

SECTION A

BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS, INFORMATION AND CONDITIONS

This request for proposal (RFP) is issued by Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC).

ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

A proposal indicates that the Bidder agrees to be bound by the instructions, information and conditions in their entirety as they appear in this RFP. No other terms and conditions included in the Bidder's proposal will be applicable to the resulting contract notwithstanding the fact that the Bidder's proposal may become part of the resulting contract.

ENQUIRIES REGARDING THE BID SOLICITATION

To ensure the integrity of the competitive bid process, enquiries and other communication regarding this procurement are to be directed **only** to the Contracting Authority. Enquiries and other communication are not to be directed to any other government official(s). Failure to comply with this condition during the solicitation period may (for that reason alone) result in the disqualification of the proposal.

Enquiries **MUST** be received **no later than five calendar days** prior to bid closing date to allow sufficient time to provide a response. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered prior to the bid closing date.

To ensure consistency and quality of information provided to Bidders, provision will be made to provide, simultaneously to all Bidders to which this RFP has been sent, any information with respect to significant inquiries received and the replies to such inquiries without revealing the sources of the enquiries.

PROPOSAL COSTS

No payment shall be made for costs incurred in the preparation and submission of a proposal in response to this RFP.

No costs incurred before receipt of a signed contract or specified written authorization from the Contracting Authority can be charged to any resultant contract.

REVISIONS

After the RFP closing date, no revisions to the proposal will be accepted. During the evaluation, members of the Evaluation Team may, at their discretion, submit questions or conduct interviews with Bidders to obtain clarifications.

APPLICABLE LAWS

Any resulting contract shall be interpreted and governed, and the relations between the Parties determined, by the laws in force in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The Bidder may, at its discretion, substitute the applicable laws of a Canadian province or territory of its choice without affecting the validity of its proposal, by deleting the name of the Canadian province or territory specified and inserting the name of the Canadian province or territory of its choice. If no change is made, it acknowledges that the applicable laws specified are acceptable to the Bidder.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

Payment shall be made within thirty (30) days following the date on which an invoice and substantiating documentation are received according to the terms of the contract.

INVOICING INSTRUCTIONS

The invoice **MUST** clearly state the date, contract number and the description of work. Any amount to be levied against Her Majesty in respect of the GST/HST is to be shown separately on all invoices for goods supplied or services provided and will be paid by the Government of Canada. The Bidder agrees to remit any GST/HST paid or due to CRA.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals to be submitted by e-mail or facsimile to the following:

Madeleine.breau

e-mail: madeleine.breau@servicecanada.gc.ca

or by fax : 819-994-4127

TERMS OF REFERENCE / STATEMENT OF WORK

1. Research Project Title: Rural and urban differences: The experiences of people with disabilities (employment, migration, supports and services, and formal/informal caregiving) 7614-08-0011.

2. Closing Date:

This RFP will close on: **February 19, 2009**. Proposals will not be accepted after **16:00 (EST / EDT)**.

3. Purpose of Research Project:

The purpose of this RFP is to seek proposals for a research project that will develop a more comprehensive understanding of the experience of people with disabilities living in rural environments and to encourage research that fully exploits statistical tools in the analysis of the 2006 Participation and Activity Limitation Survey (PALS 2006). Ultimately, this project will be used to establish a baseline for the understanding the experience of people with disabilities living in rural environments and how this differs from the experience of people with disabilities living in urban environments. This research will contribute to the development of research, knowledge and policies that work toward the full inclusion of people with disabilities and the advancement of the status of all people with disabilities, including those who live in rural Canada.

The objective of this proposed project is to identify and compare differences between the rural and urban experiences of Canadians with disabilities using the PALS 2006 data. This project will focus on at least two areas of interest pertaining to rural communities. Some possible areas of interest include: employment, migration, supports and services, and formal/informal caregiving. This project will help inform policies that are developed for people with disabilities meet the needs of those living in rural environments in urban environments.

4. Background:

Creating accessible communities and providing disability supports is integral to achieving the full participation of Canadians with disabilities. The full inclusion of people with disabilities requires action at two levels: the societal level, through the reduction or elimination of environmental barriers that affect the lives of people with disabilities and prevent their full inclusion in society, and the personal level, through improvement of the availability of disability supports that meet individual needs, further participation and maximize independence. People who live in rural environments can face longer travel distances from formal services, such as hospitals and rehabilitation centres, which are typically strategically located in more urban environments with higher population density. As a result, people with disabilities who live in rural environments may have different experiences from people with disabilities who live in more urban environments, with regards to a number of life experiences that are affected by disability status. For example, access to supports and services and to caregivers are anticipated to be different for people living in rural environments and people living in more urban environments. Before the needs of all

people with disabilities can be met, an understanding of any differences that may exist between people with disabilities living in rural environments and people with disabilities living in urban environments is necessary.

ODI is committed to developing knowledge on disability issues that can inform policy and program development and build awareness.¹ ODI acknowledges the need for research that is relevant to people with disabilities at a national level; there is consensus on the need for focused research to fill key gaps in knowledge that are preventing progress in policy development for people with disabilities.²

Through its policies and initiatives, the Government of Canada is continually working to promote the full participation of all Canadians. By providing support and funding for PALS 2006, the Government of Canada is addressing the need to ensure the full social inclusion of people with disabilities and is continuing its historically important role in building a comprehensive knowledge base on disability. PALS 2006 is a post-censal, national survey designed to collect information on adults and children who have a disability. Funded by HRSDC and conducted by Statistics Canada, PALS 2006 provides information on the prevalence of various types of disabilities, the supports for people with disabilities, their employment profile, their income and their participation in society.

PALS 2006 is the only source of detailed, disability-specific information on many important aspects of the lives of Canadians with disabilities—for example, providing valuable information on changing requirements and identifying unmet needs for supports and services requisite to fully participating in society. Linking Census 2006 data to PALS 2006 data allows for the identification and analysis of differences between people with disabilities living in rural areas and people with disabilities living in urban areas.

A gap exists in understanding the needs and experiences of people with disabilities living in rural environments in Canada. There are presently no baseline analyses available to the Government of Canada that measure the status of disability supports, employment, and income for people with disabilities living in rural Canadian regions. The experiences of all Canadians, with and without disabilities, differ depending on the rurality³ of their physical and social environments.⁴ These differences in experience greatly affect policy development that fully supports people with disabilities who live in rural, under-researched environments. In order to effectively support all Canadians with disabilities, a national portrait of Canadian rural/urban differences is needed. This proposed research will deliver baseline data highlighting the unmet needs of people with disabilities living in rural communities.

People with disabilities experience challenges that are different from those faced by the general population. Rural living has been shown to differentially affect the general population in terms of

¹ ODI Strategic Plan 2002-2007

² ODI Strategic Plan 2002-2007

³ There is no clear consensus on the definitions of “rural” and “rurality”. In 1997, Eugene Leduc of University of British Columbia, proposed a “General Practice Rurality Index for Canada” within the context of health care provision to be used to establish a standard of comparison that could be used by researchers, educators, administrators and rural physicians. Available online at: http://www.cma.ca/index.cfm/ci_id/37440/la_id/1.htm

⁴ See Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin, Vol. 7, No. 4 (January 2008). Available online at: <http://www.statcan.ca/bsolc/english/bsolc?catno=21-006-XIE#formatdisp>

its youth population, employment, income, and health.⁵ Additionally, people with disabilities have been shown to have lower employment rates and incomes on a national level than people without disabilities.⁶ The interplay between these variables likely significantly influences the experience of disability in rural environments. However, there is presently a lack of research exploring differences between the experiences of disability in rural and urban environments.

This research gap may be partially explained by the lack of common consensus on the definition of the terms “rural” and “rurality.” Different researchers use different benchmarks to define rural. The ODI has identified some researchers whose work on rural experiences is of particular interest. Please refer to Appendix A for a brief review the ODI has completed on definitions of “rural” and “rurality”. In undertaking this research, the contractor will be required to review possible benchmarks for defining “rural” and “rurality,” being sure to include research specifically identified by the ODI. On consultation with the project authority, the contractor will select the most appropriate operational definition of “rural” – compatible with the information available through PALS 2006 – to be applied for data analysis purposes.

This lack of research has resulted in numerous unanswered questions concerning the status of disability in such communities. For example, it is known that Canadians living in rural environments generally experience higher accident rates and higher levels of disability⁷ than Canadians living in urban environment and that the unemployment rate for Canadians with disabilities is significantly higher than for Canadians without disabilities (10.7% versus 7.1%),⁸ but there is no available information on the relationships between employment, income and disability in rural Canada. Moreover, increased travel distances, shortages of medical specialists, lack of transportation, limited employment opportunities, and the migration of young people have been identified as strong influences on rural life, but the effects of these factors on the lives of people with disabilities has yet to be examined. From a public policy perspective, this means that baseline data highlighting the experience and unmet needs of people with disabilities in rural Canada is needed in order to inform policy development.

⁵ The Health of Canadians – The Federal Role (Interim Report). January 2002. Volume Two: Current Trends and Future Challenges. The Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology. Chair: The Honourable Michael J.L. Kirby. Deputy Chair: The Honourable Marjory LeBreton Available online at: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/37/1/parlbus/commbus/senate/com-e/soci-e/rep-e/repjan01vol2-e.htm>

⁶ Disability in Canada: A 2001 Profile.

⁷ Pong, R. W., Pitblado, J. R., & Irvine, A. (2002). A strategy for developing environmental health indicators for rural Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 93 (supplement), S53-S56. Available online at: http://www.cranhr.ca/pdf/CJPH_2002.pdf

⁸ Williams, C. (February 2006). Disability in the workplace. *Perspectives* (Statistics Canada). Available online at: <http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/75-001-XIE/10206/art-2.pdf>

5. Research Project Requirements:

Upon initiation of this research project, an operational definition of “rural” and “urban” environments shall be arrived at with consultation with and approval by the Office for Disability Issues.

This research project shall examine and compare a number of disability factors by rural versus urban environments. The following two research questions shall be answered:

- (I) What are the physical characteristics of rural versus urban environments where people with disabilities reside?
 - i) Additionally, are there notable physical differences between rural and urban environments that have particular implications for people with disabilities? (For example, are people with disabilities living in rural environments more likely to report encountering accessibility barriers?)
- (II) What are the personal characteristics of people with disabilities residing in rural versus urban environments?
 - ii) In particular, what proportion of people living in rural environments report disabilities? Does the rural disability rate differ from urban disability rate? What are the characteristics of type and severity of disabilities in rural versus urban environments? How does the disability rate change with age in rural versus urban environments?

In addition, this proposed research shall answer a minimum of one of the following research questions:

- (I) How do employment characteristics (including occupation and industry) of people with disabilities differ in rural versus urban environments?
- (II) What are the migration patterns to and from rural/urban environments by people with disabilities?
 - i) In particular, do people with disabilities migrate away from rural/urban environments specifically because of their disabilities? (For example, to be closer to health services or to live in a more accessible environment.)
- (III) What supports and services are available to people with disabilities in rural versus urban environments?
 - i) Additionally, what supports and services are accessed? Are there supports and services that are needed but not available? Are there notable differences in availability of supports and services in rural versus urban environments?
- (IV) What are the characteristics of formal and informal caregiving for people with disabilities residing in rural versus the characteristics in urban environments?

- i) Additionally, are there notable differences in caregiving characteristics in rural versus urban environments?

These research questions must be answered using univariate, bivariate and/or multivariate regression analysis of the PALS 2006 data.

The research project is to be divided into five parts: (a) selection of the most appropriate definitions of “rural” and “urban” as applicable and identifiable within the PALS 2006 and Census 2006 data; (b) a thematic review of the Canadian and international literatures on rural/urban issues and on rural/urban differences for people with disabilities; (c) analysis PALS 2006 data using univariate, bivariate and/or multivariate regression; (d) authorship of a synthesis paper that presents a comparison of the rural/urban experiences of people with disabilities based on PALS data; and (e) presentation of research findings. The contractor shall undertake the following:

a. Review and selection of operational definitions:

The contractor shall examine existing literature and research on the defining of “rural”, “urban”, and degrees of “rurality”. As limited research has been completed examining disability-related factors in the context of rurality, the contractor will have to identify the most useful operational definitions of “rural” and “urban” to be applied in a disability context. As this research project is restricted to the variables available in the PALS 2006 and Census 2006 data, the contractor will have to ensure that the operational definitions chosen can be fully implemented within this project.

The contractor shall prepare a review paper no longer than 10 pages in length discussing the most common and the most useful definitions of “rural” and “urban”. The review paper shall analyze the usefulness and applicability of the possible definitions within the context of PALS 2006 disability research.

b. Literature review:

This review is to examine the existing literature and research on the particular needs of people with disabilities specific to rural/urban environments. Research that compares rural/urban experiences should be presented, as well as research that compares the differences between people with and without disabilities within and across these two geographic environments. The literature review shall, wherever possible, discuss Canadian research, but will extend to the international literature and research where appropriate. As there is limited Canadian research on this subject area, any and all relevant Canadian research must not be omitted from this review.

The review should be written as a thematic review no longer than 20 pages in length and accompanied by a 2-3 pages summary of the emerging themes (noting the references that pertain to each theme).

PALS data analysis:

The contractor will complete data analyses examining the retirement of Canadians with disabilities using PALS 2006 data and, where applicable, PALS 2001 data.

(A) *Conducting statistical data analyses:* The contractor will conduct univariate, bivariate and/or multivariate data analyses on PALS 2006, PALS 2001 and may also include analysis of Census data, as appropriate. They must specify and justify the method of analysis chosen in their proposal.

(B) *PALS sampling:* PALS data is collected and disseminated by Statistics Canada and is therefore reliable in its sampling methods.⁹ The 2006 sampling methods differed slightly from those of 2001. The major difference involves a change in coverage resulting from the 2006 inclusion of a number of aboriginal communities, the addition of the three territories, and the modification to the definition of collective dwellings. Therefore, it is crucial for the contractor to be aware that sample adjustments will need to be made before a comparison between the two surveys is possible.

All output files of data analyses conducted for the project shall be compiled in a separate document from the synthesis paper for review prior to inclusion in the synthesis paper.

c. Synthesis paper:

The contractor shall prepare a synthesis paper approximately 35-45 pages in length. This paper shall be based on the literature review and PALS data analysis. This paper must not be simply a summary or description of PALS data. The synthesis paper should be organized into themes that correspond to the target areas outlined above (e.g., characteristics of rural/urban communities, characteristics of people with disabilities, and supports and services). Ultimately, this paper will be used to establish a baseline for the status of people with disabilities living in rural environments. This synthesis paper will contribute to the development of research, knowledge, and policies that work toward full inclusion of people with disabilities and advancement of the status of people with disabilities who are most marginalized.

d. Presentation of preliminary research:

The contractor shall prepare and deliver a PowerPoint presentation of key disability-research findings at a national symposium, conference, or colloquium by March 31, 2010. The presentation should include a discussion of the literature, an explanation of the methods, and a discussion of the findings of the PALS 2006 data analyses.

6. Budget:

The cost of the project shall not exceed the available budget of \$45,957 (including GST, any RDC access fees and any travel and accommodation expenses related to the presentation.

⁹ For more information on PALS sampling methods, refer to Participation and Activity Limitation Survey 2006: Technical and methodological report ([89-628-X2007001](#))

An amount of \$3957.00 will be paid to the contractor to cover the costs of accessing data at a Statistics Canada Research Data Centre (RDC).

An amount of up to \$2,000 (including GST) will be available for any travel and accommodation expenses related to the final presentation deliverable as per Federal Government (Treasury Board) guidelines.

http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/hrpubs/TBM_113/menu-travel-voyage_e.asp

7. Schedule of Deliverables and Payments :

In undertaking the project, the contractor must produce the following deliverables:

Date	Event/Deliverable	Percent of total contract*
Upon signing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial (in-person or telephone) meeting with the Project Authority 	
May 4, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • draft of literature review • Proposed data analysis schedule and methodology 	5%
August 28, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed comparative data analysis • Completed literature review 	15%
November 2, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of penultimate draft of synthesis paper according to guidelines 	20%
January 15, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of final synthesis paper with revisions based on peer review according to guidelines 	50%
No later than March, 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Power Point presentation at a conference or equivalent event (no later than March31, 2010) 	10%

*i.e., total of professional service fees in contract

Payments will be based on the deliverables. Payment will be made within 30 days after receipt of an invoice and upon acceptance of each deliverable by the Project Authority after review and edits.

8. Contract Terms and Conditions:

Copyright & intellectual property: Intellectual property will remain with the contractor, but no publication based upon this work should be released without notifying HRSDC prior to its release. HRSDC requests the contractor allow HRSDC to publish the document on the internet as part of a series of reports commissioned through HRSDC.

Language requirements: The report should be produced in English or French.

Work environment: HRSDC will **not** provide an office for the completion of this contract.

Contractor's role: The contractor will commence work upon signature of the contract and must complete the presentation by March 31, 2010. The contractor's role is to perform according to the project requirements and detailed description of work and deliver the acceptable deliverables to the project authority by the specified dates outlined as per the schedule of events.

If a member of the team (including a sub-contractor) is replaced after the contract is signed, the contractor must advise the contract authority immediately in writing and provide the name and CV of the proposed replacement to justify their competence. Failing to do so may result in the termination of the contract.

Other: HRSDC reserves the right to withdraw or amend the terms of this RFP at any time.

9. Communications:

Prospective bidders may direct questions about this RFP to the contract authority. Any questions must be posed in writing, and all questions and answers will be shared with all known prospective bidders.

10. Proposal Requirements:

Proposals considered for contract award will:

- Provide a succinct project description and contextualize the proposed research.
- Demonstrate a clear understanding of the range of outcome areas to be investigated for people with disabilities living in rural environments and propose a statistical analysis framework for measuring differences between people with disabilities living in rural/urban environments.
- Include a description of the research methodology to be utilized.
- Provide a detailed statement of the work planned for carrying out this project, including the identification of specific outputs and a schedule for their completion.
- Submit a detailed statement of their estimated costs associated with the proposed work, including professional fees and other incidentals.

- Provide an outline of the activities to be carried out by each contractor and sub-contractor involved in the project, along with the estimated time spent by the staff on each component of the project. These activities should be appropriate to the requirements of this RFP.
- Provide CVs for all members of the research team along with the estimated time to be spent by specific staff on each component of the paper. These activities should be appropriate to the requirements of this RFP.
- Provide details concerning past experience with conducting statistical analyses, as well as research conducted disability issues and/or research on rural/urban issues; and
- Provide samples of at least 3 documents completed within the past 10 years (with at least 2 documents being completed within the last 5 years) which clearly demonstrate the bidders' ability to conduct quantitative research and write a synthesis paper based upon research that they have conducted. The bidders may provide web-site addresses; machine readable files; or hard copies of these documents.

11. Selection Criteria:

a) Mandatory requirements:

M-1 The principal analyst(s) must have a minimum of 2 years experience in the areas of disability and/or rural and urban research.

M-2 The principal analyst(s) must have a minimum of 2 years team experience with quantitative research methods.

M-3 The proposed budget shall not exceed budget constraints.

M-4 The Bidder's proposed personnel, including subcontractors, who require access to PROTECTED information, assets or work site(s) must **be a citizen of Canada** and each hold a valid **RELIABILITY STATUS** at the level of **PROTECTED B** granted and approved by Canadian and International Industrial Security Division (CIISD), Public Works and Government Services Canada **at time of contract award.**

b) Rated requirements:

Proposals will be assessed and awarded points to a maximum of 100 for the technical merit of the proposal and the contractor qualifications. The relative importance of certain criteria is reflected in the selection matrix in Appendix A.

Proposals will also be assessed on their proposed price.

Basis of selection:

- A minimum score of seventy (70) percent is required in each rated criteria of the technical sections and the contractor qualifications sections of the proposal ratings. Proposals that do not meet the minimum 70 percent in each rated criteria will not be considered for contract award. **See Appendix A for the evaluation criteria (technical and contractor qualifications sections).**
- The compliant bidder with the highest combined rating of technical merit (combination of technical sections and contractor qualifications sections) (weighted at 80%) and price (weighted at 20%) shall be selected as the preferred researcher(s) to implement the project. See the example table below for the method to be applied to obtain final ratings.

Example of Best Value Determination			
	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Technical Merit Points	91	88	80
Price Quoted	\$50,000	\$40,000	\$47,000
CALCULATION			
	Technical Points	Rated Price Points	Total Points
Bidder 1	$\frac{91 \times 80}{* 91} = 80.00$	$\frac{**40 \times 20}{50} = 16.00$	96.00
Bidder 2	$\frac{88 \times 80}{* 91} = 77.36$	$\frac{**40 \times 20}{40} = 20.00$	97.36
Bidder 3	$\frac{80 \times 80}{* 91} = 70.32$	$\frac{**40 \times 20}{47} = 17.02$	87.34
* Represents the highest technical score			
** Represents the lowest priced proposal			

Assumption: Three valid bids have been received. The maximum technical score that can be obtained is 100 points. The highest technical score and lowest price proposal received ‘full rated’ percentage and other proposals are pro-rated accordingly.

The winner is the bidder scoring the highest total points established by adding the technical points and the rated price points. Based on the above calculation, a contract would be awarded to Bidder 2, who attained the highest total score taking into consideration the technical merit and proposed price.

- Final awards will be decided by HRSDC upon completion of the review process. All bidders will be informed of the decision.

**Appendix A
Selection Criteria Points**

Criteria	Total Points	Min. Pts Awarded
TECHNICAL SECTION		
<p>Demonstrated Understanding of Project Requirements & Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidders should demonstrate their understanding of the project requirements and objectives while situating the proposal within existing research and literature on the topic. (maximum 10 points) 		7
<p>References Illustrative of Research Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals will be rated on their use of illustrative references in the proposal. Bidders are encouraged to reference all material used to assist in writing the proposal and may choose to add additional titles that will be referenced in the synthesis paper but have not been used for writing the proposal. (maximum 10 points) 		7
<p>Completeness & Clarity of the Work Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of the proposal will be based on whether all project requirements outlined in the RFP have been addressed in the work plan and the overall clarity with which they have been addressed. Points will be awarded for well organized and clearly presented proposals. (maximum 10 points) 		7
<p>Proposed Methodological Approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidders should thoroughly describe the methodological approaches to be used in the research and provide an understanding of how such approaches will meet the project objectives. Bidders should elaborate on the steps to be followed within the process of conducting this research. This should include a framework outlining the bidder's methods for selecting appropriate literature for the review. This should also include a detailed description of the methodological steps proposed for the statistical data analysis (for example: securing access to PALS 2006 data and Census 2006 data). (maximum 15 points) 		10.5
<p>Level of Effort & Schedule for Deliverables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals will be evaluated on the level of work allocated to each individual project member and on the schedule for completion of all major deliverables. Proposals should provide sufficient detail to assist the evaluators in determining how the tasks and activities necessary to achieve the project objectives will be carried out. The plan should outline the dates scheduled for completion of all major components of the project and the level of work to be dedicated by each project member to each deliverable (literature review, draft report, final report, PowerPoint presentation, etc.). (maximum 5 points) 		3.5
TOTAL TECHNICAL SECTION		35

CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SECTION		
<p>Relevant Research Experience Bidders should provide evidence of expertise in the gathering, analysis & synthesis of information particularly as it pertains to the subject area. A Curriculum Vitae and relevant experience for each research team member, including staff members and/or sub-contractors, who will be participating in the project should be included with the proposal. Assessment will be based on the quality of previous work completed when conducting similar types of projects over the last 10 years. Bidders must demonstrate skill, knowledge, and expertise with and expertise in conducting research in the area of people with disabilities and/or rural/urban research. (maximum 25 points)</p>		17.5
<p>Relevant Writing Experience Bidders should provide details of relevant experience and competencies that clearly demonstrate the bidder's experience in conducting, analyzing, and writing up research of this type. Bidders should be able to provide at least 3 documents completed within the past 10 years (with at least 2 documents being completed within the last 5 years) which clearly demonstrate these capacities. The documents should provide a clear indication of the bidder's ability to write a synthesis paper based upon quantitative research they have conducted. The bidder may provide web-site addresses; machine-readable files or hard copies of these documents. Bidders will be rated on the quality of the body of work completed in satisfying goals similar to that of this project as well as their relevance/aptness to the task at hand. (maximum 25 points)</p>		17.5
TOTAL CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SECTION		35
Total Technical Merit		70

TECHNICAL SECTION

a) Demonstrated Understanding of Project Requirements & Objectives:

(maximum 10 points)

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 5 pts)
Good	(up to 7 pts)
Very good	(up to 8.5 pts)
Excellent	(up to 10 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Requirement

- **Not addressed:** Information is missing.
- **Fair:** Basic understanding of project requirements and objectives. Some information presented contains a significant error (i.e. inaccurate, outdated and/or irrelevant).
- **Good:** Satisfactory understanding of project requirements and objectives. The majority of the information is accurate and current and only a small amount of information contains an error. Almost all of the information provided is relevant.
- **Very:** A good understanding of the project requirements and objectives is demonstrated. All of the information is accurate and current and contains no significant errors. A small amount of irrelevant information is included in the proposal.

- **Excellent:** Sophisticated, knowledgeable and insightful understanding of project requirements and objectives. All information presented is accurate, current and relevant.

b) References Illustrative of Research Review:

(maximum 10 points)

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 5 pts)
Good	(up to 7 pts)
Very good	(up to 8.5 pts)
Excellent	(up to 10 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Requirement

- Points will be awarded based on the breadths, depth and relevance of reference material provided, up to a maximum of 15 points. Bibliographic references must be related to the subject area in order to be awarded credit.

c) Completeness and Clarity of the Project Plan:

(maximum 10 points)

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 5 pts)
Good	(up to 7 pts)
Very Good	(up to 8.5 pts)
Excellent	(up to 10 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Completeness

- **Not addressed:** Information is missing.
- **Fair:** Limited understanding of analysis required. Some information presented contains a significant error (i.e. inaccurate, outdated and/or irrelevant).
- **Good:** Satisfactory understanding of analysis required for each research questions. None of the information presented contains a significant error (i.e. inaccurate, outdated and/or irrelevant).
- **Very Good:** Comprehensive understanding of analysis demands demonstrated for each research question. The majority of information is accurate and current, and does not contain significant errors.
- **Excellent:** Sophisticated understanding of analysis required for each research question. The plan provides a thorough and in depth description of how to meet the objectives. All information presented is accurate, current and relevant.

d) Proposed Methodological Approach:

(maximum 15 points):

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 6 pts)
Good	(up to 9 pts)
Very Good	(up to 12 pts)

Excellent

(up to 15 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Proposed Methodological Approach:

- **Not addressed**: No information on the methodological approach to be used is provided in the proposal.
- **Fair**: Proposed methods are significantly lacking in its description. Multiple major questions remain around the methods. The proposal lacks details around important steps in the process.
- **Good**: The description of the methods is adequate; however, at least two significant questions remain around the methods to be employed.
- **Very Good**: The description of the methods is good; however, there may be some details regarding some important steps in the process that are missing or weak and/or there may be a number of small questions remaining around the methods to be employed.
- **Excellent**: The description of the methods is clearly articulated with all important steps being addressed with significant detail.

e) Level of Effort & Schedule for Deliverables:

(maximum 5 points):

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 2 pts)
Good	(up to 3 pts)
Very Good	(up to 4 pts)
Excellent	(up to 5 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Level of Effort & Schedule for Deliverables:

- **Not addressed**: No information on level of effort and/or deliverable dates provided in the proposal.
- **Fair**: The level of effort outline is unrealistic for project completion. More than one major deliverable is missing from the plan or the timeframe allotted for completion of deliverables is unrealistic.
- **Good**: A satisfactory level of effort is allocated for project completion. Either one major deliverable is missing from the plan or allotted a somewhat unrealistic amount of time.
- **Very Good**: A realistic and reliable level of effort is allocated to each section of the project. No major deliverables are missing from the plan.
- **Excellent**: The level of effort allocated to project completion exceeds expectations. No deliverables are missing from the plan. Time and resources allocated to each section of the project are realistic. Either additional minor milestones may have been included in the plan and/or there is some allowance built into the schedule and work plan for possible difficulties that may arise during data analyses.

CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATIONS SECTION

a) Relevant Research Experience:

(maximum 25 points)

Relevant experience and proven capability as evidenced by similar and/or related work performed by the contractor. Assessment is based on the quality of examples provided.

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 8.5 pts)
Good	(up to 14.5 pts)
Very Good	(up to 20.5 pts)
Excellent	(up to 25 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Research Experience

- **Not addressed**: Information is missing.
- **Fair**: Body of research is mostly irrelevant or unrelated to the topic.
- **Good**: Body of research is important and has a few irrelevant or unrelated pieces.
- **Very Good**: Body of research is important and has no irrelevant or unrelated pieces of work but most work is indirectly related to research topic.
- **Excellent**: Body of research is extensive and has no irrelevant or unrelated pieces of work and most work is directly relevant to research project.

b) Relevant Writing Experience:

(maximum 25 points)

Not addressed	(0 pts)
Fair	(up to 8.5 pts)
Good	(up to 14.5 pts)
Very Good	(up to 20.5 pts)
Excellent	(up to 25 pts)

Subjective Rating Criteria for Writing Experience

- **Not addressed**: No information on experience writing research papers and synthesizing quantitative research projects is provided in the proposal.
- **Fair**: Examples provided demonstrate little quality experience in writing research papers in the areas of people with disabilities or rural/urban issues
- **Good**: Examples provided demonstrate some quality experience in writing research papers in the areas of people with disabilities or rural/urban issues. Examples demonstrate a good ability to write final research papers.
- **Very Good**: Examples provided demonstrate good quality experience in writing research papers in areas of people with disabilities or rural/urban issues for various audiences. Examples provided demonstrate good ability to write research papers based upon quantitative research.
- **Excellent**: Examples provided demonstrate significant quality experience writing research papers in the areas of people with disabilities or rural/urban issues for various audiences and demonstrate excellent ability to write research papers based upon quantitative research.

Appendix B Presentation of Research Findings

The final report must be provided in the following formats:

- Two electronic versions of the report - one in MS Word and one in Adobe portable document format (pdf), including the source files of all electronic images, e.g. graphs, photographs, tables and images, included in the document (minimum 4X5, 300 dpi);
- a .pdf file of the completed document, and;
- a .doc source file for the text source files for all graphics.

The final report must include:

- An abstract (of no more than 200 words outlining the most significant information contained in the report);
- An executive summary (1-5 pages in length describing the purpose and scope of the document, research methods and data sources, results, conclusions and key research gaps);
- A table of contents;
- A list of figures;
- A list of tables, and;
- A bibliography, proper citations, and explanatory footnotes if required.
- The final report is to be of between 35 and 45 pages in length.

The author must also provide with the final report:

- Ten subject keywords for registering the publication with internet search engines. Without these keywords, the document will not be found on the HRSDC website. The keywords must be found in the Government of Canada Core Subject Thesaurus. The Thesaurus can be found on the Internet at:
http://en.thesaurus.gc.ca/these/thes_e.html;
- A two-sentence description of the paper for use as an Internet summary, and;
- A short paragraph of Key Findings.

In order to avoid the necessity for extensive changes, the contractor should follow the style guidelines provided when preparing the report, abstract and executive summary.

The Canadian Style, published by Dundurn Press Ltd. in cooperation with Public Works and Government Services Canada Translation Bureau, can also be helpful in matters of punctuation, capitalization, and usage. *The Gage Canadian Dictionary* is the official standard for federal government spelling, but any reputable Canadian dictionary may be used as a reference. In matters of spelling, capitalization, and graphics, consistency is key.

Contractors will receive a manual entitled “*Publication Guidelines for Research Contractors*”. This manual offers a step-by-step guide to the preparation of all reports that will be published by the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC). Its aim is to ensure that all essential information is included and to promote uniformity of format. Contractors are advised to follow the format described in this manual and to adhere to the report requirements stipulated in the contract.