



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

We are seeking a consultant to develop evaluation processes and tools that Altered Minds Inc. can use for on-going evaluation and improvement of its orientation and language programs, and to use the newly developed tools and processes to conduct an evaluation of the Entry Program in 2017-2018.

Publication of Proposal: September 26, 2017

Submission of Proposal Deadline: October 13, 2017

Inquiries: Contact Grace Eidse (Executive Director, Altered Minds Inc.)
by e-mail at GraceE@entryprogram.ca or by telephone at 204-333-9922.

Altered Minds Inc.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Summary

Altered Minds Inc. (AMI) is seeking the services of an independent Evaluation Consultant to conduct an evaluation of its 4-week Entry Program. The main purpose of this evaluation is to compare the results of its unique 4-week orientation program with users of traditional 1-week orientation programs. The Consultant will also advance next steps in AMI's 2017 Logical Framework and work with AMI staff to develop an effective evaluation plan, tools and processes that the agency can use for on-going program evaluation, monitoring and improvement. An Evaluation Advisory Committee comprised of federal, provincial and agency stakeholders will provide guidance to the consultant as appropriate. The deliverables for this work are to be completed by the 30th of March 2018.

Context

Altered Minds represents a unique approach to providing newcomers with orientation to Canada. In 2016-2017, Immigration, Refugees & Citizenship Canada (IRCC) provided funding for AMI to hire an independent Consultant to conduct a limited evaluation of the Entry Program. While this evaluation demonstrated that Altered Minds clients are largely positive regarding the services they received, the next phase of the evaluation will be to assess the extent to which Altered Minds' 4-week orientation provides differences in settlement outcomes as compared to standard 1-week orientations delivered by most settlement service providers.

Altered Minds Inc. (AMI) has signed a new 3-year Contribution Agreement with Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) to provide orientation and language classes for newcomers from 2017-2020. The Agreement stipulates that AMI hire an independent 3rd party consultant to evaluate the Entry Program by the end of March 2018. Completion of the evaluation is the basis of future funding by IRCC.

An Evaluation Advisory Committee was formed in April 2017 to guide AMI in developing this RFP. The Committee will guide the consultant in matters relating to the current evaluation project. The contracted consultant will build on findings and recommendations of the *Rapid Limited Evaluation of the Altered Minds Entry Program 2014-2016* (February 2017, attached), and use *The Altered Minds Inc. Entry Program 2017-2020 Logical Framework* (April 2017, attached) as a road map for this evaluation project.¹

The following conditions apply to this Request for Proposals:

- There is no expressed or implied obligation for Altered Minds Inc. to reimburse Consultants for any expenses incurred in preparing proposals in response to this request.
- Any inquiries concerning the RFP should be addressed to Grace Eidse at gracee@entryprogram.ca, or by calling 204-333-9922.

¹ [A full list of the Data Collection Methods and Sources used in the previous study is attached in Appendix X.](#)

- Submit three copies of the proposal to Grace Eidse at 400-259 Portage Ave, Winnipeg, MB R3B 2A9 by 4:00 pm October 13, 2017. Altered Minds reserves the right to reject any or all proposals submitted.
- Submission of a proposal indicates acceptance by the Consultant of the conditions contained in this RFP, unless clearly and specifically noted in the proposal submitted and confirmed in the contract between Altered Minds Inc. and the Consultant.
- It is anticipated that the selection of the Consultant will be completed by October 24, 2017, and that a contract will be executed between AMI and the selected Consultant by November 1, 2017.
- Altered Minds reserves the right to change any of the projected dates set forth in this RFP, including the due date for the receipt of proposals.

Term of Engagement

The term of the contract is five months, from November 1, 2017 to March 30, 2018. Further evaluation services may be considered for 2018-2019 and beyond to 2020.

Description of the Entry Program

The Entry Program is an orientation and language program for newcomers to Manitoba. It is recommended for all adult immigrants upon arrival in Winnipeg, and newcomers are registered in the program when they go through intake at Manitoba Start, the doorway to Winnipeg's Centralized Intake Services.

Approximately 5,000 newly-arrived adult Permanent Residents attend the Entry Program each year. Most are Provincial Nominees (76%), and the rest are evenly divided between Refugees (12%) and Family Class (12%). They come from about 150 different countries, but predominantly from the Philippines, India and China.

Expected Deliverables

- Evaluation and monitoring processes and tools including a survey of clients and non-clients
- Detailed technical survey report
- Summary Report of the 2017 Evaluation Findings and Recommendations (March 30, 2018)

Contract Value

Up to \$60,000 excluding HST/GST including all expenses associated with performing the Statement of Work including travel costs.

Bidder Qualifications

- At least 10 years' experience in conducting evaluations or reviews: include a list of projects including duration, over the past 10 years
- Experience with federally funded projects that relate to social or economic domain including conducting three evaluations or reviews within the last 5 years
- Experience in conducting surveys in multiple languages other than English and French
- Experience in conducting at least 10 project evaluations

Proposal Requirements

To be competitive, proposals must include:

- A brief description of the bidding organization, including CV information of those individuals who will be assigned to the contract
- Indication of capacity to meet the engagement deadlines
- A description of the approach to the project, understanding of the complexity of the project, management, client liaison and quality control
- A description of the bidder's experience with newcomer issues and pedagogy
- A list and description of projects carried out as per Bidder Qualifications
- Three (3) references with contact information
- A detailed fee proposal

STATEMENT OF WORK

Objective

Altered Minds Inc. (AMI) is seeking the services of an independent contractor to build upon its newly developed tools and processes to conduct an independent, limited evaluation of the Entry Program in 2017-2018. The primary area of focus for this evaluation will be to compare the settlement outcomes of Entry Program participants with those of individuals who attend other orientation programs locally and nationally.

The contractor will also work with AMI staff to develop effective evaluation tools and processes that the agency can use for on-going program evaluation and improvement.

The evaluation of the Entry Program will assist IRCC in:

- Determining the effectiveness of the program achieving IRCC settlement outcomes, with a focus on immediate and intermediate outcomes
- Comparing settlement experience of newcomers who have attended the Entry Program with those who have attended other types of orientation, locally and nationally

The evaluation tools and processes developed will help Entry Program staff and stakeholders:

- Define the needs that can realistically be met by the program and build related outcomes statements so that clients' expectations remain realistic and program evaluation stays within the defined scope.
- Measure the impact of program format/structure, duration, curriculum/content, methodology and use of professional EAL teachers on newcomers' settlement outcomes and attitudes towards settlement (e.g. sense of belonging, reduced anxiety, ability to learn English, increased confidence, etc.)

Methodology

The Contractor will use the attached Logical Framework and 2017 evaluation as a guide for implementation, and consult with the Evaluation Advisory Committee to identify areas that require further research. The primary line of evidence for this evaluation will be a survey of clients and non-clients to:

- Test knowledge of Altered Minds clients in terms of achieving key expected outcomes and compare results of clients vs. non-clients, potentially via pre and post assessment survey/s
- Gain participants' perspectives on importance of different program features (e.g., for EP length of intervention, flexible schedules, use of guest speakers, continuous intake, use of certified teachers, content, learning outcomes, resource materials, methodology, etc.)
- Identify potential areas for program improvements

In order to minimize costs and time for the Contractor to locate clients and non-clients, Altered Minds/IRCC will provide the Contractor with contact information for clients, and facilitate access to contact information for non-clients. The Contractor will strive to develop survey methodology to ensure results are robust, representative, with high degree of validity, reliability and statistical confidence.

In addition to the proposed survey, the Contractor **may** consider building upon previous methodologies used in the previous evaluation by undertaking any number of the following: document review, data set analysis, interviews, and focus groups.

RATING CRITERIA FOR PROPOSALS

Mandatory Technical Criteria (M)		
Number	Mandatory Technical Criterion	Met/Not Met
M1	The Bidder provides a detailed description of their proposed approach and workplan for the evaluation project.	
M2	The Bidder demonstrates that the Senior Project Manager proposed for the project has at least 10 years of experience in conducting evaluations or reviews by providing a list and a summary description of all evaluation/reviews worked on, including the duration (mm/yyyy to mm/yyyy).	
M3	The Bidder demonstrated that one of the primary consultants on the proposed project team has worked on a minimum of 3 evaluations or reviews of federally-funded projects within the last 5 years that relate to the social or economic domain. <i>(The same primary consultant must have worked on all three studies.)</i>	
M4	The Bidder demonstrated that their firm has conducted at least 10 project evaluations by providing a list of program evaluations conducted by the firm.	

Point Rated Technical Criteria (R)			
	Technical Rated Requirements	Max Pts	Scoring
R1	The Bidder should demonstrate the level of academic* or research or work experience related to newcomer issues and challenges. <i>(*Academic experience only includes teaching at a university or college level.)</i>	4	One point will be awarded for each project (academic or research or work) of the proposed team related to newcomer issues and challenges, to a maximum of 4 points.
R2	The Bidder should demonstrate the level of academic* or research or work experience related to pedagogy. <i>(*Academic experience only includes teaching at a university or college level.)</i>	4	One point will be awarded for each project (academic or research or work) related to pedagogy, to a maximum of 4 points.

<p>R3</p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of the project and recommend a suitable approach to address the requirements as outlined in the Statement of Work.</p>	<p>46</p>	<p>Using the scoring legend described below, this requirement will be assessed according to the following criteria:</p> <p>A. Understanding of the issues and complexity surrounding newcomer settlement and integration in Canada (up to 6 points);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsatisfactory: No information provided. No explanation of the issues or complexity was provided. - 0 pts ii. Limited: limited understanding of the complexity of newcomer settlement and integration in Canada. Does not describe the main issues or elements of complexity. Restates information provided in SoW, or takes quotes directly from website. - 2 pts iii. Good: Good, basic description of most of the issues and elements of complexity. - 4 pts iv. Excellent: comprehensive understanding of main issues and complexities associated with newcomer settlement & integration - 6 pts <p>B. The proposed approach and data collection activities, including the use of multiple methodologies (lines of evidence) to thoroughly address the evaluation questions and indicators as specified in the Evaluation Framework (up to 20 points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsatisfactory: No approach or methodology was proposed – 0 pts ii. Limited: Limited explanation of how it will meet this requirement. The approach and methodology lack structure and coherence. Very few details are provided and some elements were not clearly addressed; major deficiencies exist with the objective and expected outcomes of this requirement – 6 pts iii. Good: Good explanation of how it will meet this requirement. The approach and methodology are structured and coherent and most of the necessary details are provided; minor deficiencies exist with the objective and expected outcomes of this requirement. The Bidder demonstrates the capability to meet most elements – 12 pts iv. Very good: very good approach and discussion of methodologies; demonstrates a good understanding of the project requirements - 15 pts v. Excellent: In-depth and specific explanation on how it will meet this requirement. The approach and methodology are structured, coherent and all necessary details are provided. No deficiencies exist. The Bidder demonstrates an understanding of the objective and expected outcomes. The Bidder demonstrates the capability to meet all elements of the requirement – 20 pts <p>C. The Bidder’s approach to data analysis (up to 10 points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsatisfactory: No information provided on the Bidder’s approach to data analysis - 0 pts
------------------	--	-----------	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Limited: limited discussion of approach to data analysis. Approach lacks structure and very few details are provided – 3 pts iii. Good: Good approach to data analysis; recognizes complexity of task. Most of the necessary details are provided. – 7 pts iv. Excellent: thorough approach to data analysis, recognizes complexity, provides detailed strategy to conduct comprehensive analysis of all data - 10 pts <p>D. Identification of potential challenges to implementation of the evaluation and development of mitigation strategies to address these challenges (up to 10 points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsatisfactory: No information provided on challenges in implementing the evaluation. - 0 pts ii. Limited: limited understanding of potential challenges and limited description of mitigation strategies - 4 pts iii. Good: good understanding of challenges and description of mitigation strategies - 8 pts iv. Excellent: very thorough understanding of potential challenges and comprehensive mitigation strategies - 10 pts
R4	The Bidder demonstrated the proposed approach to overall project management, client liaison and quality control.	26	<p>Using the scoring legend described below, this requirement will be assessed according to the following criteria:</p> <p>A. The proposed work plan and schedule for the project team (up to 13 points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsatisfactory: No information provided on proposed workplan and schedule - 0 pts ii. Poor: time and resources (number and experience) assigned to tasks is insufficient to conduct comprehensive evaluation in allotted time - 4 pts iii. Good: overall time and resources (number and experience) are adequate - 9 pts iv. Excellent: sufficient time and appropriate resources (number and experience) are assigned to each task – 13 pts (a) <p>B. Role of the Senior Project Manager is appropriate and reflected in all phases of the evaluation (up to 7 points);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsatisfactory: No information provided on the role of the senior project manager. Senior project manager’s level of involvement not identified. - 0 pts ii. Poor: project manager plays minimal role in study and/or involvement in the different tasks is not appropriate - 2 pts iii. Good: project manager plays adequate role in study and involvement in the different tasks is acceptable. - 5 pts

			<p>iv. Excellent: project manager plays a significant role in study and involvement in the different tasks is appropriate - 7 pts</p> <p>C. Client liaison (up to 3 points)</p> <p>i. Unsatisfactory: No information provided on client liaison approach – 0 pts</p> <p>ii. Good: a general approach to client liaison is outlined but no specifics are provided – 2 pts</p> <p>iii. Excellent: specific roles and responsibilities with respect to client liaison are identified and assigned to the appropriate team members – 3 pts</p> <p>D. Quality control (up to 3 points):</p> <p>i. Unsatisfactory: No information on quality control mechanisms to be used. - 0 pts</p> <p>ii. Poor: minimal strategies in place for monitoring quality of research, analysis and reporting - 1 pt</p> <p>iii. Good: strategies are clearly described and are adequate to meet minimum standards for evaluations - 2 pts</p> <p>iv. Excellent - strategies are comprehensive and exceed minimum standards for evaluation - 3 pts</p>
	TOTAL:	80	
	MINIMUM PASS MARK	56/80	

Mandatory Financial Criteria		
Pricing Score		
Max Points	20	The total proposed price does not exceed \$60,000 excluding HST/GST. The total proposed price includes all expenses associated with performing the work outlined in the Statement of Work, including travel costs.

Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

1. To be declared responsive, a bid must:
 - a. comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation; and
 - b. meet all mandatory criteria; and
 - c. obtain the required minimum of **56 points** overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating.

- d. The rating is performed on a scale of **100** points.
2. Bids not meeting (a), (b) or (c) will be declared non-responsive.
 3. The selection will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 80% for the technical merit and 20% for the price.
 4. To establish the technical merit score, the overall technical score for each responsive bid will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 80%.
 5. To establish the pricing score, each responsive bid will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and the ratio of 20%.
 6. For each responsive bid, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.
 7. Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract.

The table below illustrates an example where all three bids are responsive and the selection of the contractor is determined by a 80/20 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively. The total available points equals 100 and the lowest evaluated price is \$50,000 (50).

Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit (80%) and Price (20%)

		Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Overall Technical Score		80/80	56/80	70/80
Bid Evaluated Price		\$60,000.00	\$55,000.00	\$50,000.00
Calculations	Technical Merit Score	$80/80 \times 80 = 80$	$56/80 \times 80 = 56$	$70/80 \times 80 = 70$
	Pricing Score	$50/60 \times 20 = 16.67$	$50/55 \times 20 = 18.18$	$50/50 \times 20 = 20$
Combined rating		96.67	74.18	90
Overall rating		1 st	3 rd	2 nd