



**Judicial Council of California**  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Telephone 415-865-7739 • Fax 415-865-7217 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
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*

**TO:** **POTENTIAL PROPOSERS**

**FROM:** ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS  
FINANCE DIVISION

**DATE:** **April 21, 2011**

**SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:** The purpose of this document is to publish the AOC's Responses to Proposers' Questions, directed to the Solicitations@jud.ca.gov by April 7, 2011, at close of business.

**ACTION REQUIRED:** You are invited to review the questions and answers to the following Request for Proposals (RFP), as posted at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm>

Project Title: **Evaluation of Family Finding and Engagement Pilot Programs in Six California Counties**

RFP Number: CFCC 01-11- LM

**DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE:** Proposals must be received by **April 28, at close of business.**

**SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL:** Proposals must be sent to:  
**Judicial Council of California**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**  
**Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. CFCC 01-11-LM**  
**455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102-3688**

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

**AOC RESPONSES TO PROPOSERS' QUESTIONS**

**Question 1:** Our organization is not presently certified to do business in California will this status have a negative impact on our ability to be awarded the contract?

*Answer: Question was deemed unclear and request for clarification not provided by Proposer. Please see Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form, 4. Payee Residency Status for classifications and definitions that may be helpful in determining "certified to do business in California."*

**Question 2:** How should the contractor account for overhead costs in the proposal budget?

*Answer: See Attachment 2, Exhibit C, 4. Direct Expenses:*

*"All fees and charges noted in this Agreement are inclusive of any and all anticipated travel, lodging, transportation, clerical support, Materials, fees, overhead, profits, and other costs and/or expenses incidental to the performance of the specified requirements under this Agreement."*

**Question 3:** RFP states (page B-7 under Subcontracting) that the "contractor shall not subcontract this Agreement or services provided under this Agreement, unless the State agrees to the subcontracting in writing." Can an organization include a subcontractor in the proposal budget?

*Answer: The subcontractor(s) shall be identified, their hourly rate and the extent to which they will be used in performing the services set forth in the RFP. Any so identified subcontractor(s) shall be in any contract resulting from this RFP.*

**Question 4:** The RFP cites "six FFE pilot programs" and "pilot projects in each of the 6 counties/courts." Are the six counties already implementing family finding services? If so, who are the providers—private service organizations, staff from the courts?

*Answer: One of the pilot projects has begun providing services. Due to contracts still being negotiated, we cannot identify the specific providers. The largest pilot is expected to serve 250 children per year, and the smallest pilot to serve 25 children per year.*

**Question 5:** Are the six counties clustered in a specific region of the State?

*Answer: Pilots are not geographically clustered; they will be located from the south to the north of the State.*

**Question 6:** The RFP says that "CFCC will provide a web-based platform for collection of case-level data that can be customized and used by all the project evaluation sites. If contractor prefers to use its own web-based data collection platform the cost should be clearly identified in the budget." Does the CFCC

provided platform contain packaged reports that would provide the data needed for the evaluation or can data be easily extracted for analyses purposes?

*Answer: Yes, both reports and data extracts are available.*

**Question 7:** What is the level of detail of the data collected—e.g., does the platform allow for the assessment of change in number of family members discovered and engaged over time?

*Answer: Data is collected on a case level and allows information gathering on all family members.*

**Question 8:** Does it allow for compilation of duration of service, and extent of completion of specific family finding tasks?

*Answer: Yes, it allows for compilation.*

**Question 9:** Does the existing platform contain a module by which cases/children can be assigned randomly?

*Answer: No, this would have to be done outside the data base.*

**Question 10:** This potential contractor does have a web-based data collection system so the cost of developing such a platform would not be included in the budget; however, slight modifications may need to be conducted if requested by the six counties or CFCC. In addition, the cost of training site-level users and auditing the data will need to be included in our budget.

*Answer: Proposing to modify an existing evaluation data collection system and provide training is an acceptable use of funds.*

**Question 11:** On page D-2, 2.2.2.4, the RFP reads, “Prepare report summarizing the findings on pilots for the first seven months of data collection.” Does this mean that at the start of this contract (May 30), the six sites have been collecting data for seven months? If so, is this process/implementation data, outcome data or both? Also, if the sites have been collecting data, have they done so within the CFCC provided platform?

*Answer: This is a generic answer to all the questions on timing of data collection and deliverables.*

*The timing of this project is such that the AOC expects it to be likely that only one month of data will be collected for both the process and the impact evaluations by September 30, 2011. Section D 2.2.2.4 which read “Prepare report summarizing the findings on pilots for the first seven months of data collection” has been deleted from the RFP, pursuant to Addendum 1*

*The AOC is most concerned that bidders focus on the “design and launch” (Section D.2.1) aspects of the proposal. Proposers should refer to D.2.1: “Contractor’s responsibility is to design, launch and conduct the first round of both process and impact evaluations in each of the six FFE pilot programs. This includes a comprehensive research design by July 31, 2011; implementation of data collection instruments, procedures and technology by September 31, 2011; collection and reporting of first month of data collection and recommendations for evaluation design and data collection improvement by September 31, 2011.”*

Project Title: Evaluation of Family Finding and Engagement Pilot Programs in Six California Counties  
RFP Number: CFCC 01-11-LM

*References in Exhibit D 2.4: Deliverables and Due Dates, to project reports including data collection summaries have been changed to:*

*Deliverable 5 (Project Report 4) covers the first month of process evaluation data;*

*Deliverable 6 (Project Report 5) covers the first month of impact evaluation data;*

*Deliverable 7 (Project Report 6) covers the second month of impact evaluation data if new data is available.*

*Deliverable 8 (Project Report 7) covers the third month of impact evaluation data if new data is available.*

***[See Addendum #1]***

**Question 12:** Is there a page limit for the proposal?

*Answer: No, but we encourage proposers to be as brief as is compatible with adequately explaining the proposal.*

**Question 13:** Are materials from the Family Finding and Engagement Toolkit available for review? If so, please identify where these materials can be located.

*Answer: The Toolkit is not completed. When selected, contractor will be given the opportunity to work with the designer of the toolkit to align the toolkit and evaluations.*

**Question 14:** By project start date, will all six pilot counties identified for participation in the project have already initiated the family finding mandate (Rule 5.637. Family Finding (§§ 309(e)))?

*Answer: Yes, all sites will have begun providing service.*

**Question 15:** Page 1D-1 states that there are six different process evaluations. Page D-2 states that one must prepare an evaluation plan for each evaluation pilot. Can there be one evaluation plan for all pilots?

*Answer: Yes, but pilots may differ in the family finding and engagement model they implement. A single evaluation plan will need to include variability by site and model of service.*

**Question 16:** How much funding will the 6 sites receive for program implementation, data collection and reporting, and evaluation? When will they be funded? What will be the duration of funding? How many children will they be required to serve per year?

*Answer: See Question 4.*

**Question 17:** What is the web-based platform for the collection of case level data that CFCC will provide? Will the survey instruments be stored on a CFCC server?

*Answer: The AOC can provide a web based data collection tool for FFE projects to carry out data collection. Data can be stored on an AOC server. The tool is likely to be Oracle based.*

**Question 18:** From the perspective of the Judicial Council, does this study require IRB review and approval, or is this study subject to a waiver?

*Answer: This is not known at this time. Institutional Review Board approval may be covered through other partners in the projects.*

**Question 19:** Please clarify the distinctions between Reports 4, 5, 6, and 7. Given that the RFP asks for data for the first month of data collection and the project is only 18 weeks, it is not clear how there will be

*Answer: See Question 11.*

**Question 20:** To what extent has the Family Finding and Engagement model already been implemented in any of the proposed or potential sites (i.e., will sites be selected based on your knowledge of the family finding and engagement practices currently underway)? This question is posed in the context of the evaluation, and the degree to which evaluation methods will need to be designed to assess implementation of new practices in project sites vs. outcomes based on a period of implementation that is already underway (i.e., if the model has not yet been implemented, and given the expected timeframe for the project, would the focus of the evaluation be on implementation as opposed to impact analysis)?

*Answer: Some form of Family Finding and Engagement has been implemented in at least 3 of the 6 sites. However, evaluation design and planning, and implementing data collection, will be a new experience for all of the sites. Therefore the contractor should expect to put more resources into evaluation design and launch than into on-going data collection. The focus of the design and launch of the evaluation project should include impact analysis as well as implementation.*

**Question 21:** If the intent is to study a specific model, is there a specific description available for review of the family finding and engagement model that sites would be implementing? Will the sites have broad discretion to alter or vary the models implemented (i.e., tailor them to their own contexts, etc.), or will fidelity to the model be required for a site to participate?

*Answer: Sites may pursue different version of standard family finding and engagement models. It is the responsibility of the bidder/contractor to be familiar with these. Once a site has finalized its service model, in conjunction with the AOC and the evaluation contractor, the site will be expected to follow the model and document service fidelity.*

**Question 22:** Would comparison (non-intervention sites) be available for study? If not, what is the current capacity in potential sites to produce baseline (pre-intervention) data?

*Answer: These questions are part of the wider discussion with pilots described in D.2.3.3. We expect that the baseline data an evaluator is likely to want to use is available from the county and State social services agencies (D.2.3.2). Part of the evaluator's task will be to contact agencies about obtaining data from these administrative databases. The AOC will assist in this process.*

**Question 23:** Ideally, what might some of the Key Outcome Measures be?

*Answer: Key outcome measures should always include the State and Federal safety and permanency measures for children in foster care.*

**Question 24:** Ideally, would the evaluation focus on effective court practice, and court processes associated with pilot programs, or is the primary interest in assessing caseworker practice and impacts on families (the consumers) themselves?

*Answer: Key outcome measures should always include the State and Federal safety and permanency measures for children in foster care.*

**Question 25:** To what extent is staff at each of the six pilot sites expected to assist with evaluation activities before, during and after the site visit? (i.e., recruit participants for focus groups; provide guidance on the selection of the comparison group)

*Answer: Staff is expected to assist in recruitment and data collection.*

**Question 26:** We would appreciate some additional input from you to help us better understand the selection of comparison and control groups.

*Answer: See RFP D.2.3. Comparison groups may be derived from randomized assignment or from administrative data, it is the task of the contractor to determine the feasibility of these methods in the sites.*

**Question 27:** Will individuals within each pilot program be assigned to experimental or control groups under the guidance of the evaluator?

*Answer: Yes, if a randomized assignment model is chosen.*

**Question 28:** Alternatively, is each pilot program considered an experimental group and the evaluator is charged with finding an equivalent program that would serve as the comparison group? If so, does the Administrative Office of the Courts staff currently have relationships with other stakeholder agencies that may serve as control or comparison groups?

*Answer: See Questions 23.*

**Question 29:** Is participation in the evaluation required or voluntary for individuals within the pilot programs? For individuals within the control or comparison groups?

*Answer: It is required for the sites and their staff. Generally speaking, informed consent is required from any individual participating in a group in order for data collection to take place.*

**Question 30:** Does the Administrative Office of the Courts have any restrictions on compensating individuals or groups for their time participating in evaluation activities?

*Answer: No; however, it is very unusual to provide participants in interviews and focus groups or other activities with anything beyond a small cash or in-kind incentive to participate.*

**Question 31:** Will the contractor's home state be considered in the selection process?

*Answer: No, location of contractor is not considered.*

Project Title: Evaluation of Family Finding and Engagement Pilot Programs in Six California Counties  
RFP Number: CFCC 01-11-LM

**Question 32:** We see that there are 13 in-person meetings/ site visits scheduled – one in-person kick off meeting with the AOC Project Manager and two site visits at each pilot program (once at each site for evaluation planning and data collection). Are there other in-person meetings we should plan for?

*Answer: No, only the meetings specified in the RFP.*

**Question 33:** Please clarify whether the “six different family finding and engagement practices” (FFE) (1.3.1 Description of Issues, Overview) refers to the “Six Steps of Family Finding” by Kevin Campbell or whether this means that each county is implementing a different FFE model.

*Answer: The six pilots may or may not have six different models of FFE service. We cannot guarantee that every pilot service model will align with the document mentioned.*

**Question 34:** Is a logic model available of the FFE initiative, and if so, will it be made available to bidders?

*Answer: No. We anticipate that assisting pilots in defining this logic model is a part of the contractor’s evaluation design work.*

**Question 35:** What is the anticipated number of families served across the six pilot sites?

*Answer: In a single 12-month period, somewhere between 500 and 750 families.*

**Question 36:** When will the six pilot programs sites be selected?

*Answer: Sites will be selected by the time this contract is awarded.*

***END OF FORM***