



Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7960 • Fax 415-865-4325 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

STEPHEN NASH
Director, Finance Division

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
Finance Division

DATE: October 5, 2010

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: Request For Proposals: The AOC's Community Corrections Program seeks the services of evidence-based practices (EBP) consultants to provide training and technical assistance to criminal justice partners in California counties as they work to promote public safety by reducing recidivism among adult felony probationers.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals ("RFP"):
Project Title: Community Corrections EBP Consultants
RFP Number: EXEC-201001-RB

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: Proposals must be received by no later than close of business, October 22, 2010

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: **Proposals must be sent to:**
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden
455 Golden Gate Avenue, EXEC-201001-RB
San Francisco, CA 94102

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: E-MAIL:
Solicitations@jud.ca.gov

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.

1.2. Community Corrections Program

1.2.1. The Community Corrections Program was formed by the Administrative Office of the Courts in order to manage recent court-related initiatives designed to promote public safety by reducing recidivism among adult felony probationers and parolees. The Program works out of the Bay Area/Northern Coastal Regional Office which provides administrative guidance and support.

1.2.2. As part of the California Risk Assessment Pilot Project (CalRAPP) California counties will explore the use by the courts of actuarial risk/needs assessment instruments to reduce recidivism and probation revocations among offenders aged 18–25 placed on felony probation.

1.2.3. Napa, San Francisco, and Santa Cruz (“Round 1 counties”) were selected as the first three pilot counties in early 2010. The Round 1 counties participated in a two day project training in May 2010. Up to three pilot counties in Round 2 (will be selected in October 2010) and will participate in a similar training in early December, 2010. Contingent upon funding appropriations, the work may include additional counties. All pilot counties will receive follow-up technical assistance described in this RFP.

2. TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

2.1. The AOC has developed the following list of key events from RFP issuance through intent to award contract. All key dates are subject to change at the AOC’s discretion.

EVENT	KEY DATES
RFP issued	October 5, 2010

EVENT	KEY DATES
Deadline for Questions	October 12, 2010
Posting of Answers To Questions (<i>estimate only</i>)	October 18, 2010
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	Close of Business October 22, 2010
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	October 29, 2010

3. PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

- 3.1. The AOC’s Community Corrections Program seeks the services of up to two consultants with expertise in evidence-based practices for training and technical assistance projects with local justice partners throughout the state including the courts, probation, defense, and prosecution. The selected consultants will be expected to work together and with AOC staff as needed to complete the work. Consultants must have demonstrated expertise in the areas of the use of actuarial risk/needs offender assessment information in state felony sentencing decisions and evidence based responses to probation violations. The Community Corrections Program expects to enhance the potential of county probation departments to achieve better outcomes with felony probationers by providing more specialized education and training on evidence based practices to the local justice partners.
- 3.2. There is no guarantee of the amount of Work that may result from this RFP, any awarded Master Agreement, or any Work Order. Future Work Orders to perform Work at any of the 58 counties may be executed against a Master Agreement as needed by the AOC, pending availability of funds.
- 3.3. Attachment 2, Exhibit B, paragraph 44, entitled “Master Agreement Terms and Options to Renew,” sets forth the terms and conditions for the AOC’s option to extend the Master Agreement. Extension of the Master Agreement would be at the AOC’s sole discretion and would be for the purpose of executing a new Work Order to add other counties that will require the same or similar training and technical assistance related to the AOC’s Community Corrections Program.
- 3.4. At this time, the fund allocation for the Initial Term of this project is anticipated to be in the range of \$50,000 to \$60,000. Work Orders issued in subsequent option terms for additional counties will be contingent upon the appropriation of additional funds. Proposers must submit its rate per the hour for each consultant.

- 3.5. The State does not guarantee that the contractor will receive a specific volume of work, a specific total Work Order Amount, or a specific order value under the awarded Master Agreement. Additionally, there will be no limit on the number of Work Orders the State may issue under the Master Agreement, nor will there be any specific limitation on the quantity, minimum and/or maximum value of individual Work Orders.

4. RFP ATTACHMENTS

Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:

- 4.1. Attachment 1, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in Attachment 1, in the preparation and submittal of their proposals.
- 4.2. Attachment 2, Master Agreement Terms and Conditions. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions for the requested services are attached as Attachment 2, which consists of Exhibits A through F.
- 4.3. Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment 2, or clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment 2. If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of Attachment 2, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.
- 4.4. Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each proposer prior to entering into a contract with that proposer. Therefore, proposer's proposal must include a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form, set forth as Attachment 4.

5. SCOPE OF SERVICES

- 5.1. Services are expected to be performed by the consultants between November 15, 2010 and June 30, 2011, unless the AOC exercises its option to extend the Master Agreement.
- 5.2. The AOC will select up to two consultants to perform this work as follows:
 - 5.2.1. One consultant will be designated the primary consultant in the area of the use of actuarial risk/needs offender assessment information in felony sentencing

decisions and the secondary consultant in the area of evidence based responses to probation violations.

- 5.2.2. A second consultant will be designated the primary consultant in the area of evidence based responses to probation violations and the secondary consultant in the area of the use of actuarial risk/needs offender assessment information in felony sentencing decisions.
- 5.3. When issuing a Work Order for a consultant to perform a specific task, the AOC will consider the task and offer the work to the primary consultant in that subject area. In the event the primary consultant is unavailable, the AOC may offer the work to the secondary consultant.
- 5.4. When specified in a Work Order, the consultant may be asked to:
 - 5.4.1. Develop new or revise existing curriculum, serve as faculty, and facilitate small group discussions at training for counties specified by the AOC. The training will emphasize the use of actuarial risk/needs offender assessment information in state felony sentencing decisions and evidence based responses to probation violations. Attendees will be representatives of the courts, probation, prosecution and defense in the selected counties.
 - 5.4.2. Provide follow-up technical assistance to the same counties per paragraph 5.4.1 above. Develop the process, content, and format by which actuarial risk and needs assessment information will be provided to the court. Develop evidence based responses to probation violations for use by the courts and probation departments. Provide follow-up training to local justice partners. Provide one or more on-site visits to one or more counties

6. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- 6.1. Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC on a 100 point scale using the criteria set forth in the table below. Proposers must clearly demonstrate how it meets the requirements of the evaluation criterion.
- 6.2. The proposer with the highest total score will become the primary candidate for work set forth in either 5.2.1 or 5.2.2. The proposer’s score in Evaluation Category 1 or 2 will be the determining factor on whether the candidate is designated as primary consultant for work set forth in 5.2.1 or 5.2.2.
- 6.3. The proposer with the second highest total score will be designated the primary consultant for the remaining work category set forth in either 5.2.1 or 5.2.2, depending on which category was already awarded to the proposer with the highest total score.

Evalu- ation Category	Evaluation Description	Possible Points	Corresponding RFP Sections or Attachments
1	Demonstrated expertise in the areas of the use of actuarial risk/needs offender assessment information in state felony sentencing decisions.	20	7.2, 7.3, and 7.7
2	Demonstrated expertise in the areas of the area of evidence based responses to probation violations.	20	7.2, 7.4, and 7.7.
3	Experience serving as faculty to judges, probation departments, defense counsel, and prosecuting attorneys.	15	7.2, 7.5, and 7.7
4	Experience providing technical assistance to local justice partners in the implementation of evidence based practice and evidence based sentencing.	15	7.2, 7.6, and 7.7
5	Reasonableness of Fee Proposal.	10	7.8 and subparagraphs 7.8.1 and 7.8.2 of this RFP
6	Acceptance of Master Agreement Terms and Conditions	10	7.9 and Attachment 3
7	Organization of Proposer	10	7.1, and subparagraphs 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3, 7.1.4

7. SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

The proposal must include and be organized into the following major sections:

- 7.1. Proposer Information:
 - 7.1.1. Proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers in a cover letter.
 - 7.1.2. Number of years proposer or proposer's firm has been in the business of providing services similar in nature to the work set forth in this RFP.
 - 7.1.3. Number of full time employees.
 - 7.1.4. Disclose any judgments, pending litigation, or other real or potential financial reversals that might materially affect proposer's viability or the viability of the proposer's firm.
- 7.2. Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff.
- 7.3. A description of as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities in Evaluation Category 1.
- 7.4. A description of as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities in Evaluation Category 2.
- 7.5. A description of as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities in Evaluation Category 3.
- 7.6. A description of as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities in Evaluation Category 4.
- 7.7. Customer References - Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of 5 clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check such references.
- 7.8. Fee Proposal
 - 7.8.1. The proposal must include the proposer's hourly rate which should not exceed \$137.50 per hour. Note that any Work Orders resulting from this RFP will include the hourly rate with a maximum of 8 hours in any day work is authorized to be performed. It is expected that all service providers responding to this RFP will offer the service provider's government or comparable favorable rates.
 - 7.8.2. If a Work Order is issued for the tasks described in 5.4.1 above, the AOC will pay the proposer a firm fixed amount of \$4,000 inclusive of all

expenses including air transportation. One 2-day training session is scheduled for December 2 and 3, 2010 in San Francisco.

- 7.9. Compliance with Contract Terms - Complete and submit Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Also, if changes are proposed, submit a version of Attachment 2, Contract Terms with all tracked changes, as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.

8. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

- 8.1. Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 8.2. One (1) hard copy original and four (4) hard copy duplicates of the proposal signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative. In addition to the hard copies, proposers must submit one (1) electronic version of the proposal on CD.
- 8.3. Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed in the Submission of Proposals section of the coversheet to this RFP by the due date.
- 8.4. Only written responses received by the due date will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.

9. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

- 9.1. A proposer may be required to clarify aspect of its submittal by responding in writing to written questions asked by the AOC. Such questions will be delivered to the proposer by e-mail and the proposer must submit its response within a reasonable time solely determined by the AOC. If the AOC requests written clarification, proposers may only provide the requested clarification. Proposers will not be permitted to modify its proposal.
- 9.2. A proposer may be required to participate in one or more interviews to clarify aspects of their submittal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted by telephone conference call. However, if conducted in person at the AOC in San Francisco, all expenses shall be borne by the proposer. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

10. CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

- 10.1. The Administrative Office of the Courts is bound by California Rule of Court 10.500 (see: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules/amendments/jan2010-2.pdf>) as to disclosure of its administrative records. If the information submitted contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents.
- 10.2. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under Rule 10.500, the material may be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a proposer is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then it should not include such information in its proposal.

END OF FORM