



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

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

TO: **POTENTIAL PROPOSERS**

FROM: ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
FINANCE DIVISION

DATE: May 21, 2009

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**
The Administrative Office of the Courts seeks the services of one (1) consultant to work with juvenile delinquency courts to identify the areas of court user experience that need improvement. In addition, the consultant will write plans on areas of intervention and provide coordination and technical assistance during implementation.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal (RFP),
Project Title: **JUVENILE COURT USERS RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT**

RFP Number: CFCC 14-09-LM

QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to Solicitations@jud.ca.gov by **May 28, 2009, at close of business.**

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
Proposals must be received by **June 1, 2009, 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 14-09-LM
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 BACKGROUND

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 CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) is dedicated to improving the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, youth, families, and self-represented litigants in the California courts. Working closely with the Judicial Council's advisory committees and task forces, CFCC provides courts and court-connected agencies statewide with legal and court services, research, educational and training opportunities, print and electronic publications, and financial assistance. This is the Center's web site: www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/programs.

1.3 JUVENILE COURT USERS RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

1.3.1 The Court Users' Research and Technical Assistance Project (Court Users' Project) seeks to address issues that delinquent youth, their parents or guardians, and victims of juvenile crime confront when they participate in the court process. The project will attempt to improve the effective participation of these groups in courts by increasing their comprehension of the juvenile court process in general as well as of their own cases.

1.3.2 The starting point for this Court Users' Project is the Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment 2008 <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/pdf/files/JDCA2008CombinedV1V2.pdf>; however, effective improvement plans will make use of specific findings and suggestions from the consultant's work with the team and court users. Specifically, chapter 5 of this report identifies the experience and background of juvenile delinquency professionals and court users and Volume 2, chapter 5 provides in-depth information from court users. From these statewide findings, the consultant will

identify how these challenges specifically occur in the identified courts and how best to resolve these problems.

- 1.3.3. CFCC will work with courts to identify four (4) pilot court locations that seek to improve juvenile delinquent court user experience. The identified courts will represent a cross section of the state in terms of geographic location and county size, including representation from small, medium, and large counties and from rural, suburban, and urban counties. The 4 pilot court locations will be identified prior to award and incorporated in any resulting contract. Depending on the qualities of the chosen courts, identified issues and proposed plans could be, for example, addressing entire juvenile court delinquency systems, specific courtroom(s), or systems within a larger juvenile delinquency court structure. The nature of working with such representative counties with varying juvenile court delinquency structures should be integrated into the presented work plan and budget.
- 1.3.4 The consultant will be asked to work with these pilot courts to identify the problem(s), propose solutions, and assist these courts with implementation.
- 1.3.5 The identification process shall engage the efforts of existing or newly created multidisciplinary collaborative teams of judicial officers and other professionals working in the delinquency court systems identified by the CFCC. These teams will direct, and the consultant will support and provide guidance for, the information gathering required for the consultant to develop the respective plans for each team. The information gathering process is expected to include multidisciplinary collaborative team meetings, one-on-one interviews, or structured focus groups with judicial officers, court staff, probation officers, and attorneys. The process would also benefit from specific inquiries with court users about what they understood in their hearings and whether planned solutions would address their concerns.
- 1.3.6 After identifying the challenges to court professionals and user's comprehension of the juvenile court process and of their own case, the consultant will work with the courts to develop improvement plans. These plans will include proposed recommended interventions and how these interventions will improve court users' experiences. Based on these improvement plans, CFCC will conduct process and outcome evaluations of the efforts, proposed changes and resulting effects in each court location. The precise methodology will depend upon the interventions chosen, but the expectation is that CFCC will employ a pre-post test research design, surveying court users about the dimension of experience hypothesized to be improved.
- 1.3.7 The improvement plans will be determined by the courts themselves with the assistance of the consultant. However, several methods for improving comprehension are anticipated.
 - 1.3.7.1 Courts may wish to draft and adopt for use plain-language scripts to supplement the use of legally mandated language that can be difficult to understand. CFCC attorneys are available to create these scripts.

- 1.3.7.2 Courts may wish to experiment with longer hearings that would permit more exchanges that are meaningful.
- 1.3.7.3 Judicial officers may elect to receive feedback from youth, parents, and victims on their comprehension of their words and their non-verbal communication, via the consultant or a communications expert hired by the consultant.
- 1.3.7.4 Courts may indirectly improve the experience of court hearings by augmenting learning opportunities before hearings begin, by scheduling more time with defense attorneys, by providing materials or court staff to explain the process, or by creating an information desk where people can have court orders explained to them.
- 1.3.8 The consultant will work with the courts to create strategies for how to implement the plans, provide coordination and technical assistance during implementation, and document the steps that were taken in implementation.
- 1.3.9 The consultant will report to the AOC on lessons learned during the foregoing steps and make recommendations for future courts seeking to address this court issue.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

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

EVENT	KEY DATE
Issue date of RFP	May 21, 2009
Deadline for questions to Solicitations@jud.ca.gov	May 28, 2009, at close of business
Posting of Answers to Questions	May 29, 2009, at close of business
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	June 1, 2009 at close of business
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 2-5, 2009
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 8, 2009
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 19, 2009

3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

- 3.1 The services of the consultant shall be for a period of *approximately eighteen (18) months*.
- 3.2 The expected contractual responsibilities and work requirements are set forth in *Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*.

4.0 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 preparation and submittal of their proposals.
- 4.2 Attachment 2 - Contract Terms. 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 typical for the requested services are attached as *Attachment 2* and include *Exhibits A through F*.
- 4.3 Attachment 3 - Vendor'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 this *Attachment 3*.
 - 4.3.1 If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a redlined version of *Attachment 2*, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this Attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.
 - 4.3.2 The services anticipated by this RFP must commence prior to the June 30, 2009. Due to the short timeframe before commencement of these services, there will be insufficient time for the AOC to negotiate contract terms and conditions with the selected service provider/consultant. Therefore, prospective service providers may include exceptions to the *Attachment 2*, in their proposal submission. However, the AOC, at its sole discretion, will determine whether such submitted exceptions are significant or minor. Proposals that contain significant exceptions may be deemed non-responsive by the AOC, at the AOC's sole discretion, to the requirements of this RFP and may be rejected without further evaluation.
- 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 vendor prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, vendor's proposal must include a completed and signed *Payee Data Record Form*, set forth as *Attachment 4*.

5.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria, in order of descending priority. Each proposed candidate will be evaluated separately in accordance with these criteria:

- 5.1 Quality of work plan submitted (40 Total Possible Points). Proposals will be evaluated considering the type of services required and the complexity of the project, with special consideration as listed in paragraph 6.1, below.
- 5.2 Experience on similar assignments. (20 Total Possible Points). Proposals will be evaluated considering past performance, especially on contracts with government agencies or public bodies, including such factors as quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cooperation, responsiveness, with special consideration as listed in paragraph 6.2, below.
- 5.3 Experience of key staff working on similar assignments. (15 Total Possible Points). Proposals will be evaluated considering demonstrated experience with facilitating work with courts and justice partners, juvenile delinquency system issues, and/or experience in creating customer-focused service models, with special consideration as listed in paragraph 6.3, below.
- 5.4 Reasonableness of cost projections (10 Total Possible Points). Proposals will be evaluated in terms of reasonableness of cost, proposed rate structure for the position, including breakdown of salary, overhead and profit, as demonstrated in 6.4, below.
- 5.5 Ability to meet requirements of the project (10 Total Possible Points). Proposals will be evaluated in terms of compliance with proposed contract terms and project scheduling, as demonstrated in 6.5, below.
- 5.6 Company Stability and Capabilities (5 Total Possible Points). Proposals will be evaluated in terms of the agency's stability and capabilities as demonstrated in 6.6, below.

6.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

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.

The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal:

6.1 Quality of work plan submitted.

6.1.1 Approach:

- 6.1.1.1 Proposed process necessary to address the work objectives.

- 6.1.1.2 Proposed work and team organization.
- 6.1.1.3 Proposed methodology for creating plans, including number meetings, processes for facilitating discussion, methods for decision-making, report-writing, processes for sign-off, and types of people to be engaged.
- 6.1.1.4 Proposed methods for assisting in implementation. Although this is somewhat dependent upon plans that have yet to be created, please describe general orientation towards facilitating implementation, and possible concrete ways to match resources, ensure appropriate implementation, and communicating with AOC and the courts.

6.2. *Experience on similar assignments.*

6.2.1 Discuss the proposed key personnel’s record of performance on past projects, especially on contracts with government agencies or public bodies, including such factors as complexity and scope of past analysis work, quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cooperation, responsiveness, and other managerial considerations.

6.3 *Credentials of key personnel to be assigned.*

6.3.1 Provide the most recent resume and the names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of five (5) clients for whom the proposed key personnel has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer.

6.4 *Reasonableness of cost projections.*

6.4.1 Provide the fully burdened hourly rate of each proposed key personnel, and include the salary, overhead, and profit rate structure breakdown for a total of *eighteen (18) months* using the following formula for the work of the *fifteen (15) Deliverables* specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed.:*

Amt Payable to the Key Personnel	\$XX.XX	XX%
+ Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Overhead	\$XX.XX	XX%
+ Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Profit	\$XX.XX	XX%
= Total for Key Personnel	\$XXX.XX	100%

6.4.2 At the time of publication of this RFP, the four (4) pilot court locations have not been determined. The State guidelines for travel and lodging costs and expenses shall apply and will be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions set forth in Exhibit C, Payment Provisions, paragraph 3, Compensation for Transportation,

Meals and Lodging Expenses. The AOC will incorporate funds for travel and lodging prior to finalizing the contract with the highest ranked candidate.

- 6.4.3 Include a total not to exceed contract sum for the actual cost of performing the Work of this Agreement at the hourly rate only, bearing in mind that (i) the total cost for the consultant's services will range between **\$80,000.00 - \$100,000.00**, inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead, profit, and (ii) the method of payment to the consultant is anticipated to be by cost reimbursement. Do not propose travel and lodging costs and expenses as funds for such costs and expenses shall be added to any resulting award.
- 6.5 *Ability to meet requirements of the project.*
- 6.5.1 Discuss the key personnel's availability and ability to complete the work within the project schedule, set forth in *Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*.
 - 6.5.2 For purposes of this RFP, vendors are to estimate a total of *eighteen (18) months of work*.
 - 6.5.3 Compliance with Contract Terms. Complete and submit Attachment 3, *Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms*. Also, if changes are proposed, submit a version of *Attachment 2* with all tracked changes, as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.
- 6.6 Company Stability and Capabilities. Provide the following information about your company:
- 6.6.1 Number of years your company has been in the business of juvenile dependency or court-based work.
 - 6.6.2 Number of full time employees.
 - 6.6.3 Disclose any judgments, pending litigation, or other real or potential financial reversals that might materially affect the viability of the proposer's company.
 - 6.6.4 Annual gross revenue from your most recent audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet. State the audit/review year and the annual gross revenue. The AOC may request a copy of your most recent audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet.
 - 6.6.5 Tax recording information. Complete and submit *Attachment 4 - Payee Data Record Form*. Note that if an individual or sole proprietorship, using a social security number for tax recording purposes, is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.

7.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 7.1 The proposer shall provide their point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers in a cover letter.
- 7.2 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in items *RFP: 6.0 Specifics of a Responsive Technical Proposal*, 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
- 7.2 Proposers will submit **one (1) original and three (3) copies** of the technical proposal signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the proposer's designated representative. Proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the **entire proposal on CD-ROM**.
- 7.3 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP.
- 7.4 Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.
- 7.5 In addition to submittal of the original and three copies of the proposals, as set forth in paragraph 7.2, above, proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM.

8.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

9.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

The Administrative Office of the Courts policy is to follow the intent of the California Public Records Act (PRA). If a vendor's proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under the PRA, the material will be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a vendor is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then it should not include such information in its proposal.

END OF FORM