

Graduate Module — Teaming, Joint Ventures & Subcontracting (GE 620)

The session-by-session teaching plan for GE 620. Follows the module contract in `modules/module-template.md`, extended to the 14-week graduate arc. The teaming canon is always at concept altitude (doctrine/08).

Audience: graduate students in the MS program. **Prerequisites:** GC 520 recommended. **Readings:** the doctrine and literacy folders, plus the course reader on teaming, affiliation, and subcontracting. **Case object:** Ravonics and real (closed) procurements.

Session 1 — Why teams win

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) name the four gaps teaming closes; (2) explain which gaps cannot be closed solo; (3) identify the gap in a case pursuit.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “What can you not do alone that a team makes possible?” - Teach (25 min): doctrine/07 + the teaming canon at concept altitude. Capability, past performance, vehicle, set-aside gates. - Apply (25 min): for a case pursuit, name the gap that makes teaming necessary and the gap that does not. - Discuss (15 min): “Which gap is the hardest to close — and why?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. When is a gap a reason to team, and when is it a reason to walk? 2. What does teaming cost that a solo bid does not?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/07. Deliverable: a gap memo for a case pursuit.

Comprehension check. What are the four gaps teaming closes? Which cannot be closed solo?

Session 2 — The posture decision

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) name the five teaming postures; (2) state what each buys and costs; (3) recommend a posture from indicators.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Prime solo, prime with subs, sub, JV, mentor-protege. Which are you?” - Teach (25 min): the teaming-posture canon at concept altitude. The postures; the indicators that point to each. - Apply (25 min): recommend a posture for a case pursuit with the indicators that drive it. - Discuss (15 min): “When is subcontracting to a rival the strongest strategic move?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What does the prime-share floor protect? 2. When does a JV make sense beyond size eligibility?

Homework / reading. Read the teaming-posture canon. Deliverable: a posture memo with indicators.

Comprehension check. What are the teaming postures? What drives the posture decision?

Session 3 — Capability-gap analysis

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) rank the required capabilities of a solicitation; (2) score a firm against them; (3) rank the gaps by closability.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Which gap is hardest to close — clearances, past performance, certs, or labor?” - Teach (25 min): the gap-analysis canon at concept altitude. The capability inputs; the scoring; the gap-closing priority. - Apply (25 min): score a case solicitation’s required capabilities against a case firm and rank the gaps. - Discuss (15 min): “Why is a clearance gap harder to close than a labor gap?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. When can a gap be closed in-house, and when must it be teamed? 2. How does the gap ranking drive the posture?

Homework / reading. Read the gap-analysis canon. Deliverable: a gap-analysis scorecard for a case pursuit.

Comprehension check. How do you rank capability gaps? What is the gap-closing priority?

Session 4 — The partner rubric

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) name the partner-rubric dimensions; (2) identify critical dimensions; (3) score and rank candidate partners.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “You need a partner. What do you check first?” - Teach (25 min): the partner-rubric canon at concept altitude. Past performance, clearances and certs, financial stability, cultural alignment, relationship, customer relationship, vehicle access; critical dimensions as knockouts. - Apply (25 min): run three candidate partners through the rubric for a case pursuit; rank and justify. - Discuss (15 min): “Which dimension is a knockout for you — and which are you willing to trade?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Why does past performance weigh heaviest? 2. When do you reject a partner who is otherwise excellent?

Homework / reading. Read the partner-rubric canon. Deliverable: a partner scorecard ranking three candidates.

Comprehension check. What are the partner-rubric dimensions? What is a critical dimension?

Session 5 — Set-aside-aware teaming

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) state the small-business participation floors; (2) design a team that meets them; (3) avoid the set-aside traps.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “You are an other-than-small prime. What does the rulebook require of your team?” - Teach (25 min): the set-aside-aware teaming canon at concept altitude + doctrine/01. Participation floors, limitations on subcontracting. - Apply (25 min): design a team that meets the participation floors for a set-aside case pursuit. - Discuss (15 min): “When does meeting the floor change the team you would otherwise build?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. Why does the prime-share floor exist? 2. How do you hit the floor without gutting the team?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/01. Deliverable: a set-aside-aware team design memo.

Comprehension check. What are the participation floors? Why do they exist?

Session 6 — Who is “small” in a team

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) explain the affiliation rules; (2) determine size status for a team; (3) identify affiliation risk.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “Two small firms team up. When are they one big firm?” - Teach (25 min): the course reader on SBA affiliation + doctrine/01. Affiliation rules; when a JV is treated as small. - Apply (25 min): determine small-business status and affiliation risk for a proposed team. - Discuss (15 min): “Why does the government care how separate two teammates really are?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What creates affiliation between teammates? 2. How does a JV stay small under the rules?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/01. Deliverable: an eligibility and affiliation-risk memo.

Comprehension check. What is affiliation? When is a JV treated as small?

Session 7 — Forms and structures

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) distinguish teaming agreement, JV, and mentor-protege; (2) choose a form from the strategy; (3) state the commitments of each.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “A handshake is not a structure. What are the forms?” - Teach (25 min): the course reader on teaming forms. Teaming agreement, JV, mentor-protege; commitments and seams. - Apply (25 min): choose the teaming form for a case pursuit and state the structural reasons. - Discuss (15 min): “What does a JV commit that a teaming agreement does not?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. When is a formal JV the right call? 2. What does a mentor-protege agreement commit both sides to?

Homework / reading. Read the course reader. Deliverable: a form-selection memo.

Comprehension check. What are the teaming forms? How do you choose among them?

Session 8 — The agreement

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) name the key clauses of a teaming agreement; (2) draft scope, commitment, exclusivity, IP, and exit; (3) state what makes an agreement worth signing.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “What does a teaming agreement have to say to be worth the paper?” - Teach (25 min): the course reader on teaming agreements. Scope, commitment, exclusivity, IP, exit. - Apply (25 min): draft the key clauses of a teaming agreement for a case partnership. - Discuss (15 min): “Which clause do firms regret most often — and why?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What should exclusivity look like in a pursuit-specific agreement? 2. How do you write an exit that does not poison the relationship?

Homework / reading. Read the course reader. Deliverable: drafted key clauses.

Comprehension check. What are the key clauses of a teaming agreement? What makes an exit clean?

Session 9 — Midterm

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students demonstrate: (1) gap analysis; (2) posture selection; (3) partner discipline; (4) set-aside correctness.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): exam logistics. - Exam (65 min): a case pursuit is distributed. Students run the full teaming decision — gap analysis, posture, partners, form, terms. - 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 — Managing the seam

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) design flow-down and performance management; (2) explain the subcontract as a governance instrument; (3) manage the daily seam.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The agreement is signed. What actually happens on Monday?” - Teach (25 min): the course reader on subcontracting. Flow-down, performance risk, the daily governance of a team. - Apply (25 min): design the flow-down and performance-management structure for a case subcontract. - Discuss (15 min): “Where do teams most often fail after the agreement is signed?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What must flow down to the subcontractor? 2. How do you manage performance risk at the seam?

Homework / reading. Read the course reader. Deliverable: a flow-down and performance-management memo.

Comprehension check. What is flow-down? Why is the subcontract a governance instrument?

Session 11 — Teaming as a displacement play

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) use teaming to displace an incumbent; (2) convert a competitor into a teammate; (3) design a team-around play.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The incumbent is unbeatable solo. What is the move?” - Teach (25 min): the incumbent-displacement and teaming canon at concept altitude. Team around the entrenched; entry via a partner’s vehicle. - Apply (25 min): design a team-around play for an entrenched-incumbent case pursuit. - Discuss (15 min): “When is the incumbent the best possible teammate?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What makes an incumbent a teaming candidate? 2. How do you team around a holder without signaling weakness?

Homework / reading. Read the displacement and teaming canon. Deliverable: a team-around displacement memo.

Comprehension check. What is a team-around play? When is the incumbent a teammate?

Session 12 — Risks: affiliation, OCI, IP

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) identify affiliation risk; (2) identify OCI risk; (3) identify IP risk; (4) mitigate all three.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The three seams that break teams: size, conflict, and who owns the work.” - Teach (25 min): doctrine/04 + the course reader on teaming risk. Affiliation, OCI, IP. - Apply (25 min): for a case team, identify the three exposures and the mitigation for each. - Discuss (15 min): “Which seam is the most common killer of a team?” - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. How does an OCI appear in a team you did not see coming? 2. Who owns the proposal’s IP when the team dissolves?

Homework / reading. Read doctrine/04. Deliverable: a team-risk memo with mitigations.

Comprehension check. What are the three team-breaking risks? How do you mitigate each?

Session 13 — Capstone exercise

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) integrate the course; (2) design a full teaming strategy; (3) defend it.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): logistics and the real (closed) pursuit. - Workshop (50 min): design a full teaming strategy — posture, partners, form, terms, set-aside posture, risk. - Peer critique (20 min): the room attacks the design. - Close (5 min): assignment.

Discussion prompts. 1. What is the weakest seam in your design? 2. Who is the partner you rejected, and why?

Homework / reading. (exercise). Deliverable: draft teaming strategy.

Comprehension check. What makes a teaming strategy defensible?

Session 14 — Synthesis

Learning objectives. By the end of this session, students can: (1) integrate gap, posture, form, terms, and risk; (2) defend a complete teaming strategy; (3) connect teaming to the degree.

Session plan (75 min). - Open (5 min): “The teaming call is the highest-leverage decision most small firms never study.” - Teach (15 min): course synthesis. - Apply (35 min): panel defense of the teaming strategies; the panel plays the partners. - Discuss (15 min): “What will you do differently about teaming after this course?” - Close (5 min): bridge to the capstone.

Discussion prompts. 1. What is the most common teaming mistake in the discipline? 2. How does teaming connect to strategy and to governance?

Homework / reading. Course synthesis. Deliverable: final teaming strategy, revised after defense.

Comprehension check. How do gap, posture, form, terms, and risk form one teaming discipline? What is the one idea you will carry forward?