

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION
OFFICE OF COMMUNICATION
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30333

REQUEST FOR TASK ORDER PROPOSAL

Date Issued: *June 30, 2005* Date Response Due: *July 28, 2005*

Questions are to be submitted via email to Helen Mitchell, hjm3@cdc.gov by July 18, 2005.

Proposals are to be submitted via email to Helen Mitchell, hjm3@cdc.gov by July 28, 2005.

Request for Task Order Proposal (RFTOP) NO.:261 CDC 34

Title: A Systematic Review and Analysis of Literature on Factors Influencing Self-rated Health or Perceptions of Quality of Life among People with Arthritis

Contract reference: This Request for Task Order Proposal is consistent with the purposes for which the NIH Public Information and Communication Services (PICS) contracts for health communication services were awarded. This RFTOP includes tasks described in the contract as Task 1, Communications Research.

Page Suggestion:

Limit proposals to no more than 20 pages. Resumes of contractor and managerial staff to be assigned to this project can be included in an appendix, and are not page-limited.

Budget format suggestion:

Please provide an itemized budget for each deliverable listed in the RFTP.

Funding Range: (check one)

- Under \$100,000
- Over \$100,000 but less than \$300,000
- Over \$300,000 but less than \$500,000
- Over \$500,000 but less than \$700,000
- Over \$700,000 but less than \$1,000,000
- Over \$1,000,000

Type of Pricing Requested: (check one)

- Cost Plus Fixed Fee
- Other (Specify) _____

Background:

Arthritis is among the most prevalent chronic conditions in the United States. Diagnosed in approximately 21% of adults, arthritis is the most common reported cause of disability and the third leading cause of work limitation in the United States.

Because arthritis and other rheumatic conditions seldom cause death but have a substantial impact on health, health-related quality of life (HRQOL) measures are better indicators of their impact than mortality rates. Findings from the *Quality of Life* module questions in the 1996–1998 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) indicate that persons with arthritis have substantially worse HRQOL than persons without arthritis, regardless of sex, age, or education level.

Healthy People 2010 addresses health related quality of life with an over-arching goal to increase quality and years of healthy life. As CDC adopts newly formulated health protection goals, individual perceptions of general health or health related quality of life will become increasingly important. For example, one of the new CDC health protection goals states that “by 2015 at least 85% of adults will rate their health as very good to excellent”.

The purpose of this task order is to use a comprehensive literature search to identify those factors that influence how people with arthritis rate their general health or health related quality of life. Specifically the Arthritis Program is seeking guidance from the literature on what factors (such as pain, activity limitation or depression among others) need to be addressed to meet the health protection goal of at least 85% of people with arthritis who rate their health as very good to excellent. This literature search can also be used to identify gaps where further research is needed.

Description of work:

This project involves data collection and article abstraction for a systematic review of the literature on factors influencing self-rated health or quality of life perceptions of people living with arthritis. While the majority of the literature is published, the vendor is encouraged to explore relevant un-published or “gray” literature as well, including meeting abstracts, unpublished abstracts, dissertations etc.)

This work will involve five phases:

Phase I is a systematic search of published and unpublished literature. This phase includes appropriate database searches (i.e., MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Collaboration, etc.) as well as manual searches of reference lists for potentially relevant articles to be included in the review. The potential terms, concepts, or phrases to be used in these searches might include, among others, arthritis;

rheumatic conditions; health related quality of life; quality of life; health status; emotional, physical, social and subjective feelings of well being that reflect an individual's subjective evaluation and reaction to arthritis or other rheumatic conditions; impact of arthritis or other rheumatic conditions on function or health status; factors influencing perceptions of quality of life.

Phase II includes entering all references in a commonly used and reliable study database (i.e., Reference Manager or Microsoft Access) and categorizing potentially relevant articles as "eligible" and "ineligible" for inclusion in the review. Ineligible articles must be entered with the complete citation and justification for exclusion.

Phase III includes abstracting relevant information from eligible articles and entering it in the database. Database entries will be supported by written documentation of the search strategies employed and search results.

Phase IV includes analyzing abstracted information from eligible articles to determine factors that influence perceptions of quality of life among people with arthritis.

Phase V includes developing a final report that summarizes the review and analysis of published literature on factors influencing quality of life perceptions among people with arthritis. The summary report will also include recommendations for key factors to focus on to improve the health perceptions of people with arthritis, and areas where additional research is needed.

Items from CDC appropriate for preparation of proposals and task completion:

- Background materials (National Arthritis Action Plan, key articles and Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Reports). All are available on the CDC Arthritis Program website <http://www.cdc.gov/arthritis/>.

Deliverables:

- A detailed work plan and supporting time line. (Due November 15, 2005)
- Draft and final descriptions of article inclusion and exclusion criteria. (Due December 31, 2005)
- Draft and final abstraction form for eligible articles. (Due January 30, 2006)
- Database of "Eligible Articles" that includes information abstracted from all eligible articles. (Due April 30, 2006)
- Database of "Ineligible Articles" that includes all ineligible articles with complete citation and justification for exclusion. NOTE: These can be combined into a single database as long as it is easily searchable by eligibility status. (Due April 30, 2006)
- Copies of eligible and ineligible articles. (Due July 30, 2006)
- Written documentation describing search strategy employed (list of search terms, databases searched, inclusion and exclusion criteria) and final review results. (Due July 30, 2006)
- A summary report detailing the findings of the literature review and analyses. (Due September 30, 2006)

- Bi-monthly progress reports that shall state in concise form the following: (a) Progress and Accomplishments - A brief outline of what was specifically accomplished during the reporting period, (b) Planned Work - A brief outline by task of what is planned for accomplishment during the next 60 days, (c) Problems - Problems or delays that the Contractor has experienced in the conduct of services and specific action that the Contractor plans to take or which should be taken by the Project Officer to alleviate the problem. (Due December 15, 2005; February 15, 2006; April 15, 2006; June 15, 2006; August 15, 2006; October 15, 2006)
- Other duties as assigned as they relate to the purposes of this task.

Period of Performance:

The performance period begins September 1, 2005 with an overall end date of April 1, 2007.

Special Clearances:

Check all that apply:

- OMB
- Human Subjects
- Privacy Act

Production Clearances:

- 524 (concept)
- 524a (audiovisual)
- 615 (printing)

Evaluation Criteria:

A. Award

This task order will be awarded to the contractor whose proposal is considered to be the most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors identified below considered. Price and technical factors will be treated equally in the evaluation. The Government will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to the Government to achieve only slightly superior performance.

B. Technical Evaluation

Technical evaluation criteria for this RFTOP are as follows:

Criteria	<u>Points or relative Value of criteria</u>
Technical Approach	<input type="checkbox"/> 30% <input type="checkbox"/>
Staffing and Management	<input type="checkbox"/> 30% <input type="checkbox"/>
Prior and Similar Experience	<input type="checkbox"/> 30% <input type="checkbox"/>
Recommendations	<input type="checkbox"/> 10% <input type="checkbox"/>

Technical Approach:

Contractors are to provide a discussion of their technical approach and products to be used for providing the services required for this task order.

Staffing and Management:

Contractors are to provide (1) a staffing plan that demonstrates their understanding of the labor requirements for this task order and the expertise necessary to complete the task; and (2) a management plan that describes their approach for managing the work, to include subcontract management if applicable. Sub-contractor expertise should be described as well.

Similar Experience:

Contractors are to describe no more than three projects that have been completed in the past three years that reflect the Contractor's organizational capacity for conducting projects similar in complexity and scope to the anticipated project within this scope of work, including Phases I and II. Contractors should also provide information reflecting experience of assigned staff that is similar in complexity and size to the anticipated project.

Examples of previous work completed should demonstrate the Contractor's ability to: 1) develop methodology for tracking news media coverage of health issues or other issues; 2) conduct content analyses, with particular emphasis on coding for reliability; 3) work collaboratively and productively with clients in conducting media tracking, content analysis, research, and related activities; and 4) provide feedback during the planning phases to assure fidelity of media surveillance, content analysis, and research to the expected project outcomes.

This criteria will be evaluated to determine appropriate experience and organizational capacity of the Contractor and assigned personnel to conduct projects similar in complexity and scope to the anticipated tasks within this scope of work.

Recommendations:

Contractors are to provide ideas and/or suggestions about creative and/or innovative ways to accomplish either the processes or products described in this task.

C. Cost Evaluation

A cost analysis of the cost proposal shall be conducted to determine the reasonableness of the contractor's cost proposal.

Proposed Technical Monitor: Lee Ann Ramsey
MS K 51
770-488-6036

Project Officer: Brittney A. Spilker, Division of Creative Services (CS)