



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

CHRISTINE M. HANSEN
Director, Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Finance Division

DATE: May 30, 2007

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: **ADDENDUM 3**
Scope of Work / Schedule Changes
Responses to Questions

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (“RFP”), as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/> :

Project Title: California Peer Court DUI Prevention Strategies Project Evaluation

RFP Number: CFCC-070508-RB

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: 1:00 p.m., June 11, 2007—See Section 1.4 for additional key dates

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS: Proposals must be delivered to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP #CFCC-070508-RB
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

The following paragraphs on pages 10 – 11 of the RFP have been modified:

On Page 10:

- 3.1.2 *August 2007 through ~~April~~ ~~late June~~ ~~July~~ 2008*— Consultant accomplishments must include (but not be limited to) the implementation of an evaluation plan of the curriculum and project timeline that include:

On Page 11:

- 3.1.6 By *~~May~~ ~~June~~ ~~July~~ 2008*—Consultant shall submit a final draft report that includes program recommendations and best practices, an executive summary, and final drafts of all supplemental materials.

The following are the responses to questions asked:

1. Where are each of the 10 mini-grant recipients from Phase 2 located (please specify city)?

Answer: 1. Oakland, Alameda County; 2. Eureka, Humboldt County; 3. San Rafael, Marin County; 4. Auburn, Placer County; 5. Stockton, San Joaquin County; 6. Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County; 7. Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County; 8. Redding, Shasta County; 9. Santa Rosa, Sonoma County; 10. Modesto, Stanislaus County.

2. About how many youth do you expect will participate in the program from July 2007 to July 2008?

Answer: Approximately 2000+ youth.

3. About how many parents/guardians do you expect will participate in the program from July 2007 to July 2008?

Answer: Approximately 1000+ parent/guardians.

4. What is the structure of program delivery? Specifically, do they meet in a group with a trainer? How long is each meeting? How many times do they meet, and over what duration of time? Please specify for youth and parents/guardians.

Answer: The curriculum consists of 5 modules for the peer court program youth and 1 module for the parent/guardian component. The youth component of the curriculum is designed for 6 to 8 hours of instruction. The parent/guardian component of the curriculum is designed for 1 to 2 hours of instruction.

The youth would meet with the instructor at his/her respective peer court program to take 5 modules of the curriculum. The parent/guardian would take 1 module of the curriculum. To best accommodate each court's program, the instructor can teach the 5 modules in flexible segments:

- *1 module per day (delivered over 5 sessions);
- *2 to 3 per day (delivered over 2 sessions); and
- *All 5 modules delivered in a one day session.

The logistics regarding the program delivery is up to the peer court program instructor's discretion (classroom size, number of staffing, number of cases, etc.). However, all youth who go through the program are required to complete 6 to 8 hours of the curriculum, and the parents/guardians who go through the program are required to complete 1 to 2 hours of the curriculum (depending on how the peer court programs deliver youth and parent/guardian components).

5. Is program registration for youth ongoing or based on cohorts? Likewise, is program registration for parents/guardians ongoing or based on cohorts?

Answer: Program participation for youth and parent/guardian is ongoing. The number of registered participants at a given time will determine the frequency of the program delivery. Some peer court programs may offer the program once a month whereas other courts may offer the program weekly.

6. Has the curriculum been implemented?

Answer: A few courts have begun implementing the program since April 1st. However, all court grantees should have begun implementation by June 1st.

7. At how many sites and when was the curriculum implemented at each site?

Answer: Ten peer court sites are part of the implementation phase. The implementation start date varies for each court site. However, all courts should have begun implementation by June 1st.

8. Have the sites been collecting data and is this data retrievable electronically?

Answer: The sites have not begun collecting data. The hired evaluator would create the pre and post test for the courts to use to collect data.

9. Have instruments been designed to measure changes in knowledge about DUI (e.g., pre- and post-tests to measure knowledge gains)? Changes in attitudes?

Answer: No instruments have been designed to measure changes in knowledge about DUI. The hired evaluator would design the instrument to do so.

10. If such instruments have been developed, are their particular versions for (1) parents and (2) participants?

Answer: No instruments have been developed, but the hired evaluator would develop the instruments to evaluate the parents and teen participants separately.

11. If instruments have not been developed, is their design and testing within the scope of this RFP?

Answer: The hired evaluator would be responsible for the design and testing; however, there are ample internal research and subject matter resources available to assist in the process.