?
 - a. The in-text citation “Dickinson” was a misspelling. The author’s last name is spelled the way it is in the References section, “Dickson.”
7. You noted a preference for SJTs or simulated task performance over self-report inventories. Given the logistical constraints outlined on page 4 of the solicitation, what level of fidelity and technological sophistication is expected or acceptable for the assessment platform?
 - a. At least moderate fidelity is expected. Measures may involve a computer or be paper-and-pencil based.

8. Page 4 of the solicitation references the involvement of the Soldier population. Will participant recruitment, data collection (e.g., proctoring, scheduling), and data sharing be coordinated by your team, or will this be the responsibility of the performer? If the latter, would the use of a general population sample (e.g., crowdsourced participants) be acceptable for preliminary validation efforts?
 - a. ARI will work with the offeror to recruit Soldiers and collect data. The offeror will be expected to travel for data collections. If offeror systems are not approved to hold Army data, the offeror will need to obtain CACs and government-furnished equipment to get access to Army systems. Data collection needs to be with U.S. Army Soldiers, not a general population sample.
9. You also mention expert reviews on page 4 of the solicitation. Will Government-provided SMEs be available for this, or should we plan to identify and engage our own subject matter experts?
 - a. The offeror should identify who they would like to conduct the review and request government assistance if needed to secure government/military SMEs.
10. Page 4 of the solicitation notes that evidence of criterion-related validity will be needed. If Soldiers are used as participants, would we be able to access performance criteria in a predictive or concurrent fashion? Alternatively, if we use a general population sample, would validation via performance tasks or self-reported outcomes (e.g., GPA) be acceptable?
 - a. The offeror should propose performance criteria that will meet project objectives in line with their design. Army concurrent or predictive performance criteria may be available for us through an archival source or via data collection.
11. Is this effort being managed out of Ft. Belvoir or Ft. Moore? Are any security clearances or specific contractor facility requirements anticipated?
 - a. Ft. Belvoir. If offeror systems are not approved to hold Army data, the offeror will need to obtain CACs and GFE to get access to Army systems.

13. Can you please confirm that this effort is currently funded? We noticed a significant decrease in funding for the option period—should we interpret this to mean that most of the IMAP development and validation is expected in Year 1, with Year 2 focused on refinement or sustainment?

- a. Contracts are not funded until the funding is obligated at the time of award. The CTR's proposal should align with the total period of performance and the planned fiscal distribution to accomplish the project's goals.

14. What is the anticipated start date or fiscal year for project initiation—FY25 or FY26?

- a. FY26

15. Will offerors be expected to come to the table with an existing contract vehicle, or is there a preferred vehicle (e.g., GSA, IAC MAC) that will be used for this effort?

- a. No, the offeror is not expected to come to the table with an existing contract vehicle. The government does not have a preferred vehicle.