

Graduate Module — Proposal Management & Color-Team Leadership (GE 640)

The session-by-session teaching plan for GE 640. Follows the module contract in `modules/module-template.md`, extended to the 14-week graduate arc. The proposal-management and review canon is always at concept altitude (doctrine/08); reviewer independence and finding specificity are graded. The from-storyboard-to-prose workshop lives inside the storyboarding session.

Audience: graduate students in the MS program. **Prerequisites:** GC 510 recommended. **Readings:** the doctrine and literacy folders, plus the course reader on proposal management and the review disciplines. **Case object:** Ravonics and real (closed) RFPs.

Session 1 — The proposal as a production system

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) name the roles of a proposal team; (2) build a production plan; (3) identify the production risks.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “A proposal is a factory with a deadline and a quality bar. Run it.” - Teach (25 min): doctrine/03 + the course reader on proposal management. Roles, team, schedule, page budget, risks. - Apply (25 min): build the production plan for a case proposal — roles, schedule, page budget, risks. - Discuss (15 min): “Which production risk kills most proposals?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What does the page budget discipline protect? 2. When does a proposal need a full production system vs. a lean one?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/03. Deliverable: a one-page production plan.

Comprehension check. What are the roles of a proposal team? What is the page budget?

Session 2 — Reading the solicitation as a PM

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) read Section L and Section M like a PM; (2) extract instructions and factors; (3) convert the deadline into a schedule.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “What does a PM see in an RFP that a writer does not?” - Teach (25 min): doctrine/02 + literacy/how-to-read-an-rfp. Section L, Section M, the page budget, the deadline. - Apply (25 min): extract

the instructions and evaluation factors from a real (closed) RFP. - Discuss (15 min): “Why is Section M the PM’s most important page?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What happens when Section L and Section M conflict?
2. How does the deadline become the production schedule?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/02 and literacy/how-to-read-an-rfp.
Deliverable: a Section L/M brief.

Comprehension check. What is Section L? What is Section M? How does the deadline become the schedule?

Session 3 — The compliance matrix

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) build a compliance matrix; (2) map every requirement to a response location; (3) keep it current through amendments.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Every ‘shall’ is a promise. Where is the ledger?” - Teach (25 min): the compliance-matrix canon at concept altitude + doctrine/02. The matrix as the contract with the solicitation. - Apply (25 min): build a compliance matrix for a real (closed) RFP, at least 30 rows. - Discuss (15 min): “Why does the matrix drift, and what keeps it honest?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What does a matrix row need to be worth the ink? 2. How do you track an amendment through the matrix?

Homework / reading. Read the compliance-matrix canon. Deliverable: a 30-row compliance matrix.

Comprehension check. What is a compliance matrix? Why must it stay current?

Session 4 — Storyboarding and the from-storyboard-to-prose workshop

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) explain the storyboard as a promise; (2) align a team on structure and evidence; (3) draft a section from its storyboard — opening claim, evidence, proof points, close.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The section promises a claim and the evidence that supports it. What is the promise — and what does the page have to prove?” - Teach (25 min): the storyboard canon at concept altitude, plus the prose discipline. Structure and evidence before drafting; the storyboard as the contract; the four-part section shape — opening claim, evidence, proof points,

close; the page-budget reality; the compliance-matrix-driven drafting loop (every paragraph answers a matrix row before it earns its place). - Apply (25 min): storyboard three sections of a case proposal with their evidence commitments, then draft one section from its storyboard using the four-part shape. - Discuss (15 min): “What does a storyboard catch that drafting would not — and where does prose fail a storyboard promise?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Why must the evidence be committed before the draft? 2. What happens when drafting reveals a storyboard promise that cannot be kept — and who decides the fix? 3. How does the page budget force a section to choose between claim and evidence?

Homework / reading. Read the storyboard canon and the prose-craft canon. Deliverable: three storyboarded sections, and one section drafted from its storyboard with the four-part shape.

Comprehension check. What is a storyboard? What is the evidence commitment? What are the four parts of a section draft?

Session 5 — The color-team system

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) name the color cadence; (2) state the independence rule; (3) state the finding-specificity rule.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Pink, red, gold, white-glove. Why the sequence, and why forward-only?” - Teach (25 min): the color-team canon at concept altitude + doctrine/04. Cadence, independence, specificity, roster lock. - Apply (25 min): design the review schedule for a case proposal with entry/exit criteria for each color. - Discuss (15 min): “What does reviewer independence actually protect?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Why is a skipped color a gate violation? 2. What is the cost of a reviewer who drafted the section they review?

Homework / reading. Read the color-team canon and doctrine/04. Deliverable: a review-schedule design.

Comprehension check. What is the color cadence? What are the two non-negotiable review rules?

Session 6 — Pink team

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) run a compliance and outline-integrity review; (2) classify findings; (3) write specific findings.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Pink is not about whether the section reads well. What is it about?” - Teach (25 min): the pink-team canon at concept altitude. Compliance, outline fidelity, theme presence, page budget. - Apply (25 min): run a mini pink team on a case draft; produce findings classified critical/major/minor. - Discuss (15 min): “What separates a pink-team finding from an opinion?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What is the difference between a critical and a major pink finding? 2. Why must pink precede red?

Homework / reading. Read the pink-team canon. Deliverable: a mini pink-team findings register.

Comprehension check. What does pink review? What makes a finding specific?

Session 7 — Red team

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) review from the evaluator’s stance; (2) score against Section M factors; (3) write factor-based findings.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Read the proposal the way the government will read it.” - Teach (25 min): the red-team canon at concept altitude. Evaluator stance, factor scoring, the cost-technical check. - Apply (25 min): run a mini red team — score a case draft against Section M factors and write the findings. - Discuss (15 min): “What does a red-team rating actually predict?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Why does red team matter more than pink for winning? 2. What makes a red-team finding actionable?

Homework / reading. Read the red-team canon. Deliverable: a mini red-team factor scorecard and findings.

Comprehension check. What is the evaluator stance? How do you score a factor?

Session 8 — Cost-technical reconciliation

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) reconcile the cost volume with the technical volume; (2) write a reconciliation memo; (3) identify every mismatch.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The technical volume promises a team the cost volume does not price. Which wins?” - Teach (25 min): the reconciliation canon at concept altitude + doctrine/05. The price as the proposal

in money; the memo as the audit. - Apply (25 min): reconcile a case cost volume with its technical volume; state every mismatch. - Discuss (15 min): “Why does a mismatch block a red-team exit?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Where do cost and technical volumes most often drift? 2. What does a clean reconciliation prove to the customer?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/05. Deliverable: a reconciliation memo.

Comprehension check. What is cost-technical reconciliation? Why must the memo be signed?

Session 9 — Midterm

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students demonstrate: (1) evaluator-stance review; (2) factor scoring; (3) finding specificity.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): exam logistics. - Exam (65 min): a case draft is distributed. Students run a red-team review in 75 minutes — factor scores, findings, and the cost-technical check. - Close (5 min): what to review for the second half.

Discussion prompts. n/a (examination).

Homework / reading. Review weeks 1–8. Deliverable: midterm submission.

Comprehension check. n/a.

Session 10 — Gold team

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) run an executive submission decision; (2) weigh compliance, pricing, and residual risk; (3) write the submission recommendation.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Submit, revise, or withdraw. The executive decision.” - Teach (25 min): the gold-team canon at concept altitude + doctrine/04. Compliance posture, pricing posture, residual risk, confidence to perform. - Apply (25 min): for a case proposal, write the submission recommendation with the residual-risk posture. - Discuss (15 min): “What does the gold team have to know that red did not tell it?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. When should gold overrule red? 2. What is the difference between a revise and a withdraw?

Homework / reading. Read the gold-team canon and doctrine/04. Deliverable: a gold-team submission memo.

Comprehension check. What does gold decide? What is residual risk?

Session 11 — White-glove and production

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) run the final production pass; (2) build the final-48-hours checklist; (3) manage the submission deadline.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The content is done. The proposal can still die in production.” - Teach (25 min): the white-glove and submission canon at concept altitude. Formatting, the last compliance sweep, the submission checklist, the two-deadline discipline. - Apply (25 min): build the final-48-hours checklist for a case proposal. - Discuss (15 min): “What is the most common production failure at submission?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Why does the deadline have a buffer? 2. What must be checked in the last hour?

Homework / reading. Read the white-glove and submission canon. Deliverable: a final-48-hours checklist.

Comprehension check. What is white-glove? What is the two-deadline discipline?

Session 12 — Review leadership

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) run a review where writers push back; (2) defend a finding; (3) keep the roster discipline.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The writer says your finding is wrong. Now what?” - Teach (25 min): the review-leadership canon at concept altitude. Specificity, roster lock, escalation of findings to owners. - Apply (25 min): role-play a review where the writers push back on the findings. - Discuss (15 min): “How do you hold a review’s discipline without breaking the team?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What do you do when a finding is challenged? 2. How do you escalate an unresolved finding?

Homework / reading. Read the review-leadership canon. Deliverable: a review-leadership memo.

Comprehension check. What is finding specificity? How do you keep roster discipline?

Session 13 — The retrospective

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) design a proposal retrospective; (2) capture the lessons; (3) feed the learning loop.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The proposal is submitted. The learning begins.” - Teach (25 min): doctrine/03 + doctrine/07. The retrospective as the learning-loop input, not the blame exercise. - Apply (25 min): design the retrospective protocol for a case proposal after submission. - Discuss (15 min): “What does a retrospective need to capture to change the next proposal?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What is the difference between a retrospective and a post-mortem blame session? 2. Who owns the lessons, and where do they go?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/03 and doctrine/07. Deliverable: a retrospective protocol.

Comprehension check. What is a proposal retrospective? How does it feed the learning loop?

Session 14 — Synthesis

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) integrate production, review, and learning; (2) defend a complete proposal-management doctrine; (3) connect to the degree.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The proposal is a production system, and the review is its quality gate.” - Teach (15 min): course synthesis. - Apply (35 min): panel defense of the proposal-management doctrines; the panel probes the review leadership. - Discuss (15 min): “What will you run differently after this course?” - Close (5 min): bridge to the capstone.

Discussion prompts. 1. What is the most common proposal-management failure in the discipline? 2. How does proposal management connect to strategy and finance?

Homework / reading. Course synthesis. Deliverable: final memo, “My proposal-management doctrine.”

Comprehension check. How do production, review, and learning form one discipline? What is the one idea you will carry forward?