

U.S. Department of Energy

Oak Ridge National Laboratory Site Office

Fiscal Year 2015

Oak Ridge Associated Universities, Inc.

Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

for the Management and Direction of the Programs of

Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education

Approval Page

U.A. Page

Andy Page
President and Chief Executive Officer
Oak Ridge Associated Universities

11/12/2014

Date

M.S. Moore

for Johnny O. Moore
ORNL Site Office Manager
U.S. Department of Energy

11-12-2014

Date

Mary Lou Crow

Mary Lou Crow
Contracting Officer
U.S. Department of Energy

9-22-2014

Date

INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND AWARD FEE....	2
II. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES	7
GOAL 1.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Support to DOE Mission Accomplishment	8
1.1 Provide Effective Management and Produce Quality Services and Deliverables	8
GOAL 2.0 N/A	11
GOAL 3.0 N/A	12
GOAL 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE	13
4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE	13
4.2 Management and Operation of ORISE.....	15
4.3 Contractor Value-added.....	17
GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection.....	18
5.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program	18
5.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System.....	18
GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of ORISE Mission(s)	19
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	19
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System and Property Management System(s).....	19
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program	19
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality	19
GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet ORISE Needs	21
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs.....	21
7.2 Provide Planning for and acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of ORISE Missions and Programs	21

GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems	23
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	23
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information.....	23
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property.....	23

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan, primarily serves as the Department of Energy's (DOE) Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan for the evaluation of Oak Ridge Associated Universities' (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and direction of the programs of the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (hereafter referred to as "ORISE") under Contract Number DE-AC05-06OR23100, for the evaluation period of October 1, 2014, through December 31, 2015. For the purposes of this Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan, this fifteen month period will be referred to as Fiscal Year (FY) 2015.

The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of ORISE and is meeting the mission and requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within the contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available award fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, B.2, Estimated Cost, Base Fee, and Award Fee; G.4, Payment of Base Fee and Award Fee; and I.109, 952.223-76, Conditional Payment of Fee or Profit – Safeguarding Restricted Data and Other Classified Information and Protection of Worker Safety and Health. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) Site Office (OSO), in partnership with the Contractor and DOE Headquarters (HQ) has defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives), and set of Notable Outcomes discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Notable Outcomes for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with the OSO as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Notable Outcomes, will be evaluated by the appropriate HQ office(s), major customers, and/or the OSO, as appropriate. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Notable Outcomes, as well as all additional information available to the evaluating office. The OSO will work closely with each HQ program office and other customers throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects, as well as other management and direction activities, conducted by the Contractor throughout the year. The OSO will also meet periodically with the Contractor to discuss performance.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the award fee earned (if any), will be determined.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, its corresponding Objectives, and Notable Outcomes identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND AWARD FEE

The FY 2015 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science, Technology, and Program Achievement (STPA) and Management (MGMT). Each Goal is composed of one or more weighted Objective(s). Additionally, a set of Notable Outcomes has been identified to highlight key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention by the Contractor for the upcoming FY. Each Notable Outcome is linked to one or more Objectives, and failure to meet expectations against any Notable Outcome will result in a grade less than B+ for that Objective(s). Performance above expectations against a Notable Outcome will be considered in the context of the Contractor's entire performance with respect to the relevant Objective. The following section describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grades at the Objective level.

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop grades at the Objective Level. Each evaluating office or organization will provide a rating for each applicable Objective. A numerical score and corresponding letter grade for each Objective will be subjectively assigned. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the corresponding Objectives.

For Goals 1.0 and 4.0, the Contractor will be evaluated against the defined levels of performance provided for each Objective under each Goal. The descriptions for these defined levels of performance are included in Section II. For all other Goals, the Contractor will be evaluated against the defined levels of performance provided in Figure A.

It is DOE's expectation that the Contractor provides for and maintains management systems that efficiently and effectively support the current mission(s) of ORISE and assures ORISE's ability to deliver against DOE's future needs. In evaluating the Contractor's performance, DOE will assess the degree of effectiveness and performance in meeting each of the Objectives provided under each of the Goals. For Goals 5.0 through 8.0, DOE will rely on a combination of the information through the Contractor's own assurance systems, the ability of the Contractor to demonstrate the validity of this information, and DOE's own independent assessment of the Contractor's performance across the spectrum of its responsibilities. The latter might include, but is not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; formal assessments; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (Office of Inspector General, General Accounting Office, Defense Contract Audit Agency, etc.).

The mission of ORISE is to assist in developing the infrastructure required for development of science and technology (S&T) needed to support Departmental missions and other sponsors' needs. Operational performance at ORISE meets DOE's expectations (defined as the grade of B+ for each Objective) if the Contractor is performing at a level that fully supports ORISE's current and future mission(s). Performance that has, or has the potential to, (1) adversely impact the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/ORISE mission(s); (2) adversely impact the DOE and/or ORISE's reputation; or (3) does not provide the competent people, necessary facilities, and robust systems necessary to ensure sustainable performance, will be graded below expectations.

The Department sets our expectations high, and expects performance at that level to optimize the efficient and effective operation of ORISE. Thus, the Department does not expect routine Contractor performance above expectations against the MGMT Goals (4.0 – 8.0). Performance that might merit grades above B+ would need to reflect a Contractor's significant contributions to the management and operations at the system of DOE Laboratories, or recognition by external, independent entities as exemplary performance.

Definitions for the grading scale for the Objectives associated with Goals 5.0 – 8.0 are provided in Figure A.

Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Definition
A+	4.3-4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports ORISE's current and future mission(s). Performance is notable for its significant contributions to the management and operations across the Office of Science (SC) system of laboratories, and/or has been recognized by external, independent entities as exemplary.
A	4.0-3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports ORISE's current and future mission(s). Performance is notable for its contributions to the management and operations across the SC system of laboratories, and/or has been recognized by external, independent entities as exemplary.
A-	3.7-3.5	Exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports ORISE's current and future mission(s).
B+	3.4-3.1	Meets expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports ORISE's current and future mission(s). No performance has, or has the potential to, adversely impact (1) the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/ORISE mission(s), (2) DOE and/or ORISE's reputation, or does not (3) provide a sustainable performance platform.
B	3.0-2.8	Just misses meeting expectations of performance against a few aspects of the Objective in question. In a few minor instances, the Contractor's systems function at a level that does not fully support ORISE's current and future mission(s) or provide a sustainable performance platform.
B-	2.7-2.5	Misses meeting expectations of performance against several aspects of the Objective in question. In several areas, the Contractor's systems function at a level that does not fully support ORISE's current and future mission(s) or provide a sustainable performance platform.
C+	2.4-2.1	Misses meeting expectations of performance against many aspects of the Objective in question. In several notable areas, the Contractor's systems function at a level that does not fully support ORISE's current and future mission(s) or provide a sustainable performance platform and/or have affected the reputation of ORISE or DOE.
C	2.0-1.8	Significantly misses meeting expectations of performance against many aspects of the Objective in question. In many notable areas, the Contractor's systems do not support ORISE's current and future mission(s) or provide a sustainable performance platform and may affect the reputation of ORISE or DOE.
C-	1.7-1.1	Significantly misses meeting expectations of performance against most aspects of the Objective in question. In many notable areas, the Contractor's systems demonstrably hinder ORISE's ability to deliver on current and future mission(s) and have harmed the reputation of ORISE or DOE.
D	1.0-0.8	Most or all expectations of performance against the Objective in question are missed. Performance failures in this area have affected all parts of ORISE; DOE leadership engagement is required to deal with the situation and help the Contractor.
F	0.7-0.0	All expectations of performance against the Objective in question are missed. Performance failures in this area are not recoverable by the Contractor or DOE.

Figure A. Letter Grade Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned an earned numerical score as stated under "Performance Evaluation Methodology." The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of

each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall raw numerical score for each Goal. The raw numerical score for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Figure B to determine the final Goal score and grade.

Utilizing Table A below, the raw numerical scores for each Goal are multiplied by the weight assigned and then summed to provide an overall raw numerical score for the STPA and MGMT areas respectively. The raw numerical score for (1) STPA and (2) MGMT will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using the standard rounding convention discussed below. The total score for (1) STPA and (2) MGMT is compared to the letter grade scale found in Figure B, to determine the overall STPA and MGMT grades for FY 2015. No overall rollup grade will be provided.

As stated above, the raw numerical score from each calculation will be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.5).

STPA Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Total Score
1.0 Support to DOE Mission Accomplishment			100%	
2.0 (Reserved)				
3.0 (Reserved)				
Total STPA Score				
MGMT Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE			30%	
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			20%	
6.0 Business Systems			20%	
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			10%	
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			20%	
Total MGMT Score				

Table A. FY 2015 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0.0

Figure B. FY 2015 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Determining the Amount of Award Fee Earned:

The percentage of the available award fee that may be earned by the Contractor will be determined based on the total score for STPA (see Table A) and then compared to Figure C to determine the percent STPA

Fee Earned. The total score for MGMT (see Table A) will then be compared to Figure C to determine the MGMT fee multiplier. The Percent STPA Fee Earned and MGMT Fee Multiplier will be utilized to determine the Overall Earned Award Fee for FY 2015 as calculated within Table B.

Total Score from Table A	Percent STPA Fee Earned	MGMT Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7 to 1.1	0%	60%
1.0 to 0.0	0%	0%

Figure C. Award Fee Earned Scale

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent STPA Fee Earned	
MGMT Fee Multiplier	×
Overall Earned Award Fee (%)	

Table B. Final Percentage of Award Fee Earned Determination

The Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) requirements for using and administering cost-plus-award-fee contracts provide for a five-level Adjectival Grading System with associated levels of available fee. SC has addressed the FAR 16 language by mapping its standard numerical scores and associated fee determinations to the FAR Adjectival Rating System, as noted in Figure D.

Range of Total STPA Score	FAR Adjectival Rating	Maximum Award Fee Pool Available to be Earned
3.1 to 4.3	Excellent	100%
2.5 to 3.0	Very Good	88%
2.1 to 2.4	Good	75%
1.8 to 2.0	Satisfactory	50%
0.0 to 1.7	Unsatisfactory	0%

Figure D. Crosswalk of SC Scores and the FAR Rating System

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Award Fee Determination:

The lack of Objectives and Notable Outcomes in this plan does not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives will be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade and/or amount of award fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the prime contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses, which address reduction of fee. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may also be derived from other previously addressed sources.

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. The aforementioned Conditional Payment of Fee or Profit – Safeguarding Restricted Data and Other Classified Information and Protection of Worker Safety and Health clause is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, safety, and health (ES&H). Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor grades for each Goal and fee earned determination will be contained within a year-end report documenting the results from the OSO review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Goal achievements.

II. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES

Background:

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the Performance-Based Management System, DOE provides clear direction to the contractors and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors' performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on demonstrated performance by the Contractor, and on a set of Notable Outcomes that focus Contractor leadership on the specific items that are the most important initiatives and highest risk issues the Contractor must address during the year. These Notable Outcomes should be objective, measurable, and results-oriented to allow for a definitive determination of whether or not the specific outcome was achieved at the end of the year.

Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes:

The following sections describe the Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated Notable Outcomes for FY 2015.

GOAL 1.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Support to DOE Mission Accomplishment

The weight of this Goal is 100%.

This Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in producing results and managing programs which contribute to and enhance accomplishment of DOE's mission.

Objectives:

1.1 Provide Effective Management and Produce Quality Services and Deliverables

Evaluation of the Objective will include consideration of performance against the ORAU Contract Performance Work Statement (PWS) activities reflective of the overall priority of each in supporting the Department's mission as well as the difficulty in managing each.

- Illness and injury surveillance - remaining tasks;
- Independent environmental assessment and verification;
- Radiation accident management;
- National security and emergency management;
- Professional and technical training;
- Science education programs; and
- Scientific and technical resource integration;

The Objective will be assigned an appropriate numerical score and corresponding letter rating (as defined in Table 1.1) by the OSO. Input from DOE HQ and other major customers will be considered in deriving the score and rating. In measuring the performance of the above Objective, the evaluator(s) will consider performance trends, accomplishments, recognition, outcomes, and continuous improvement in overall Contractor performance in achieving the Objective. Performance against planned schedules and budgets, prompt responses to customer inquiries, and maintaining effective communications with customers to include both positive and negative outcomes and/or issues will also be considered. The Contractor's performance in meeting the Notable Outcomes (when applicable) will also be addressed and considered in deriving the final score for the Objective.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	<p>In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are significant examples in which ORAU has exceeded the expectations of the objectives in significant ways through creative, new, or unconventional methods that produced results beyond that which was expected. • ORAU performance provided major advances that significantly accelerate DOE or other customer mission(s).
A	<p>In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are important examples in which ORAU exceeded the expectations of the objectives in significant ways through creative, new, or unconventional methods that produced results beyond that which was expected. • All ORAU performance was of exceptional or outstanding merit and quality. • ORAU performance had significant positive impact to DOE or other customer missions.
A-	<p>In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are important examples where ORAU exceeded the expectations of the objectives. • Significant amounts of results produced by ORAU are of exceptional or outstanding merit and quality. • ORAU performance significantly impacted DOE or other customer missions.
B+	<p>ORAU has achieved for each of the objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful execution. • Results produced by ORAU are uniformly of high merit and quality. • ORAU performance advanced DOE or other customer missions.
B	<p>ORAU has successfully executed objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORAU performance advanced DOE or other customer missions. <p>However ORAU fails to meet the conditions for B+ for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results produced by ORAU are not uniformly of high merit and quality.
B-	<p>ORAU fails to meet the conditions for B+ for at least one of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORAU has failed to successfully execute objectives but contingencies were in place such that no funding was or will be terminated, or ORAU performance did little to advance DOE or other customer missions. • Significant amounts of results produced by ORAU are not of high merit and quality.
C	<p>ORAU fails to meet the conditions for B+ for at least one of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In several significant aspects, ORAU failed to deliver on objectives using available resources such that some funding was or will be terminated, or ORAU performance failed to contribute to DOE or other customer missions. • Significant amounts of results produced by ORAU are of poor merit and quality.
D	<p>ORAU fails to meet the conditions for B+ for at least one of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple program elements at ORAU failed to deliver on objectives using available resources such that significant funding was or will be terminated. • Multiple significant amounts of results produced by ORAU are of poor merit and quality. • ORAU performance failed to contribute to DOE or other customer missions.
F	<p>ORAU fails to meet the conditions for B+ for at least one of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple program elements at ORAU failed to deliver on objectives using available resources resulting in total termination of funding. • Multiple significant amounts of results produced by ORAU are of poor merit and quality OR ORAU has been found to have engaged in gross incompetence and/or fraud. • ORAU performance failed to contribute to DOE or other customer missions.

Figure 1.1. Letter Grade Definitions

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
Goal 1.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Support to DOE Mission Accomplishment				
1.1 Provide Effective Management and Produce Quality Services and Deliverables			100%	
Goal 1.0 Total				

Table 1.1. Goal 1.0 Score Development

GOAL 2.0 N/A

GOAL 3.0 N/A

GOAL 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of ORISE, the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement, and Corporate Office involvement/commitment to the overall success of ORISE.

The weight of this Goal is 30%.

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) will consider performance trends, outcomes, and continuous improvement in overall Contractor Leadership's planning for, integration of, responsiveness to, and support for the overall success of ORISE. This may include, but is not limited to, the quality of ORISE Vision/Mission strategic planning documentation and progress in realizing ORISE's vision/mission; the ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships with the scientific and local communities, as well as private industry that advance, expand, and benefit the on-going ORISE mission(s) and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; implementation of a Robust Assurance System; ORAU's and Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; overall effectiveness of communications with DOE and other cognizant customers; understanding, management, and allocation of the costs of doing business at ORISE commensurate with associated risks and benefits; utilization of corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities to strengthen ORISE; and advancing excellence in stakeholder relations to include good corporate citizenship within the local community.

Objectives:

4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE

By which we mean the performance of ORAU's Senior Management Team as demonstrated by their ability to do such things as:

- Define an exciting yet realistic scientific vision for the future of ORISE;
- Make progress in executing strategic plans for future ORISE activities;
- Establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that maintain appropriate relations with the scientific and local communities; and
- Develop and leverage appropriate relations with academia and private industry to the benefit of ORISE and the U.S. taxpayer.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made outstanding progress (on an order of magnitude scale) over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE, and has had a demonstrable impact on the Department and the Nation. Strategic plans are of outstanding quality, have been externally recognized and referenced for their excellence, and have an impact on the vision/plans of other national laboratories. The Senior Leadership of ORAU may have been faced with very difficult challenges and plotted, successfully, its own course through the difficulty, with minimal handholding by the Department. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud ORISE in national forums, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE, and has made demonstrable positive impacts on SC and the Department. Strategic plans are of outstanding quality and recognize and reflect the vision/plans of other national laboratories. Faced with difficult challenges, actions were taken by the Senior Leadership of ORAU to redirect activities to enhance the long-term future of ORISE. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud ORISE in national forums, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A-	ORAU Senior Management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are both exciting and realistic. Decisions and actions taken by ORAU Leadership align work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. The Senior Leadership of ORAU has faced difficult challenges and successfully plotted its own course through the difficulty, with help from the Department. Partners in the scientific and local communities are supportive of ORISE.
B	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made little progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are exciting and realistic; however, DOE is not fully confident that ORAU is taking the actions necessary for the goals to be achieved. ORAU is not fully engaged with its partners/relationships in the scientific and local communities to maximize the potential benefits these relations have for ORISE.
C	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made no progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE or aligning work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are either unexciting or unrealistic. Business plans exist, but they are not linked to the strategic plan and do not inspire DOE's confidence that the strategic goals will be achieved. Partnerships with the scientific and local communities with potential to advance ORISE exist, but they may not always be consistent with the mission of or vision for ORISE. Affected communities and stakeholders are mostly supportive of ORISE and aligned with the management's vision for ORISE.
D	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made no progress or has back-slid over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE or in aligning work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are neither exciting nor realistic. Partnerships that may advance ORISE towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, or unlikely. Affected communities and stakeholders are not adequately engaged with ORISE and indicate non-alignment with DOE priorities.
F	The Senior Leadership of ORAU has made no progress or has back-slid over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE or in aligning work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are not aligned with DOE priorities or the mission of ORISE. Partnerships that may advance ORISE towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, and unlikely, and/or the Senior Management Team does not demonstrate a concerted effort to develop, leverage, and maintain relations with the scientific and local communities to assist ORISE in achieving a successful future. Affected communities and stakeholders are openly non-supportive of ORISE and DOE priorities.

Figure 4.1. Letter Grade Definitions

4.2 Management and Operation of ORISE

By which we mean the performance of ORAU's Senior Management Team as demonstrated by their ability to do such things as:

- Maintain a Contractor Assurance System which meets the requirements of the clause in Section H entitled, Contractor Assurance System;
- Understand the costs of doing business at ORISE and prioritize the management and allocation of these costs commensurate with their associated risks and benefits;
- Instill a culture of accountability and responsibility down and through the entire organization; and
- Ensure good and timely communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and DOE local offices so that DOE can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	<p>ORAU has a nationally or internationally recognized Contractor Assurance System in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk, and is working to help others in the Department establish similarly outstanding practices. ORAU understands the drivers of cost and is prioritizing and managing these costs commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. ORAU management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility, which is evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and the local DOE offices is such that the SC Laboratory System and the Department as a whole benefit.</p>
A	<p>ORAU has improved dramatically in the last year in all of the following: building a robust and transparent Contractor Assurance System that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk; demonstrating the use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with ORISE's vision and strategic plan; understanding the drivers of cost and prioritizing and managing these costs consistent with their associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System; demonstrating that ORAU Management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility which is evident down and through the entire organization; assuring communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and the local DOE offices that is beneficial to both ORISE and DOE.</p>
A-	<p>ORAU Senior Management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.</p>
B+	<p>ORAU has a robust and transparent Contractor Assurance System in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk. ORAU can demonstrate use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with ORISE's vision and strategic plan. ORAU understands the drivers of cost and is prioritizing and managing these costs commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. ORAU Management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility, which is evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and local DOE offices is such that there are no surprises or embarrassments.</p>
B	<p>ORAU has a Contractor Assurance System in place, but further improvements are necessary, or the link between the Contractor Assurance System and ORAU's decision-making processes are not evident. ORAU understands the drivers of cost, but it is not prioritizing and managing these costs, as well as they should to be commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. ORAU Management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility, which is mostly evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and local DOE offices is such that there are no significant surprises or embarrassments.</p>
C	<p>ORAU lacks a robust and transparent Contractor Assurance System in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk. ORAU cannot demonstrate use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with ORISE's vision and strategic plan. ORAU does not fully understand the drivers of cost, and thus are not prioritizing and managing these costs, as well as they should to be commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. Communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and local DOE offices is such that there has been at least one significant surprise or embarrassment.</p>
D	<p>ORAU lacks a Contractor Assurance System, does not understand the drivers of cost, and is not prioritizing and managing costs. SC HQ must intercede in management decisions. Poor communication between ORAU, SC HQ, and local DOE offices has resulted in more than one significant surprise or embarrassment.</p>
F	<p>Lack of management by ORAU's Senior Management has put the future of ORISE at risk, or has significantly hurt the reputation of SC.</p>

Figure 4.2. Letter Grade Definitions

4.3 Contractor Value-added

By which we mean the additional benefits that accrue to ORISE and DOE by virtue of having this particular contractor in place. Included here, typically, are things such as:

- Corporate involvement/contributions to deal with challenges at ORISE;
- Using corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities that strengthen ORISE; and
- Providing other contributions to ORISE to do things that are good for it and its community and that DOE cannot supply.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	ORISE has been transformed as a result of the many, substantial, additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE.
A	Over the past year, ORISE has become demonstrably stronger, better and more attractive as a place of employment as a result of the many, substantial, additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE.
A-	ORAU Senior Management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	ORISE enjoys additional benefits above and beyond those associated with managing ORISE's activities that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE.
B	ORISE enjoys few additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; help by the contractor is needed to strengthen ORISE.
C	ORISE enjoys few additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; the contractor seems unable to help ORISE.
D	ORISE enjoys few additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; the contractor's efforts are inconsistent with the interests of ORISE and the Department.
F	ORISE enjoys no additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; the contractor's efforts are counter-productive to the interests of the Department.

Figure 4.3 Letter Grade Definitions

Notable Outcomes:

- Demonstrate matured implementation of contractor assurance systems and processes to enable execution of contract requirements. (Objective 4.1)

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
Goal 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE				
4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE			25%	
4.2 Management and Operation of ORISE			45%	
4.3 Contractor Value-Added			30%	
Goal 4.0 Total				

Table 4.1. Goal 4.0 Score Development

GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor’s overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated ES&H systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of ORISE.

Objectives:

5.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program

5.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) will consider performance trends, outcomes, and continuous improvement in protecting workers, the public, and the environment. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Minimizing the occurrence of ES&H incidents;
- Effectiveness of the Integrated Safety Management System;
- Effectiveness of contractor assurance, work planning, feedback, and improvement processes;
- The strength of the safety culture throughout ORISE;
- The effective development, implementation, and maintenance of an efficient Environmental Management System; and
- The effectiveness of responses to identified hazards and/or incidents.

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection				
5.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program			60%	
5.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System			40%	
Goal 5.0 Total				

Table 5.1. Goal 5.0 Score Development

GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of ORISE Mission(s)

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of ORISE.

Objectives:

6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)

6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System and Property Management System(s)

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program

6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) will consider performance trends, outcomes, and continuous improvement in the development, deployment, and integration of foundational program (e.g., Quality, Financial Management, Acquisition Management, Requirements Management, and Human Resource Management) systems across ORISE. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Minimizing the occurrence of management systems support issues;
- Quality of work products; continual improvement and improvement driven by the results of audits, reviews, and other performance information;
- The integration of system performance metrics and trends;
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/ procedures by Contractor management and staff; and
- Benchmarking and performance trending analysis.

Notable Outcomes:

- Leverage contractor assurance system and process improvements to provide DOE high confidence in performance to allow streamlined DOE governance that minimizes risk. (Objective 6.4)

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of ORISE Mission(s)				
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			25%	
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System and Property Management System(s)			25%	
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program			20%	
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality			30%	
Goal 6.0 Total				

Table 6.1. Goal 6.0 Score Development

GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet ORISE Needs

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

This Goal evaluates the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of ORISE facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's mission(s) and complex challenges.

Objectives:

7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs

7.2 Provide Planning for and acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of ORISE Missions and Programs

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) will consider performance trends, outcomes, and continuous improvement in facility and infrastructure programs. This may include, but is not limited to:

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness;
- Effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution; day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio;
- Maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures, and components associated with ORISE's facility and land assets;
- Management of energy use and conservation practices;
- The integration and alignment of ORISE's comprehensive strategic plan and Ten-Year Site Plan with capabilities; and
- Facility planning, forecasting, acquisition, and quality of site and facility planning documents.

Notable Outcomes:

- Implement computer power management on eligible computers, monitors, and laptops by the end of calendar year 2014. (Objective 7.1)

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet ORISE Needs				
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs			50%	
7.2 Provide Planning for and acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of ORISE Missions and Programs			50%	
Goal 7.0 Total				

Table 7.1. Goal 7.0 Score Development

GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing ORISE assets that support the mission(s) of ORISE in an efficient and effective manner and providing an effective Emergency Management Program.

Objectives:

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information

8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) will consider performance trends, outcomes, and continuous improvement in the Safeguards and Security, Cyber Security, and Emergency Management Program systems. This may include, but is not limited to:

- The commitment of leadership to strong safeguards and security, cyber security, and emergency management systems;
- The integration of these systems into the culture of ORISE;
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/ procedures by Contractor management and staff;
- Maintenance and the appropriate utilization of safeguards, security, and cyber risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- The prevention and management controls and prompt reporting and mitigation of events as necessary.

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems				
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			10%	
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information			40%	
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property			50%	
Goal 8.0 Total				

Table 8.1. Goal 8.0 Score Development