



**OFFER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY CANADA
VENDOR INFORMATION AND AUTHORIZATION**

Each proposal must include a copy of this page properly completed and signed.

Vendor Name and Address

Legal Status (incorporated, registered, etc.)

GST or HST Registration Number and/or Business Identification Number (Canada Revenue Agency)

Name and Title of Person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor

Print Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Central Point of Contact

The Vendor has designated the following individual as a central point of contact for all matters pertaining to the proposed contract, including the provision of all information that may be requested:

Print Name: _____

Title: _____

Tel: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____



This cancels and supersedes previous solicitation number 201800266 dated July 28, 2017, which was due at 2:00 p.m. on September 7, 2017.

PART 1 – GENERAL INFORMATION

1. INTRODUCTION

The bid solicitation is divided into six parts and annexes, as follows:

- Part 1 General Information: provides a general description of the requirement;
- Part 2 Bidder Instructions: provides the instructions, clauses and conditions applicable to the bid solicitation;
- Part 3 Bid Preparation Instructions: provides bidders with instructions on how to prepare their bid;
- Part 4 Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection: indicates how the evaluation will be conducted, the evaluation criteria that must be addressed in the bid, and the basis of selection;
- Part 5 Certifications: includes the certifications to be provided;
- Part 6 Resulting Contract Clauses: includes the clauses and conditions that will apply to any resulting contract.

The Annexes include

- Annex A: Statement of Work
- Annex B: Basis of Payment

2. SUMMARY

See Annex A, Statement of Work.

3. DEBRIEFINGS

Bidders may request a debriefing on the results of the bid solicitation process. Bidders should make the request to the Contracting Authority within 15 working days of receipt of the results of the bid solicitation process. The debriefing may be in writing, by telephone or in person.

PART 2 – BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS

1. STANDARD INSTRUCTIONS, CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS

All instructions, clauses and conditions identified in the bid solicitation by number, date and title are set out in the *Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions Manual* (<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual>) issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada.

Bidders who submit a bid agree to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions of the bid solicitation and accept the clauses and conditions of the resulting contract.

1.1 2003 Standard Instructions - Goods or Services – Competitive Requirements (2016-04-04)

The 2003 (2016-04-04) Standard Instructions - Goods or Services – Competitive Requirements, are incorporated by reference into and form part of the bid solicitation.

Subsection 5.4 of 2003, Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, is amended as follows:

Delete: sixty (60) days

Insert: one-hundred twenty (120) days

2. SUBMISSION OF BIDS

Bids must be submitted only to Public Safety Canada by the date, time and place indicated on page 1 of the bid solicitation.

Due to the nature of the bid solicitation, bids transmitted by either facsimile or email will not be accepted.

3. ENQUIRIES – BID SOLICITATION

All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority no later than 5 calendar days before the bid closing date. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered.

Bidders should reference as accurately as possible the numbered item of the bid solicitation to which the enquiry relates. Care should be taken by bidders to explain each question in sufficient detail in order to enable Canada to provide an accurate answer. Technical enquiries that are of a proprietary nature must be clearly marked "proprietary" at each relevant item. Items identified as "proprietary" will be treated as such except where Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a proprietary nature. Canada may edit the question(s) or may request that the Bidder do so, so that the proprietary nature of the question(s) is eliminated and the enquiry can be answered to all bidders. Enquiries not submitted in a form that can be distributed to all bidders may not be answered by Canada.

It is the responsibility of the Bidder to obtain clarification of the requirements contained herein, if necessary, prior to submitting a bid.

A request for a time extension to the bid closing date will be considered provided it is received in writing by the PS Contracting Authority at least five (5) working days before the closing date shown on page 1 of



this RFP document. The request, if granted, will be communicated by www.BuyandSell.gc.ca at least three (3) working days before the closing, showing the revised closing date. The request, if rejected, will be directed to the originator at least three (3) working days before the closing date by the PS Contracting Authority.

4. APPLICABLE LAWS

Any resulting contract must be interpreted and governed, and the relations between the parties determined, by the laws in force in Ontario.

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

5. IMPROVEMENT OF REQUIREMENT DURING SOLICITATION PERIOD

Should bidders consider that the specifications or Statement of Work contained in the bid solicitation could be improved technically or technologically, bidders are invited to make suggestions, in writing, to the Contracting Authority named in this bid solicitation. Bidders must clearly outline the suggested improvement as well as the reason for the suggestion. Suggestions that do not restrict the level of competition nor favour a particular bidder will be given consideration provided they are submitted to the Contracting Authority at least **five (5)** days before the bid closing date. Canada will have the right to accept or reject any or all suggestions.

6. OFFICE OF THE PROCUREMENT OMBUDSMAN

The Office of the Procurement Ombudsman (OPO) was established by the Government of Canada to provide an independent avenue for suppliers to raise complaints regarding the award of contracts under \$25,000 for goods and under \$100,000 for services. You have the option of raising issues or concerns regarding the solicitation, or the award resulting from it, with the OPO by contacting them by telephone at 1-866-734-5169 or by e-mail at boa.opo@boa.opo.gc.ca. You can also obtain more information on the OPO services available to you at their website at www.opo-boa.gc.ca.

PART 3 – BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

1. BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

Canada requests that bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:

Section I: Technical Bid: 4 hard copies and 1 soft copy on CD, DVD or USB key.

Section II: Financial Bid: 1 hard copy

Section III: Certifications 1 hard copy

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of the soft copy and the hard copy, the wording of the hard copy will have priority over the wording of the soft copy.

Prices must appear in the financial bid only. No prices must be indicated in any other section of the bid.

Canada requests that bidders follow the format instructions described below in the preparation of their bid:

- (a) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper;
- (b) use a numbering system that corresponds to the bid solicitation.

In April 2006, Canada issued a policy directing federal departments and agencies to take the necessary steps to incorporate environmental considerations into the procurement process Policy on Green Procurement (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ecologisation-greening/achats-procurement/politique-policy-eng.html>). To assist Canada in reaching its objectives, bidders should:

- 1) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper containing fibre certified as originating from a sustainably-managed forest and containing minimum 30% recycled content; and
- 2) use an environmentally-preferable format including black and white printing instead of colour printing, printing double sided/duplex, using staples or clips instead of cerlox, duotangs or binders.

SECTION I: TECHNICAL BID

In their technical bid, bidders should demonstrate their understanding of the requirements contained in the bid solicitation and explain how they will meet these requirements. Bidders should demonstrate their capability and describe their approach in a thorough, concise and clear manner for carrying out the work.

The technical bid should address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. Simply repeating the statement contained in the bid solicitation is not sufficient. In order to facilitate the evaluation of the bid, Canada requests that bidders address and present topics in the order of the evaluation criteria under the same headings. To avoid duplication, bidders may refer to different sections of their bids by identifying the specific paragraph and page number where the subject topic has already been addressed.

The technical proposal must exclude any reference to financial information relative to the costing of the proposal.

Failure to provide a technical proposal with the submission will result in non-compliance and will not be evaluated.



Section II: Financial Bid

Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex B. The total amount of Applicable Taxes must be shown separately.

Failure to provide a financial proposal with the submission will result in non-compliance and the bid will not be evaluated.

Section III: Certifications

Bidders must submit the certifications required under Part 5.

PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION

1. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

- (a) Bids will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the bid solicitation including the technical evaluation criteria.
- (b) An evaluation team composed of representatives of Canada will evaluate the bids.

2. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the requirements, or reusing the same wording as the RFP, will not be considered "demonstrated" for the purposes of this evaluation. The Bidder should provide complete details as to where, when, month and year, and how, through which activities / responsibilities, the stated qualifications / experience were obtained. Experience gained during formal education shall not be considered work experience. All requirements for work experience shall be obtained in a legitimate work environment as opposed to an educational setting. Co-op terms are considered work experience provided they are related to the required services.

When completing the resource grids the specific information which demonstrates the requested criteria should be in the grid. The reference to the page and project number should also be provided so that the evaluator can verify this information. It is not acceptable that the grids contain all the project information from the résumé, only the specific answer should be provided.

Bidders are advised that the month(s) of experience listed for a project in which the timeframe overlaps that of another referenced project of the same resource will only be counted once. For example: Project #1 timeframe is July 2001 to December 2001; Project #2 timeframe is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two project references is seven (7) months.

Bidders are also advised that the experience is as of the closing date of the Request for Proposal. For example, if a given requirement states, "The proposed resource must have a minimum of three (3) years' experience, within the last six (6) years, working with Java", then the six (6) years are accounted for as of the closing date of the RFP.

Proposals not meeting the mandatory requirements below will be given no further consideration.

2.1. Mandatory Technical Criteria

The bid must meet the mandatory technical criteria specified below. The Bidder must provide the necessary documentation to support compliance with this requirement.

Any bid which fails to meet the mandatory technical criteria will be declared non-responsive. Each mandatory technical criterion will be addressed separately.

The Bidder must provide sufficient detail to clearly demonstrate how they meet each mandatory requirement below. Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data and information to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the requirements, or reusing the same wording as the RFP, will not be considered “demonstrated” for the purpose of this evaluation.

Number	Mandatory Technical Criteria	Demonstrated Compliance
M1	<p>The Bidder must propose a team of resources to complete the work as described in Annex A, Statement of Work. The team must include not more than one Principal Investigator. Each resource must be identified by full name and role for completing the work.</p> <p>For each proposed Senior Team Member, including the Principal Investigator, the Bidder must provide a detailed résumé for EACH resource that clearly describes their relevant work experience, academic qualifications, professional certifications and publications. The Bidder should bold-face or highlight the relevant areas in each resource’s résumé.</p>	
M2	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that its proposed Principal Investigator has a minimum of five (5) years of experience within the past 10 years conducting research in the crime prevention domain and/or juvenile offenders and/or youth at risk of offending.</p> <p>Note that to satisfy this criterion (MT2), it is not sufficient to simply state that the Principal Investigator has the relevant experience/expertise, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations. The response to this criterion must explain in detail how the relevant 5+ years of experience were obtained.</p>	
M3	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that the Principal Investigator has been the lead author on a minimum of three (3) publications based on research in the crime prevention domain and/or juvenile offenders and/or youth at risk of offending. The publications can consist of peer-reviewed articles and/or reports prepared for governmental and non-governmental agencies.</p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with MT3, the Bidder must provide a list of bibliographical citations of the Principal Investigator’s publications. Each publication must be accompanied by a brief (75-100 word) description of the subject matter, which explains why the publication is relevant to the</p>	



Number	Mandatory Technical Criteria	Demonstrated Compliance
	criterion (i.e., it must demonstrate how the publication deals with crime prevention and/or juvenile offenders and/or youth at risk of offending).	

2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria

Bids which meet all the mandatory technical criteria will be evaluated and scored as specified in the tables inserted below.

Bids which fail to obtain the required minimum number of points specified will be declared non-responsive. Each point rated technical criterion should be addressed separately.

Number	Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Score	Demonstrated Compliance
R1	<p>Work Plan – The bidder should provide a comprehensive work plan that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows a logical organization of tasks to be completed and scheduling for the project as per the Statement of Work, including resources to be consulted; and where applicable, provides details on team composition, the responsibilities of the team members and expected efforts per task; and demonstrates that the level of effort is appropriate for the tasks outlined in the Statement of Work. 	<p>Points will be awarded as follows:</p> <p>20 points - Excellent Work Plan; realistic details and explanations of work phase definitions, activities, deadlines and deliverables resulting in a complete understanding of the work plan, its practicality and achievability. Level of effort is very well distributed amongst resource(s).</p> <p>15 points - Solid Work Plan; sufficient detail presented on work phase definitions, activities, deadlines and deliverables to provide a substantiated and rational plan whose likelihood of successful implementation is high. Level of effort is well distributed amongst resource(s).</p> <p>10 points - Weak Work Plan; incomplete and/or insufficient detail provided on work phase definitions, activities, deadlines and deliverables; some inconsistencies or lack of realism. Level of effort is acceptably distributed among resource(s)</p> <p>0 points - Poor Work Plan Either no work plan is submitted or, the work plan submitted has an absence or near absence of work phase definitions, specific activities, deadlines and deliverables;</p>	<p>20 POINTS</p> <p>(pass mark for criterion: 10)</p>	

Number	Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Score	Demonstrated Compliance
		unrealistically presented methods/ outcomes/ outputs/timing. Level of effort is unrealistically divided between resource(s) or is not presented.		
R2	<p>Approach and Methodology The bidder should provide the comprehensive approach and specific tasks proposed to complete all aspects of the project.</p> <p>Sufficient detail should be provided to allow for a complete understanding of the approach to the work undertaken by the resource designated as Project Leader. This should include the advantages and disadvantages of the methodologies/approach.</p>	<p>25 points - Excellent methodology and approach <u>Clear and complete with convincing details on all of the points below:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understanding of project objectives; • understanding of what is excluded from the scope of research; • literature review strategy; • proposed analytic strategies; and • strategies to mitigate possible research challenges. <p>20 points - Very Good methodology and approach <u>Clear and complete with convincing details on at least 4 out of 5 of the points listed below:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understanding of project objectives; • understanding of what is excluded from the scope of research; • literature review strategy; • proposed analytic strategies; and • strategies to mitigate possible research challenges. <p>15 points Good methodology and approach <u>Clear and complete with convincing details on at least 3 out of 5 of the points listed below:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understanding of project objectives; • understanding of what is excluded 	25 POINTS (pass mark for criterion: 15)	

Number	Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Score	Demonstrated Compliance
		<p>from the scope of research;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • literature review strategy; • proposed analytic strategies; and • strategies to mitigate possible research challenges. <p>0 points - Poor methodology and approach Either a methodology and approach is not submitted or the approach and methodology submitted is <u>incomplete</u> with insufficient detail provided on 3 or more of the points listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understanding of project objectives; • understanding of what is excluded from the scope of research; • literature review strategy; • proposed analytic strategies; and • strategies to mitigate possible research challenges. 		
R3	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that the senior team members have conducted research projects on risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) within the past 10 years.</p> <p>Note that each project can only be counted once. For example, if two or more members of the project team worked jointly on a research project on risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24), this project would still only contribute 5 points toward R3.</p>	<p>5 points per project up to a maximum of 20 points</p> <p>1 project = 5 points 2 projects = 10 points 3 projects = 15 points 4 projects = 20 points</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>5 points – If at least one of the above projects was a research project on risk screening and assessment tools used in the context of crime prevention interventions.</p>	30	

Number	Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Score	Demonstrated Compliance
	<p><i>Note also that to satisfy this criterion (R2), it is not sufficient to simply state that the senior team members have the experience, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations.</i></p> <p><i>The response to this criterion must:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) include the project title;</i> <i>(b) describe the research project and its duration (including dates);</i> <i>(c) identify which senior team member(s) was/were involved, the duration of their involvement (including dates), and the extent of their roles and responsibilities; and</i> <i>(d) explain in detail how the project is related to risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24).</i> 	<p>5 points – If at least one of the above projects was a research projects on gender-specific or culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools.</p>		
R4	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that the senior team members have conducted validation studies on risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) within the past 10 years.</p> <p>Note that each project can only be counted once. For example, if two or more members of the project team worked jointly on a validation study on risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24), this project would still only contribute 5 points toward R4.</p>	<p>5 points per project up to a maximum of 20 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 project = 5 points 2 projects = 10 points 3 projects = 15 points 4 projects = 20 points <p>PLUS</p> <p>5 points – a senior member of the project team has conducted one or more validation studies on risk screening and assessment tools used in the context of crime prevention interventions.</p> <p>5 points – a senior member of the project</p>	30	

Number	Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Score	Demonstrated Compliance
	<p><i>Note also that to satisfy this criterion (R3), it is not sufficient to simply state that the senior team members have the experience, or simply provide a list of bibliographical citations.</i></p> <p><i>The response to this criterion must:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) include the study title;</i> <i>(b) describe the validation study and its duration (including dates);</i> <i>(c) identify which senior team member(s) was involved, the duration of their involvement (including dates), and the extent of their roles and responsibilities; and</i> <i>(d) explain in detail how the study is related to risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24).</i> 	<p>team has conducted one or more validation studies on gender-specific or culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools.</p>		
Maximum points:			95	
Overall Minimum Points Required to Pass:			65	



3. FINANCIAL EVALUATION

The Bidder must complete this pricing schedule and include it in its financial bid. Prices must only appear in the Financial Bid and in no other part of the bid.

The price of bids will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, Goods and Services Tax (GST) excluded; FOB destination, Customs duties and Excise taxes included. The total amount of Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax is to be shown separately, if applicable.

Table 1

Professional Services			
Resource Name	Estimated Level of Effort	Firm per diem rate*	Total
Ceiling Price:			

* **Per Diem rates** are firm and all inclusive of overhead, profit and expenses such as travel and time to the NCR facilities.

Please note the following:

Definition of a Day/Proration: A day is defined as 7.5 hours exclusive of meal breaks. Payment will be for days actually worked with no provision for annual leave, statutory holidays and sick leave. Time worked ("Days_worked", in the formula below) which is less than a day will be prorated to reflect actual time worked in accordance with the following formula:

Table 2

Other expenses	Amount	Mark-up	TOTAL
Direct Expenses: Materials, supplies, and other direct expenses incurred during the performance of the Work at actual cost with a Mark-up		_____ %	



Table 3

Other expenses	Amount	Mark-up	Total
Subcontracts: at actual cost with mark-up. List any subcontracts proposed for any portion of the Contract describing the work to be performed and a cost breakdown with a Mark-up			

Table 4

TOTAL (sum tables 1 – 3)	\$
---------------------------------	----

Other Expenses

All original supporting documentation is required for the reimbursement of all direct expenses and sub-contracts.

Bidders should note the basis of payment is defined in Part 6 – Resulting Contract Clauses

42. Basis of Selection – Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit 70% and Price 30%

- 4.1 To be declared responsive, a bid must:
- (a) comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation;
 - (b) meet all the mandatory evaluation criteria; and
 - (c) obtain the required minimum number of points specified in Part 4 for the point rated technical criteria.
- 4.2 Bids not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) will be declared non-responsive. Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest number of points nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted.
- 4.3 The lowest evaluated price (LP) of all responsive bids will be identified and a pricing score (PS), determined as follows, will be allocated to each responsive bid (i) : $PS_i = LP / P_i \times 30$. P_i is the evaluated price (P) of each responsive bid (i).
- 4.4 A technical merit score (TMS), determined as follows, will be allocated to each responsive bid (i): $TMS_i = OS_i \times 70$. OS_i is the overall score (OS) obtained by each responsive bid (i) for all the point rated technical criteria specified in Article 4, determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available.
- 4.5 The combined rating (CR) of technical merit and price of each responsive bid (i) will be determined as follows: $CR_i = PS_i + TMS_i$
- 4.6 The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract. In the event two or more responsive bids have the same highest combined rating of technical merit and price, the responsive bid that obtained the highest overall score for all the point rated technical criteria detailed in article 4 will be recommended for award of a contract.
- 4.7 The table below illustrates an example where the selection of the contractor is determined by a 70/30 ratio of the technical merit and price, respectively.

Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)			
Bidder	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Overall Technical Score	90	86	79
Bid Evaluated Price	C\$60,000	C\$55,000	C\$50,000
Calculations	Technical Merit Points	Price Points	Total Score
Bidder 1	$90 / 100 \times 70 = 63.00$	$50,000^* / 60,000 \times 30 = 24.99$	87.99
Bidder 2	$85 / 100 \times 70 = 59.50$	$50,000^* / 55,000 \times 30 = 27.27$	86.77
Bidder 3	$79 / 100 \times 70 = 55.30$	$50,000^* / 50,000 \times 30 = 30.00$	85.30

* represents the lowest evaluated price

In the example above, Bidder 1 is the Bidder who obtained the highest combined technical and financial score.



PART 5 – CERTIFICATIONS

Bidders must provide the required certifications and associated information to be awarded a contract. The certifications listed below should be completed and submitted with the bid but may be submitted afterwards. If any of these required certifications is not completed and submitted as requested, the Contracting Authority will inform the Bidder of a time frame within which to provide the information. Failure to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority and to provide the certifications within the time frame provided will render the bid non-responsive.

The certifications provided by bidders to Canada are subject to verification by Canada at all times. Canada will declare a bid non-responsive, or will declare a contractor in default in carrying out any of its obligations under the Contract, if any certification made by the Bidder is found to be untrue, whether made knowingly or unknowingly, during the bid evaluation period or during the contract period.

The Contracting Authority will have the right to ask for additional information to verify the Bidder's certifications. Failure to comply and to cooperate with any request or requirement imposed by the Contracting Authority may render the bid non-responsive or constitute a default under the Contract.

1. Certifications Required with the Bid

1.1. Certification 1 – Acceptance of Terms and Conditions

I, the undersigned, as the Bidder and/or an authorized representative of the Bidder, hereby certify that by signing the proposal submitted in response to **RFP 201800266-1** that I agree to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions in their entirety as they appear in this RFP. No modifications or other terms and conditions included in our Proposal will be applicable to the resulting contract notwithstanding the fact that our proposal may become part of the resulting contract

Name (block letters): _____

Title _____

Signature: _____

Telephone number: _____

Fax number: _____

Date: _____

1.2 Certification 2 – Integrity Provisions – Declaration of Convicted Offences

In accordance with the Ineligibility and Suspension Policy (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html>), the Bidder must provide the required documentation, as applicable, to be given further consideration in the procurement process.



1.3 Certification 3 – Employment Equity, Federal Contractors' Program

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that the Bidder, and any of the Bidder's members if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, is not named on the Federal Contractors Program (FCP) for employment equity "FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid" list (http://publiservice.gc.ca/services/fcp-pcf/index_f.htm) available from Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) - Labour's website.

Canada will have the right to declare a bid non-responsive if the Bidder, or any member of the Bidder if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, appears on the "FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid" list at the time of contract award.

Signature

Date

1.4 Certification 4 – Former Public Servant

Former Public Servant Certification

Contracts with former public servants (FPS) in receipt of a pension or of a lump sum payment must bear the closest public scrutiny and reflect fairness in spending public funds. In order to comply with Treasury Board policies and directives on contracts with FPS, bidders must provide the information required below.

Definitions

For the purposes of this clause,

"former public servant" means a former member of a department as defined in the *Financial Administration Act, R.S., 1985, c. F-11*, a former member of the Canadian Armed Forces or a former member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and includes:

- a) an individual;
- b) an individual who has incorporated;
- c) a partnership made up of former public servants; or
- d. a sole proprietorship or entity where the affected individual has a controlling or major interest in the entity.

"Lump sum payment period" means the period measured in weeks of salary, for which payment has been made to facilitate the transition to retirement or to other employment as a result of the implementation of various programs to reduce the Public Service.

"Pension" means a pension payable pursuant to the *Public Service Superannuation Act, R.S., 1985, c. P-36* as indexed pursuant to the *Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, R.S., 1985, c. S-24*.

Former Public Servant in Receipt of a Pension

Is the Bidder a FPS in receipt of a pension as defined above?

YES () NO ()



If so, the Bidder must provide the following information:

- a) name of former public servant,; and
- b) date of termination of employment or retirement from the Public Service.

Work Force Reduction Program

Is the Bidder a FPS who received a lump sum payment pursuant to the terms of a work force reduction program?

YES () NO ()

If so, the Bidder must provide the following information:

- a) name of former public servant,;
- b) conditions of the lump sum payment incentive,;
- c) date of termination of employment,;
- d) amount of lump sum payment,;
- e) rate of pay on which lump sum payment is based,;
- f) period of lump sum payment including start date, end date and number of weeks,; and
- g) number and amount (professional fees) of other contracts subject to the restrictions of a work force reduction program.

For all contracts awarded during the lump sum payment period, the total amount of fee that may be paid to a FPS who received a lump sum payment is \$5,000, including Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax.

STATEMENT:

I, the undersigned, as a director of the Bidder, hereby certify that the information provided on this form and in the attached proposal are accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name (block letters): _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Telephone number: _____

Email: _____

The above-named individual will serve as intermediary with Public Service Canada



PART 6 – RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES

The following clauses and conditions apply to and form part of any contract resulting from the bid solicitation.

1. REQUIREMENT

See Annex A, Statement of Work.

2. STANDARD CLAUSES AND CONDITIONS

All clauses and conditions identified in the Contract by number, date and title are set out in the Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions Manual (<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual>) issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada. However any reference to Public Works and Government Services Canada or its Minister contained in these terms and conditions shall be interpreted as reference to Public Safety Canada or its Minister

2.1 General Conditions

2035 (2016-04-04), General Conditions – Higher Complexity – Services, apply to and form part of the Contract.

Delete section 20 in its entirety.

3. SECURITY REQUIREMENT

This document is UNCLASSIFIED, however;

- 3.1 The Contractor shall treat as confidential, during as well as after the performance of the services contracted for, any information of the affairs of Canada of a confidential nature to which its servants or agents become privy; and
- 3.2 Contract personnel requiring casual access to the installation site do not require a security clearance but may be required to be escorted at all times.

4. TERM OF CONTRACT

4.1 Period of the Contract

The Work is to be performed from date of contract award to **October 31, 2018**.

4.2 Termination on Thirty Days' Notice

Canada reserves the right to terminate the Contract at any time in whole or in part by giving thirty (30) calendar days written notice to the Contractor. In the event of such termination, Canada will only pay for costs incurred for services rendered and accepted by Canada up to the date of the termination. Despite any other provision of the Contract, there will be no other costs that will be paid to the Contractor as a result of the termination.



5. AUTHORITIES

5.1 Contracting Authority

The Contracting Authority for the Contract is:

Rachel Hull
Senior Contracting and Procurement Officer
Contracting and Procurement Unit
Public Safety Canada
340 Laurier Avenue, West
Ottawa ON K1A 0P8

Tel: 613-949-1821
Fax: 613-954-1871
Email: contracting@ps.gc.ca

The Contracting Authority is responsible for the management of the Contract and any changes to the Contract must be authorized in writing by the Contracting Authority. The Contractor must not perform work in excess of or outside the scope of the Contract based on verbal or written requests or instructions from anybody other than the Contracting Authority.

5.2 Project Authority

To be identified at Contract award.

The Project Authority is the representative of the department or agency for whom the Work is being carried out under the Contract and is responsible for all matters concerning the technical content of the Work under the Contract. Technical matters may be discussed with the Project Authority; however, the Project Authority has no authority to authorize changes to the scope of the Work. Changes to the scope of the Work can only be made through a contract amendment issued by the Contracting Authority.

5.3 Contractor's Representative

To be identified at Contract award.

6. PAYMENT

6.1 Ceiling Price

For the Work described in Annex A, Statement of Work, the Contractor will be reimbursed for the costs reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the Work, as determined in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex B, to a ceiling price of \$ _____ (*insert amount at contract award*). Customs duties are included and Applicable Taxes are extra.

The ceiling price is subject to downward adjustment so as not to exceed the actual costs reasonably incurred in the performance of the Work and computed in accordance with the Basis of Payment.

7. INVOICING INSTRUCTIONS

7.1 The Contractor must submit invoices in accordance with the information required in Section 12 of 2035, General Conditions – Higher Complexity – Services.



- 7.2 An invoice for a single payment cannot be submitted until all Work identified on the invoice is completed.
- 7.3 Each invoice must be supported by:
- (a) a copy of time sheets to support the time claimed;
 - (b) a copy of the release document and any other documents as specified in the Contract;
- 7.4 In the ongoing efforts of being a department that contributes to the greening initiative, as well as to improve our efficiencies when processing invoices, Public Safety Canada is moving towards receiving all invoices electronically from vendors. We ask, where possible, that vendors send their invoices electronically and do not send their invoices in paper format through regular postal mail services.

Email address: PS.InvoiceProcessing-TraitementDesFactures.SP@canada.ca

8. **CERTIFICATIONS**

8.1 **Compliance**

The continuous compliance with the certifications provided by the Contractor in its bid and the ongoing cooperation in providing associated information are conditions of the Contract. Certifications are subject to verification by Canada during the entire period of the Contract. If the Contractor does not comply with any certification, fails to provide the associated information, or if it is determined that any certification made by the Contractor in its bid is untrue, whether made knowingly or unknowingly, Canada has the right, pursuant to the default provision of the Contract, to terminate the Contract for default.

9. **APPLICABLE LAWS**

The Contract must be interpreted and governed, and the relations between the parties determined, by the laws in force in _____. (*Insert the name of the province or territory as specified by the bidder in its bid, if applicable.*)

10. **PRIORITY OF DOCUMENTS**

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of any documents that appear on the list, the wording of the document that first appears on the list has priority over the wording of any document that subsequently appears on the list.

- a) the Articles of Agreement;
- b) the general conditions 2035 (2016-04-04), General Conditions – Higher Complexity – Services;
- c) Annex A, Statement of Work;
- d) Annex B, Basis of Payment;
- e) the Contractor's bid dated _____, (*insert date of bid*) (*If the bid was clarified or amended, insert at the time of contract award.*), as clarified on _____ " **or** ", as amended on _____ " *and insert date(s) of clarification(s) or amendment(s).*

11. **FOREIGN NATIONALS (CANADIAN CONTRACTOR)**

The Contractor must comply with Canadian immigration requirements applicable to foreign nationals entering Canada to work temporarily in fulfillment of the Contract. If the Contractor wishes to hire a foreign national to work in Canada to fulfill the Contract, the Contractor should immediately contact the



nearest Service Canada regional office to enquire about Citizenship and Immigration Canada's requirements to issue a temporary work permit to a foreign national. The Contractor is responsible for all costs incurred as a result of non-compliance with immigration requirements.

OR

11. FOREIGN NATIONALS (FOREIGN CONTRACTOR)

The Contractor must comply with Canadian immigration legislation applicable to foreign nationals entering Canada to work temporarily in fulfillment of the Contract. If the Contractor wishes to hire a foreign national to work in Canada to fulfill the Contract, the Contractor should immediately contact the nearest Canadian Embassy, Consulate or High Commission in the Contractor's country to obtain instructions, information on Citizenship and Immigration Canada's requirements and any required documents. The Contractor is responsible to ensure that foreign nationals have the required information, documents and authorizations before performing any work under the Contract in Canada. The Contractor is responsible for all costs incurred as a result of non-compliance with immigration requirements

12. WORK PERMIT AND LICENSES

The Contractor must obtain and maintain all permits, licenses and certificates of approval required for the Work to be performed under any applicable federal, provincial or municipal legislation.

The Contractor is responsible for any charges imposed by such legislation or regulations. Upon request, the Contractor will provide a copy of any such permit, license, or certificate to Canada.

13. NON-PERMANENT RESIDENT

Non-Permanent Resident

The Contractor is responsible for compliance with the immigration requirements applicable to non-permanent residents entering Canada to work on a temporary basis in fulfillment of this Contract. The Contractor will be responsible for all costs incurred as a result of noncompliance with immigration requirements.

Non-Permanent Resident (Foreign Contractor)

The Contractor must ensure that non-permanent residents intending to work in Canada on a temporary basis in fulfillment of the Contract, who are neither Canadian citizens nor United States nationals, receive all appropriate documents and instructions relating to Canadian immigration requirements and secure all required employment authorizations prior to their arrival at the Canadian port of entry.

The Contractor must ensure that United States nationals having such intentions receive all appropriate documents and instructions in that regard prior to their arrival at the Canadian port of entry. Such documents may be obtained at the appropriate Canadian Embassy/Consulate in the Contractor's country. The Contractor will be responsible for all costs incurred as a result of noncompliance with immigration requirements.

14. INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS

1. Persons in Canada, and Canadians outside of Canada, are bound by economic sanctions imposed by Canada. As a result, the Government of Canada cannot accept delivery of goods or services that originate, either directly or indirectly, from the countries or persons subject to economic sanctions.



Details on existing sanctions can be found at: <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/trade/sanctions-en.asp>

2. It is a condition of this Contract that the Consultant not supply to the Government of Canada any goods or services which are subject to economic sanctions.
3. By law, the Consultant must comply with changes to the regulations imposed during the life of the Contract. During the performance of the Contract, should the imposition of sanctions against a country or person or the addition of a good or service to the list of sanctioned goods or services cause an impossibility of performance for the Consultant, the situation will be treated by the Parties as a force majeure. The Consultant shall forthwith inform Canada of the situation; the procedures applicable to force majeure shall then apply.

15. CANADA FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, DOCUMENTATION & PERSONNEL

1. Access to the following Canada facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel may be required during the Contract period in order to perform the work:
 - a. Client department's premises;
 - b. Client department's computer systems;
 - c. Documentation; and
 - d. Personnel for consultation.
2. Canada's facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel are not automatically at the disposal of the Contractor. The Contractor is responsible for timely identification of the need for access to the referenced facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel.
3. Subject to the approval of the Project Authority, arrangements will be made for the Contractor to access the required facilities, equipment, documentation and personnel at the Client department's earliest convenience.

16. INSURANCE

The Contractor is responsible to decide if insurance coverage is necessary to fulfill its obligation under the Contract and to ensure compliance with any applicable law. Any insurance acquired or maintained by the Contractor will be at its own expense and for its own benefit and protection. It will not release the Contractor from or reduce its liability under the Contract.



ANNEX A STATEMENT OF WORK

1. TITLE

Risk Screening & Assessment – A Review of Gender-Specific and Culturally-Adapted Tools to Prevent Crime

2. CONTEXT

The Government of Canada is committed to reducing crime and strengthening the safety of our communities through effective crime prevention measures, police services and correctional services. With regards to prevention, Public Safety Canada (PSC) is responsible for the administration of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS). The Strategy aims to reduce offending among at-risk groups of the population by funding evidence-based interventions and knowledge dissemination projects. Its current priorities are to address early risk factors among vulnerable children, youth, and young adults that are at risk of offending, respond to priority crime issues (e.g., youth gangs, drug-related crimes), prevent recidivism among high-risk groups, implement measures to support exiting prostitution, and foster prevention in Aboriginal communities.

In this context, several divisions responsible for supporting the NCPS within Public Safety Canada (e.g., crime prevention research and evaluation, policy, and programs) work in close collaboration to provide national leadership on effective and cost-efficient ways to prevent and to reduce crime, by addressing risk factors in the most vulnerable populations and in high-risk environments. In order to find effective ways to both prevent and reduce crime, PSC continues to gather national and international evidence on ‘what works’, but also increasingly on “how programs are implemented and in which context(s) they are most effective” in order to guide program and policy decisions, and to contribute to acquiring scientific knowledge and experience in crime prevention.

The objective of the work outlined below is to provide a review and analysis of the current state of the knowledge on risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) for use in crime prevention interventions in Canada and their applicability for various sub-populations (i.e., young women, Aboriginal youth, and ethnic minority youth groups). By having an up-to-date examination of the most recent work in this area, the work will: (1) assist practitioners in becoming better equipped to make informed decisions when selecting from currently available risk screening and assessment tools with respect to their appropriateness for the subjects of their intervention; and (2) to contribute to the knowledge on ‘where to go from here’ in the development and implementation of gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools for community-based crime prevention interventions in Canada.

3. BACKGROUND

There is a considerable body of knowledge on the risk factors associated with child and youth delinquency and offending (e.g., Farrington, 2002; Farrington, 2007; Farrington, Loeber, & Ttofi, 2012; Hawkins, Catalano, & Arthur, 2002). One of the challenges in preventing future offending is to identify individuals who are at risk, that is, who are facing multiple risk factors associated with delinquency, and to measure the effect of these factors on their behaviours in order to apply an intervention of the appropriate type and intensity. Incorporating screening and risk assessment tools into crime prevention initiatives reinforces the actions and interventions to be taken by directing them toward appropriate targets, and structuring them based on the nature and level of the risk presented by the young person. Most of the tools currently available to crime prevention researchers, evaluators and practitioners fall into two main categories (Savignac, 2010):

- Tools for Identifying Individuals at Risk of Offending (Screening Tools) – These tools are used to facilitate referral and screening procedures for young people at risk so as to refer them to the appropriate resources, programs and services. Allowing for the identification of at-risk individuals, these tools help strengthen the foundations of targeted prevention approaches by focusing resources on a specific clientele and by recommending appropriate interventions.
- Tools for Assessing the Risk of Offending/Re-Offending (Risk Assessment Tools) – These tools are designed to analyze a client’s current and past situations by identifying the principal risk and protective factors so as to assess the level of risk (low/moderate/high) and develop tailored intervention plans. These tools foster a better understanding and a comprehensive approach to the client’s situation by assessing and measuring significant relationships between past and current risk factors and behaviours.

The tools currently used by crime prevention researchers, evaluators and practitioners are based on conceptual models of the social vulnerabilities and risk factors associated with delinquency and are taken from various fields of study (Savignac, 2010):

- Tools from the field of developmental psychology focus on youth development and are based on models that emphasize the assessment of behavioural adequacy and social skills acquisition in children and youth, as well as on the presence of cognitive and behavioural problems. They help to identify social and behavioural vulnerabilities that often correspond to the dynamic risk factors associated with offending behaviour.¹
- Tools from the field of youth justice are used specifically to identify and assess the risk of re-offending among young offenders. They are based on a conceptual model of the significant relationships between the main known risk factors for offending and the youth’s behaviour. These tools are used primarily with young people who have already committed criminal offences or who have had contact with the police.²
- Since youth offending is often accompanied by related problems (e.g., substance use and abuse, school problems and mental health problems) (Huizinga, Loeber, & Cothorn, 2000), the screening and assessment of these problems should also be integrated within a comprehensive prevention approach.³

More recently, resilience (and the presence of protective factors) has been seen as a central feature of how to address risk for delinquency and offending (France, Freiberg, & Homel, 2010). Children and youth develop into mature adults depending on the extent of intrinsic assets (e.g., perseverance, efficacy, self-esteem, and active avoidance of risk-taking behaviours) and extrinsic assets (e.g., living in a nurturing environment with supportive parents, having a non-delinquent peer group and experiencing a healthy school climate) (Armstrong, Birnie-Lefcovitch, & Ungar, 2005; Hanson & Austin, 2003; Lerner, Dowling, & Anderson, 2003). When faced with adversity and risk, some individuals will survive and even thrive while others will succumb to risky and possibly self-destructive behaviour. Those who thrive under adversity (e.g., poverty, maltreatment, loss of a parent) demonstrate qualities often described as resilience (Rutter, 2006; Ungar, 2011). As an addition to risk screening and assessment tools, the measurement of

¹ Examples of tools include: the Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (BASC-2 BESS), the Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC-2), the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA), the School Social Behaviour Scales (SSBS) and the Problem-Oriented Screening Instrument for Teenagers (POSIT), and the Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS).

² Examples of tools include: the Early Assessment Risk List (EARL-20B and EARL-21G), Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY), Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) and Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI).

³ Tools used in the field of youth substance abuse include: Detection of Alcohol and Drug Problems in Adolescents (DEP-ADO) and the Addiction Severity Index for Adolescents (IGT-ADO). Tools used in the context of school problems include: Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ/BVQ), Academic Competence Evaluation Scales (ACES), and School Motivation and Learning Strategies Inventory (SMALS). Tools used in the mental health field include: Beck Scale for Suicide Ideation (BSS) and Depression, Anxiety, Stress Scales (DASS).



resilience (and assessment of protective factors) can enable identification of modifiable factors that can be used to inform crime prevention initiatives to help youth develop the capacity they require to cope with adversity during normative and non-normative developmental transitions (Masten & Wright, 2010).⁴

The existing research and evaluation literature has analyzed the validity and accuracy of prediction for many risk screening and assessment tools. Although limited in depth of analysis, more recent examinations of the effectiveness of risk screening and assessment tools have focused on the area of gender differences in predictive ability (e.g., Olver, Stockdale, & Wormith, 2009; Schwalbe, 2008) and generalizability to culturally diverse groups such as Aboriginal youth (e.g., Gossner & Wormith, 2007; Jung & Rawana, 1999; Meyers & Schmidt, 2008; Stockdale, Olver & Wong, 2010; Thompson & McGrath, 2012) and other ethnically diverse youth groups (e.g., Schmidt et al., 2005).

As risk screening and assessment tools are largely based on convenience samples of Caucasian participants, their equal application to diverse populations who may experience unique risk (and protective) factors is a legitimate concern. Only a few studies have included significant cohorts of females or non-Caucasian participants (Shepherd, Luebbers, & Dolan, 2013). It is critical that tools used to screen for and assess risk have been formulated and empirically tested on populations comparable to the cohort being evaluated. Therefore additional research is needed to explicitly identify what risk screening and assessment tools have been and can be employed for the purposes of crime prevention intervention in the Canadian context, and on what sub-populations (i.e., young women, Aboriginal youth, and ethnic minority youth groups) they have been validated with and used.

Since the inception of risk screening and assessment tools, questions have arisen over their generalizability and applicability to various populations (e.g., young women, Aboriginal youth, and various other ethnic minority groups). To date, there is no consensus on whether the same instruments (termed gender-neutral) should be used to predict male and female delinquency and offending (Reisig, Holtfreter, & Morash, 2006). Much of the early literature suggested that males and females generally possess similar risk factors for offending behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter, & Silva, 2001), leading to the notion that current methods of screening and assessment are valid for both genders (Schwalbe, 2008; Simourd & Andrews, 1994). Some research studies have demonstrated screening and assessment tools to be equally predictive of female offending (Olver, Stockdale, & Wormith 2009; Schwalbe, 2008). Alternatively, a growing body of research on female delinquency suggests the need for gender-specific tools. A number of studies have noted important gender-specific predictors that feature prominently in women (Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Cauffman, Lexcen, Goldweber, Shulman, & Grisso, 2007; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Chesney-Lind et al., 2008; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998; Daigle, Cullen, & Wright, 2007; Kempf-Leonard & Johansson, 2007; Reisig, Holtfreter, & Morash, 2006; Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman, 2010). Further, while generic risk factors may be predictive for both men and women, some argue it is the contextual experience of those risk factors that is essential to understanding female criminality (Hannah-Moffat, 2009; Resnick, Ireland, & Borowsky, 2004). Proponents of the contextual experience argument suggest that gendered risk assessment tools are needed (Emeka & Sorenson, 2009; Salisbury, Van Voorhis, & Spiropoulos, 2009).

The same lack of consensus exists for the application of risk screening and assessment tools to culturally diverse groups. Some research has demonstrated the commonalities of maladaptive behaviours across culturally diverse groups suggesting the universal utility of particular standardized risk measures (Bonta, 2002; Gutierrez, Wilson, Rugge, & Bonta, 2013; Rugge, 2006). Alternatively, the assumption that the same risk factors extend to all individuals has been described as ethnocentric and can cause the misclassification of ethnic minority individuals potentially impacting their ability to receive adequate interventions (Jones, Masters, Griffiths, & Moulday, 2002; Martel, Brassard, & Jaccoud, 2011). Further, other literature suggests there may be discernible variation between the criminal pathways and experiences of various sub-groups of children and youth when compared with the general population. For example, Aboriginal compared with non-Aboriginal young people are more likely to experience a convergence of psychological, social, and environmental risks as a result of the evolving impact of

⁴ Examples of tools include: The Child and Health Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM-28 and CYRM-12) and the Structured Assessment of Protective Factors (SAPROF).



colonization and economic disadvantage (Austin, 2010; Cunneen & White, 2007; Wundersitz, 2010). In the United States, discrepancies in juvenile arrest rates for Black versus White youth have been linked to increased levels of risks in early childhood such as conduct problems, low academic achievement, poor parent child communication, and delinquent peers (Fite, Wynn, & Pardini, 2009).

Additional efforts are necessary to summarize and critically examine the arguments for and against the use of gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools and to examine whether population specific tools outperform more general tools. Based on this literature review process, it will be possible to highlight considerations (relevant and important factors) and make recommendations (informed opinion based on findings) for the future development and implementation of risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) to be used in the context of crime prevention interventions in Canada.

4. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF WORK

The objective of this work is the creation of three main deliverables as it relates to gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) applicable in the context of crime prevention:

- (1) A literature review;
- (2) A practical toolkit; and
- (3) A presentation on the findings.

These deliverables will assist Canadian practitioners responsible for the implementation of crime prevention interventions to make informed decisions when selecting from currently available risk screening and assessment tools with respect to their appropriateness for the subjects of their intervention.

It must be noted that the focus of the following work is on risk screening and assessment tools to be used in the context of implementing crime prevention interventions with children and youth (aged 6-24) in community-based settings and not on tools that focus explicitly on identifying risk for recidivism among institutionalized/incarcerated youth and/or adult populations.

5. TASKS

In order to complete the work, the Contractor must perform the following tasks:

- 5.1 Within five days of contract award, the Contractor must attend a kick-off meeting with the Technical Authority (TA) to discuss the project scope, objectives, work plan and methodological research approach.
- 5.2 Within 10 days of the kick-off meeting, the Contractor must submit to the TA a draft work plan that describes the timelines for completing the work. The TA will provide the Contractor with feedback and may request changes. The Contractor must then update the work plan and submit a final version. The Contractor must receive approval from the Technical prior to commencing the work.
- 5.3 Within 10 days of the kick-off meeting, the Contractor must submit a revised methodological research approach based on the feedback and requested changes received from the TA. The Contractor must make the requested changes and submit the final version to the TA for approval. The Contractor must receive approval from the Technical prior to commencing the work.
- 5.4 Based on the approved work plan and methodological research approach, the Contractor must submit an outline of the literature review to the TA for approval.



- 5.5 Based upon the TA's approval of the outline of the literature review, the Contractor must conduct an up-to-date review of the research and evaluation literature. The literature review must be submitted to the TA in report format with the following purposes:
- (1) To briefly summarize the current state of gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) in the crime prevention field.
 - (2) To identify the risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) that have either been validated with and/or adapted for various sub-populations (i.e., young women, Aboriginal youth, and ethnic minority youth groups) as well as those tools that have been developed explicitly for a specific sub-population (i.e., young women, Aboriginal youth, and ethnic minority youth groups). The focus should be on risk screening and assessment tools that can be employed for the purposes of crime prevention interventions and that can be administered in a community-based setting by practitioners possessing minimal clinical qualifications.
 - (3) To summarize and present a critical analysis of the issues and arguments for and against the need for gender-specific and culturally-adapted instruments. The focus should be on risk screening and assessment tools employed in the crime prevention and/or youth justice domains but, depending on the availability of information, and in consultation with the TA, the Consultant may expand the scope to include other relevant fields (e.g., adult criminal justice, mental health, etc.).
 - (4) To prepare and present considerations (relevant and important factors as identified in the literature review) and general recommendations (informed opinion based on findings of the literature review) for the future development and implementation (as necessary and/or appropriate) of gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and risk assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) to be used in the context of community-based crime prevention interventions in Canada.
 - (5) The literature review must focus on research and evaluation information and materials from Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand (and any other relevant countries as determined by the Contractor in consultation with the TA) and include a wide range of publications (i.e., peer-reviewed articles, books, governmental and non-governmental reports, guidance documents, manuals and tip sheets). A starting point for the literature review is the reference list at the end of this document.

The literature review must be developed as a comprehensive, succinct report, which will take into account the feedback of the TA. It must include: an abstract (approximately 100 words); a structured executive summary (3-4 pages); and a main report (maximum 40 pages, including references but excluding annexes, and appendices). Annexes and appendices can be used to present supporting methodological and analytical documentation not central to communicating the main findings

Both a draft and final version of the literature review must be submitted.

- 5.6 Based on the results of the literature review process, the Contractor must prepare and submit to the TA a practical toolkit that includes the following two sections:
- (1) The first section of the toolkit is a list of all identified risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) that have either been explicitly developed, validated with and/or adapted for various sub-populations (i.e., young women, Aboriginal youth, and ethnic



minority youth groups) in Canada and internationally. For the identified tool, at minimum, the following information must be included:

- Name of tool; author(s)/developer(s); date(s) of publication; version(s); domains/categories; construct(s) measured; purpose/objective(s); population(s) measured; language(s).

(2) The second section of the toolkit is comprised of descriptive sheets of gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) that have been used in Canada only (1 descriptive sheet per tool). The Contractor has to develop a template for descriptive sheet that must include, at the minimum, the following information:

- General – name of tool; author(s)/developer(s); date(s) of publication; version(s); domains/categories; construct(s) measured; purpose/objective(s); use(s) of information; population(s) measured; language(s).
- Structure and Administration – method(s) of administration; respondent(s); number of items; subscales; response format(s); estimated time to administer; respondent qualification(s); training requirements, scoring and interpretation.
- Sample Norms, Reliability and Validity – sample for development norms; measures of reliability; validation studies.
- Availability – permission to use; cost details; downloads; contact information; online resources; key references.

The practical toolkit will be presented as a separate deliverable, which will take into account the feedback of the TA. It must include an introduction; an overview of the methodology for tool selection (including inclusion and exclusion criteria); a list all identified risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) that have either been explicitly developed, validated with and/or adapted for various sub-populations (i.e., young women, Aboriginal youth, and ethnic minority youth groups); and descriptive sheets on the gender-specific and culturally-adapted risk screening and assessment tools for children and youth (aged 6-24) that have been used in Canada only.

Both a draft and final version of the practical toolkit must be submitted.

5.7 Develop and deliver a presentation (on a date and in a format determined in collaboration with the TA) that incorporates information and findings based on both the literature review report and the practical toolkit.

The presentation will be delivered as part of a Public Safety Canada learning event on a date and in a format (in-person or virtually via WebEx and/or teleconference) determined in collaboration with the TA.

Both a draft and final version of the presentation must be submitted.

5.8 The Contractor must participate in status update meetings and must submit status reports as requested by the TA.



6. DELIVERABLES

The Contractor must submit the following deliverables, each of which builds on previous deliverables:

- A work plan;
- A methodological research approach;
- A literature review;
- A practical toolkit;
- A PowerPoint presentation;
- Status reports as requested.

7. PERIOD OF WORK AND SCHEDULE

The period of work would occur from the date of contract award to October 31, 2018.

Deliverable	Due Date
7.1 Start date	Date of contract award
7.2 Project kick-off meeting with the TA	Within five days of the contract award
7.3 Work plan methodological research approach	Within 10 days of receipt of comments on the proposed approach from the TA.
7.4 Outline of literature review report Draft of descriptive sheet template for practical toolkit	Within 1 month of the contract award
7.5 Draft literature review report	June 30, 2017
7.6 Draft Practical Toolkit	July 31, 2017
7.7 Draft PowerPoint presentation	August 31, 2017
7.8 Final literature review report Final practical toolkit Final PowerPoint presentation	September 30, 2018
7.9 Delivery of PowerPoint presentation	By October 31, 2018

8. REPORTING AND COMMUNICATION

In addition to the timely submission of all deliverables and fulfilment of obligations specified within the contract, it is the responsibility of the Contractor to facilitate and maintain regular communication with the TA. Communication is defined as all reasonable effort to inform all parties of plans, decisions, proposed approaches, implementation, and results of work, to ensure that the project is progressing well and in accordance with expectations. Communication may include: phone calls, electronic mail, faxes, mailings, and meetings. In addition, the Contractor is to immediately notify the Department of any issues, problems, or areas of concern in relation to any work completed under the contract, as they arise.

9. WORK LOCATION

All work will be carried out at the Contractor's facilities; however, the Contractor must be available to participate in teleconference meetings with Public Safety and may be required to make a final in-person presentation in Ottawa, ON. Any travel required will be paid in accordance with the Treasury Board Secretariat and National Joint Council travel guidelines and directives.



10. LANGUAGE

All communications with Public Safety Canada staff must be performed in the official language (*English or French*) preferred by the employee.

Deliverables may be submitted in either Official Language and PS will arrange for the translation of deliverables, as required.

11. REFERENCES

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. A. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Armstrong, M. I., Birnie-Lefcovitch, S., & Ungar, M. (2005). Pathways between social support, family wellbeing, quality of parenting, and child resilience: What we know. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14(2), 269-81.

Austin, D. (2010). Narratives of power: Historical mythologies in contemporary Quebec and Canada. *Race & Class*, 52, 19-32.

Baglivio, M. T., & Jackowski, K. (2013). Examining the validity of a juvenile offending risk assessment instrument across gender and race/ethnicity. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 11(1), 26-43.

Belknap, J., & Holsinger, K. (2006). The gendered nature of risk factors for delinquency. *Feminist Criminology*, 1, 48-71.

Bonta, J. (2002). Offender risk assessment: Guidelines for selection and use. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 355-379.

Bottrell, D. (2009). Understanding "marginal" perspectives: Towards a social theory of Resilience. *Qualitative Social Work*, 8, 321-339.

Cauffman, E., Lexcen, F. J., Goldweber, A., Shulman, E. P., & Grisso, T. (2007). Gender differences in mental health symptoms among delinquent and community youth. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 5, 287-307.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1997). *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chesney-Lind, M., Morash, M., & Stevens, T. (2008). Girls' troubles, girls' delinquency, and gender responsive programming: A review. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 41, 162-189.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. (1998). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Cunneen, C., & White, R. (2006). Australia: Control, containment or empowerment? In J. Muncie & B. Goldson (Eds.), *Comparative youth justice* (pp. 96-110). London, UK: Sage.

Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Wright, J. P. (2007). Gender differences in the predictors of juvenile delinquency: Assessing the generality-specificity debate. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 5, 254-286.

Emeka, T. Q., & Sorensen, J. R. (2009). Female juvenile risk. Is there a need for gendered assessment instruments? *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7, 313-330.

Farrington, D. P. (2002). Developmental criminology and risk-focused prevention. In



M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner, (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of criminology*, (3rd ed., pp. 657-701). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Farrington, D. P. (2007). Childhood risk factors and risk-focused prevention. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (4th ed., pp. 602-640). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Farrington, D. P., Loeber, R., & Ttofi, M. M. (2012). Risk and protective factors for offending. In B. C. Welsh & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of crime prevention* (pp. 46-69). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Farrington, D. P., & Welsh, B. C. (2007). *Saving children from a life of crime: Early risk factors and effective intervention*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fite, P. J., Wynn, P., & Pardini, D. A. (2009). Explaining discrepancies in arrest rates between black and white male juveniles. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77*, 916-927.

France, A., Freiberg, K., & Homel, R. (2010). Beyond risk factors: Towards a holistic prevention paradigm for children and young people. *British Journal of Social Work, 40* (4), 1192-1210.

Gossner, D., & Wormith, J. S. (2007). The prediction of recidivism among young offenders in Saskatchewan. *Canadian Journal of Police & Security Services, 5*, 70-82.

Gutierrez, L., Wilson, H. A., Rugge, T., & Bonta, J. (2013). The prediction of recidivism with Aboriginal offenders: A theoretically informed meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 55*, 55-99.

Hannah-Moffat, K. (2009). Gridlock or mutability: Reconsidering "gender" and risk assessment. *Criminology and Public Policy, 8*, 209-219.

Hanson, T., & Austin, G. (2003). *Student health risks, resilience, and academic performance in California: Year 2 report, longitudinal analyses*. Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., & Arthur, M. W. (2002). Promoting science-based prevention in communities. *Addictive Behaviors, 27*, 951-976.

Huizinga, D., Loeber, R., & Cothorn, L. (2000). Co-occurrence of delinquency and other problem behaviors. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Jones, R., Masters, M., Griffiths, A., & Moulday, N. (2002). Culturally relevant assessment of Indigenous offenders: A literature review. *Australian Psychologist, 37*, 187-197.

Jung, S., & Rawana, E. P. (1999). Risk and need assessment of juvenile offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26*, 69-89.

Kempf-Leonard, K., & Johansson, P. (2007). Gender and runaways: Risk factors, delinquency, and juvenile justice experiences. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 5*, 308-327.

Lerner, R. M., Dowling, E. M., & Anderson, P. M. (2003). Positive youth development: Thriving as the basis of personhood and civil society. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*(3), 172-80.

Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., & LeBlanc, J. C. (2013). *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 104*(2), 131-135.

Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., & Van de Vijver, F. R. R. (2012). Validation of the Child and Youth Resilience Measure-28 (CYRM-28) among Canadian youth with complex needs. *Research on Social Work Practice, 22*(2), 219-26.



Martel, J., Brassard, R., & Jaccoud, M. (2011). When two worlds collide: Aboriginal risk management in Canadian corrections. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51, 235-255.

Masten A. S., & Wright, M. O. (2010). Resilience over the lifespan: Developmental perspectives on resistance, recovery, and transformation. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra, & J. S. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience*. New York, NY: Guilford.

Meyers, J., & Schmidt, F. (2008). Predictive validity of the Structured Assessment for Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY) with juvenile offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 344-355.

Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). *Sex differences in antisocial behavior: Conduct disorder, delinquency, and violence in the Dunedin longitudinal study*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Olver, M. E., Stockdale, K. C., & Wormith, J. S. (2009). Risk assessment with young offenders: A meta-analysis of three assessment measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 329-353.

Ontario Centre of Excellence for Child and Youth Mental Health. (2017). Resource Hub: Measures Database. Available from:

<http://www.excellenceforchildand youth.ca/resource-hub/measures-database>

Reisig, M. D., Holtfreter, K., & Morash, M. (2006). Assessing recidivism risk across female pathways to crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 23, 384-405.

Resnick, M. S., Ireland, M., & Borowsky, I. (2004). Youth violence perpetration: What protects? What predicts? Findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 35, 424e1–424e10.

Rugge, Y. (2006). *Risk assessment of male Aboriginal offenders: A 2006 perspective*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Rutter, M. (2006). Implication of resilience concepts for scientific understanding. In B. M. Lester, A. S. Masten, & B. McEwen (Eds.), *Resilience in children*. Boston, MA: Blackwell.

Salisbury, E. J., Van Voorhis, P., & Spiropoulos, G. V. (2009). The predictive validity of a gender-responsive needs assessment: An exploratory study. *Crime and Delinquency*, 55, 550-585.

Savignac, J. (2010). *Tools to identify and assess the risk of offending among youth*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Available from: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pbctns/tls-dntf-rsk-rprt/index-en.aspx>

Schmidt, F., Hoge, R. D., & Gomes, L. (2005). Reliability and validity analyses of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 32, 329-344.

Schwalbe, C. S. (2008). A meta-analysis of juvenile justice risk assessment instruments: Predictive validity by gender. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 1367-1381.

Shepherd, S. M., Adams, Y., McEntyre, E., & Walker, R. (2014). Violence risk assessment in Australian Aboriginal offender populations: A review of the literature. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20(3), 281-293.

Shepherd, S. M., Luebbers, S., & Dolan, M. (2013). Gender and ethnicity in juvenile risk assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(4), 388-408.



Simourd, L., & Andrews, D. A. (1994). Correlates of delinquency: A look at gender differences. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 6, 26-31.

Stockdale, K. C., Olver, M. E., & Wong, S. C. P. (2010). The Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version and adolescent and adult recidivism: Considerations with respect to gender, ethnicity and age. *Psychological Assessment*, 22(4), 768-781.

Thompson, A. P., & McGrath, A. (2011). Subgroup differences and implications for contemporary risk-need assessment with juvenile offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, (Dec 12), 1-11.

Ungar, M. (2011). The social ecology of resilience: Addressing contextual and cultural ambiguity of a nascent construct. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 81(1), 1-17.

Ungar, M., & Liebenberg, L. (2011). Assessing resilience across cultures using mixed methods: Construction of the Child and Youth Resilience Measure. *Journal of Multiple Methods Research*, 5(2), 126-49.

Van Voorhis, P., Wright, E., Salisbury, S., & Bauman, A. (2010). Women's risk factors and their contributions to existing risk/needs assessment: The current status of gender responsive assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 261-288.

Wundersitz, J. (2010). *Indigenous perpetrators of violence: Prevalence and risk factors for offending* (Research and Public Policy Series 105). Available from:
<http://www.aic.gov.au/documents/2/A/4/%7B2A48440C-E61B-41E4-AD8D-28F536F8B586%7Drpp105.pdf>



ANNEX B BASIS OF PAYMENT

The Contractor will be paid in accordance with the following Basis of Payment for Work performed pursuant to the Contract.

(To be inserted at contract award.)

Canadian Customs Duty and GST/HST extra.

All deliverables are F.O.B. Destination, and Canadian Customs Duty included, where applicable.

GOOD AND SERVICES TAX (GST) / HARMONIZED SALES TAX (HST)

All prices and amounts of money in the Contract are exclusive of Goods and Services Tax (GST) or Harmonized Sales Tax (HST), as applicable, unless otherwise indicated. The GST or HST, whichever is applicable, is extra to the price and will be paid by Canada.

The estimated GST or HST is included in the total estimated cost. GST or HST, to the extent applicable, will be incorporated into all invoices and progress claims and shown as a separate item on invoices and progress claims. All items that are zero-rated, exempt or to which the GST or HST does not apply, are to be identified as such on all invoices. The Contractor agrees to remit to Canada Revenue Agency any amounts of GST and HST paid or due.