



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts

Center for Families, Children & the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Telephone 415-865-7217 ♦ 415-865-7741 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4399 ♦ 415-865-4399

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

DIANE NUNN
Director

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Center for Families, Children & the Courts

DATE: April 22, 2002

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
EVALUATION DESIGN OF UNIFIED COURTS FOR FAMILIES –
MENTOR COURT PROGRAM

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (“RFP”):

Project Title: EVALUATION DESIGN OF UNIFIED COURTS FOR FAMILIES – MENTOR COURT PROGRAM

RFP Number: CFCC EMCP 04-19-02

DEADLINE: **Proposals must be received by 5 p.m. on May 10, 2002**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals should be sent to:
Attn: Alexa Hirst
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: **NAME:** Alexa Hirst **TEL:** 415-865-7566 **FAX:** 415-865-7217 **E-MAIL:** alexa.hirst@jud.ca.gov

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

The Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) announces the availability of \$200,000 from the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund) to collaborate with the AOC and the state court system to design an evaluation of the Unified Courts for Families (Mentor Courts) Program.

1.2 Background on Requesting Agency

The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the policymaking body 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 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. CFCC is an AOC division that 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. CFCC focuses on juvenile and family court projects that improve the lives of children and families through positive changes in both the trial and appellate courts' handling of matters involving children.

1.3 Unified Courts for Families (Mentor Courts) Project

The Judicial Council's Operational Plan for fiscal years 2000–2001 to 2002–2003 articulates “high-priority, state-level operational objectives” for California's Courts (<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/opplan2k.pdf>). Goal IV of the plan, “Quality of Justice and Service to the Public”, sets an objective of establishing “unified or coordinated family court systems” and authorizes six pilot “mentor courts”¹ to be established in the state by June 2003.

The Judicial Council seeks to implement this Operational Plan objective by providing resources, technical assistance, and a structured planning process to courts interested in developing and implementing new or enhanced unified family and juvenile court systems.

The premises below guide the plan for unified or coordinated family court systems in California:

¹ So-called because the pilot projects will be required to act as “mentors” to other courts seeking to make similar systemic changes in their courts.

- (1) A unified or coordinated family court is more efficient and effective in addressing the needs of families than a traditional compartmentalized case processing model;
- (2) Consolidating or coordinating related cases in a family will result in more informed and effective judicial decisions, more consistent orders, and improved delivery of services to children and families;
- (3) Coordinating information about cases will result in judges making fewer conflicting orders and parties needing to make fewer court appearances;
- (4) Consistent management of cases will enhance the safety and accountability of all participants.

The AOC will facilitate the development of unified courts by allocating a total of \$1.3 million annually from the Modernization Fund from June 2002 through December 2005. These funds will support (1) participation in a structured six-month planning phase by *all* eligible courts and (2) the implementation of *six* selected unified family court pilot projects during the following four years. A detailed description of these phases follows in the next two Sections (1.3.1 through 1.3.2) to provide a background for this RFP. The description of the evaluation component follows in Section 1.3.3

1.3.1 Planning Phase for Courts

The first phase of the Unified Courts for Families Initiative is the planning phase. Funding for the planning phase will be available to all courts that submit a timely application pursuant to application guidelines. The phase will run from June 3 through November 30, 2002. During that time, courts will (1) work with the AOC and the evaluator to conduct a needs assessment to determine existing service and case coordination needs and create an action plan for a proposed unified court project; (2) provide a description of their existing court system and the proposed system for coordinating cases; (3) send their project team to a two-day planning symposium (the Unified Courts for Families Planning Symposium) in September or October of 2002 to learn about successful unified family court models from other jurisdictions, to plan and strategize as a group about project designs, and to develop strategies to overcome identified obstacles; and (4) collaborate with AOC staff and the evaluator to create an evaluation plan that includes definitions of measurable objectives and a strategy for collecting evaluation data.

This phase will help courts develop well designed plans for coordinating multiple cases involving the same family, and it will bring as many courts as possible into the process, regardless of whether they will ultimately be funded as mentor courts. The planning phase also provides an opportunity for the selected evaluator, hired by the AOC and working in conjunction with participating courts, to establish a meaningful research design at the start of the project.

1.3.2 Implementation Phase for Courts

The second (implementation) phase of the project will run from January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2005. The AOC will distribute \$1.3 million annually to six California courts through a competitive RFP process. The implementation RFP will be circulated in September or October of 2002, with an application deadline in November 2002. Applicant courts should build on the plans developed during the planning phase in proposals for implementation grants. Court grantees may use AOC funds either to establish a unified family court or to augment an existing unified family court, but the implementation grant may not be used to supplant existing funding. During the three-year funding period, the six mentor courts will pilot their proposed strategies for unifying cases within the same families. It is anticipated that the selected pilot projects will share some or all of the following features:

- Broad jurisdiction over cases affecting children and families, including family law, juvenile dependency, and juvenile delinquency, as well as other case types²;
- Coordination of cases involving members of the same family; methods of intake, screening, and assessment that allow for identification and coordination of cases involving family members;
- A model for coordinating cases, such as one judge/one family, one family/one case management team, or one family/one file;
- A case management system or procedures that allows key information to be shared among judges and court staff;

² Possibilities include, but are not limited to, adoption, domestic partnerships, emancipation, probate guardianship, underage marriage, non-criminal mental health, conservatorships, criminal domestic violence, criminal child endangerment and abuse, and adult and juvenile traffic.

- A plan for making the court experience more user-friendly for litigants and more efficient for court staff, through measures such as time-certain hearings;
- Collaboration between the court, community services, and professionals to ensure that families receive necessary and appropriate services;
- An effective program for assisting self-represented litigants;
- Adequate staff, including a supervising judge or a judge assigned to oversee administration of the unified court; a mentor court administrator; a case manager/service coordinator or team; and a research attorney;
- Regular meetings and collaborative problem-solving by all key stakeholders; and
- Each grantee court will serve as a mentor for other courts by providing information and technical assistance to others interested in replicating the court improvements or implementing the best practices identified or developed in their project.

1.3.3 Evaluation Component

Mentor courts will be required to collaborate with AOC staff and the selected evaluator to fulfill requirements for needs assessment, program description, data collection, and evaluation by allowing staff and researchers to visit their courts for research and consulting purposes.

\$200,000 is currently available for a contractor to work with the courts and the AOC to design an overall evaluation plan for the project. It is anticipated that a similar level of funding will be available in each subsequent fiscal year to implement the evaluation plan for data collection and analysis in the six funded mentor courts.

It is anticipated that a second RFP will be issued in Winter 2002 for a contractor to carry out the evaluation of the six mentor courts.

2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

The purpose of this RFP is to obtain a contractor who will collaborate with AOC project staff and state courts involved in the planning phase to design and begin an evaluation of the Unified Courts for Families Project. The AOC seeks the services of a consultant with

significant experience working directly with stakeholders in planning and conducting multi-site program evaluations. It is anticipated that a successful bidder will also have expertise in collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, knowledge of family and juvenile court operations, and experience conducting research and collecting data in family and juvenile courts. Familiarity with family and juvenile court operations in the State of California is strongly preferred.

3.0 SCOPE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES

The proposed services below are expected to be performed by the consultant between June 3, 2002 and June 30, 2003.

3.1 Create a General Evaluation Plan

During the six-month court planning phase (June 3, 2002 through November 29, 2002), the contractor will work closely with the AOC project team and court grantees on needs assessment, descriptions of existing and proposed services, and design an evaluation plan and methodology. This evaluation plan should include a model of a theory of change, identification of key research questions, and baseline and outcome measures of program impact. The plan must include indicators that will be useful in court-level budget development. The evaluation should be designed to measure both changes to the system that result from the implementation of mentor courts and the impact of these mentor courts on the children and families they serve.

Given that a large number of courts will be involved in the six-month planning phase, the AOC anticipates that the evaluation design created at this stage will be general in scope. The contractor should use this time to establish a strong relationship with the courts and become familiar with the project goals and operations.

The evaluation plan should be closely aligned with the action plans that will be created by each participating court during the six-month planning phase. It is anticipated that the general evaluation plan will be refined and made more specific once the six mentor court sites are selected. The general evaluation plan should be sufficiently specific to serve as a framework for the evaluation of the six mentor courts. The general evaluation plan and supporting documentation must be delivered to the AOC in writing by February 1, 2003.

The evaluator's duties in the initial phase of the project will involve some or all of the activities in the bulleted list below. Bidders should describe their approach to these project activities in their proposal [*see specifics of response in Section 4.0*] and provide information about relevant experience:

- The evaluator should actively participate in the Unified Courts for Families Symposium in September or October of 2002. At this meeting and throughout the planning period, the evaluator will work with project stakeholders and the AOC to determine empirical questions most useful in measuring the impact of the project.
- With the AOC and the courts, identify (1) system changes and (2) key *measurable* outcomes for families that are hypothesized to result from Unified Family Court Project activities and goals. Design a methodology for measuring the impact of the project on the system and on families it serves. A key component of this plan will be the identification of appropriate baseline data to collect. Bidders should be aware that many of the courts involved lack computerized information systems or may utilize multiple information systems that do not easily link together.
- Create a consistent evaluation model that will be usable across all six sites. The evaluator should consider pre-post designs, formative evaluations, and the use of comparison courts. Grantee programs may vary in size, types of cases eligible, program structure, and existing level of court unification. It is anticipated that a successful bidder will have experience working with multi-site projects and evaluations.

3.2 Refine Evaluation Plan and Collect Baseline and Formative Evaluation Data

After the six mentor court have been selected in December 2002, the contractor will refine and begin to implement the evaluation plan developed during the first six months of the study period. Between January 2003 and May 1, 2003, the evaluator will collect baseline data on court operations and cases in each of the six mentor courts. This study component may involve collecting data through methods such as surveys or focus groups, official records data, or semi-structured interviews. Throughout the period of data collection, project staff from the AOC will monitor contractor progress as documented in the data collection plan. The deliverables for this phase of the evaluation will include pilot data and baseline data collected during this period, implementation information, and formative evaluation data.

Proposed contractor activities during this phase of the evaluation include some of the following:

- Visits to the six funded mentor courts to observe court operations, interview staff, and assess the feasibility of data collection.
- Collect data on the court system and cases before project implementation to establish baseline measures.

- Gain access to key data systems from various state agencies, such as the Department of Social Services case management system and data systems or case files from different courts.
- The contractor MUST provide the AOC with all data collected during this part of the evaluation and observe industry standards for safeguarding confidentiality.

4.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

The following information should be included in the proposal:

4.1 Bidder Information

- 4.1.1 Please use the cover page in Attachment B to provide your name, mailing address, e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers, and social security number or federal tax identification number.

4.2 Staff Qualifications and Experience

Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.

- 4.2.1 Description of key staff knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project.
- 4.2.2 Provide a list and description of projects completed during the past five years that were similar in scope, complexity, content, and time frames to that identified in this RFP. Documentation of these projects should include (1) project title; (2) description of work performed; (3) dates for work performed; (4) organization for whom the work was performed; (5) name, address, title, and telephone number of each organization's project manager; and (6) copies of the final report for at least two of the listed projects.

4.3 Narrative

- 4.3.1 *Statement of Purpose.*
- 4.3.2 *General Evaluation Plan.* Describe how you would approach the requirement to collaborate with AOC project staff and the courts in designing an evaluation framework (Section 3.0). Your response should also address the following questions:

- What experience do you have with this type of collaborative approach to evaluation design?
- How would you establish a close relationship with organizations involved? What key players would you like to be involved and what information would you need from them?
- How would you encourage court buy-in to the evaluation plan that you design?
- What problems do you anticipate for an evaluator selecting a comparison group? How would you address these issues?
- How would you approach designing a general evaluation plan as described in Section 3.0?
- Your evaluation plan will need to include measurements of indicators useful for budget development. Please provide information about your familiarity with state-level budget development process.
- Please discuss what type of evaluation design you believe would be most suited to this project and provide a justification.

4.3.3 *Refinement of Evaluation Plan and Collection of Baseline and Formative Evaluation Data.* Describe how you will work with project staff and six funded unified courts for families to obtain the information and data that you need to meet the project objective described in Section 3.0.

- Describe the support and resources you anticipate you will need from the Administrative Office of the Courts to modify and implement your evaluation plan.
- Describe how you would work with the six mentor courts to modify and implement your evaluation plan.
- Describe the steps you would take to put in place your evaluation plan during the first six months of the mentor court implementation phase (January 1, 2003-June 3, 2003).
- What formative evaluation data do you think are essential to collect?

- What problems and issues do you anticipate in collecting system-wide data from different jurisdictions in California? How would you address these issues?
- Please describe the procedures you will use to maintain the confidentiality of all data collected during the evaluation.

4.4 Project Team and Work Plan

4.4.1 *Project team.* Proposed project and team organization. Please include a description of the roles and duties of each member of the project team.

4.4.2 *Project work plan.* Provide a detailed work plan that outlines major project tasks/segments and approach, including key staff, methods to be used, and the time needed to complete each task.

4.5 Cost proposal

Provide an estimated project budget for your work on the evaluation. See specific directions for response in Section 5.0. Submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the services. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled “Budget Justification.”

The total cost for consultant services may not exceed \$200,000, inclusive of personnel, materials, computer support, travel, lodging, per diem, and overhead rates. The method of payment to the consultant will be cost reimbursement.

4.6 Proposal Format and Submission Requirements

4.6.1 Bidders must send their completed application with original signatures to the Administrative Office of the Courts in a sealed package, which must be received by Alexa Hirst on or before May 10, 2002 at 5 p.m. Applications may be submitted by e-mail, provided that the e-mail is received by Alexa Hirst by May 10 at 5 p.m., and the paper copy with original signatures is postmarked by May 10 at 5 p.m.

Any proposal received after the deadline will be disqualified.

4.6.2 All proposals should be submitted on standard white paper (8 ½ inches by 11 inches), typed, double-spaced, one-inch margins, 12-point font, with each page clearly and consecutively numbered. The narrative section should not exceed **15** pages, excluding charts and figures.

- 4.6.3 Please submit one original and **six** copies of the proposal signed by an authorized representative of the bidder, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 4.6.4 One original copy of the proposal **MUST** be submitted (in addition to six copies) that bears that original signature of the bidder, a corporate officer, or an authorized agent of the bidder. Signature facsimile stamps will not be accepted.
- 4.6.5 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.

5.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, 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.

6.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Project Manager for this RFP process is:

Alexa Hirst
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Phone: 415-865-7566
Fax: 415-865-7217
E-mail: alexa.hirst@jud.ca.gov

The Project Manager for the Unified Courts for Families Project is:

Mara Bernstein
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Phone: 415-865-7728
Fax: 415-865-7217
E-mail: mara.bernstein@jud.ca.gov

7.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria:

- A. Quality of methodology and work plan submitted:
 - *Statement of Purpose.* Demonstrates an understanding of the scope of services to be provided and major issues surrounding the unification of court proceedings for members of the same family.
 - *Study Approach and Proposed Methodology.* Contains items specified in Section 3.0 of the RFP and appears reasonable, given the scope and time frame of the study.
 - *Project Team and Work Plan.* Work plan and corresponding timelines are reasonable, given study objectives and RFP requirements.
- B. Experience on similar assignments
 - Experience designing evaluation models as part of a collaborative process.
 - Experience with work that is similar in objectives and/or scope (i.e., multi-site projects, evaluations, and/or strategic planning).
 - Experience integrating information from multiple sources to meet study objectives.
 - Familiarity with family, juvenile, and related court proceedings.
 - Familiarity with California court system/process.
- C. Credentials of staff to be assigned to the project
- D. Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project
- E. Reasonableness of cost projections

8.0 BIDDERS' CONFERENCE

A bidders' teleconference will be held to clarify the requirements of this RFP by answering previously submitted written questions. Remarks and explanations made at the bidders' conference do not change the provisions of the RFP and are not binding unless reduced to writing. Questions concerning the RFP may be submitted in writing prior to the date of the conference, according to the instructions below. The AOC reserves the right to determine which questions will be answered verbally at the bidders' conference and which will be answered only in writing in the summary of issues raised.

A summary of the issues and questions answered at the bidders' conference, as well as a summary of previously submitted questions and respective responses will be prepared in writing and posted to the CFCC website www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc.

Attendance at the conference is *not* mandatory. However, each bidder who intends to submit an application is strongly encouraged to have at least one representative participate in this conference call. This is an opportunity to ask questions about these application guidelines and about the Unified Courts for Families Project in general. The conference is tentatively set for 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. (PDT) on April 26, 2002 at the Administrative Office of the Courts office in San Francisco. Please RSVP to Alexa Hirst at 415-865-7566 or by email at alexa.hirst@jud.ca.gov no later than 9:00 a.m. (PDT) on April 26, 2002 if you plan to attend the bidders' teleconference. The toll-free conference call number will be 1-866-223-4039.

Questions for the bidders' conference may be sent by mail, fax, or email to the AOC in advance of the conference date. All inquiries are to be labeled and addressed as follows:

Questions: Evaluation of Unified Courts for Families RFP

Attn: Alexa Hirst

Center for Families Children & the Courts

Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

Phone: 415-865-7566

Fax: 415-865-7217

Email: alexa.hirst@jud.ca.gov

9.0 INTERVIEW

It may be necessary to interview one or more bidders to clarify aspects of their submittal or to select from two or more bidders. If interviews are conducted, they will likely take place in person or by conference call.

10.0 RFP AND GENERAL PLANNING PHASE TIMELINE

Stage	Date	Activities
	April 19, 2002	Release of RFP
	April 26, 2002	Bidders' teleconference
	May 10, 2002	Proposals due by 5 p.m.
	May 15, 2002	Notification of grant awards
Court Planning Phase and Mentor Court Site Selection [June 3, 2002-December 31, 2002]	September/October 2002	Unified Courts for Families Planning Symposium
	December 30, 2002	Six mentor courts selected
Court Implementation Phase [January 1, 2003-December 31, 2005]	February 1, 2003	General evaluation design plan due (<i>see RFP Section 3.1</i>)
	May 15, 2003	Implementation phase deliverables due (<i>see RFP Section 3.2</i>)

11.0 PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

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. Generally, the terms of the contract will include, but are not limited to: (1) completion of the project within the timeframe provided; (2) no additional work authorized without prior approval; (3) no payment without prior approval; (4) funding availability subject to Legislature; (5) termination of contract under certain conditions; (6) indemnification of the State; (7) approval by the State of any subcontractors; (8) national labor relations board, drug-free workplace, nondiscrimination, and ADA requirements; and (9) minimum appropriate insurance requirements.

Incorporated in this RFP, and attached as Attachment A, is a document entitled "Administrative Rules Governing Requests for Proposals. Consultants shall follow these rules in preparation of their proposals.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

A. General

1. This solicitation document, the evaluation of proposals, and the award of any contract shall conform with current competitive bidding procedures as they relate to the procurement of goods and services. A vendor's proposal is an irrevocable offer for 30 days following the deadline for its submission.
2. A nondiscrimination clause will be included in any contract that ensues from this solicitation document.
3. In addition to explaining the State's requirements, the solicitation document includes instructions, which prescribe the format and content of proposals.

B. Errors in the solicitation document

1. If a vendor submitting a proposal discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this solicitation document, the vendor shall immediately provide the State with written notice of the problem and request that the solicitation document be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the State may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by issuing an addendum to all vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent.
2. If prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals a vendor submitting a proposal knows of or should have known of an error in the solicitation document but fails to notify the State of the error, the vendor shall bid at its own risk, and if the vendor is awarded the contract, it shall not be entitled to additional compensation or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

C. Questions regarding the solicitation document

1. If a vendor's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the vendor may submit the question in writing, conspicuously marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive. If the State concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence. If the State does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the vendor will be notified.

2. If a vendor submitting a proposal believes that one or more of the solicitation document's requirements is onerous or unfair, or that it unnecessarily precludes less costly or alternative solutions, the vendor may submit a written request that the solicitation document be changed. The request must set forth the recommended change and vendor's reasons for proposing the change. Any such request must be submitted to Alexa Hirst at the Administrative Office of the Courts by 5 p.m. on May 8, 2002.

D. Addenda

1. The State may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by faxing an addendum to the vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent. If any vendor determines that an addendum unnecessarily restricts its ability to bid, it must notify Alexa Hirst at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than one day following the receipt of the addendum.

E. Withdrawal and resubmission/modification of proposals

1. A vendor may withdraw its proposal at any time prior to the deadline for submitting proposals by notifying the State in writing of its withdrawal. The notice must be signed by the vendor. The vendor may thereafter submit a new or modified proposal, provided that it is received at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than 5 p.m. on May 10, 2002. Modification offered in any other manner, oral or written, will not be considered. Proposals cannot be changed or withdrawn after 5 p.m. on May 10, 2002.

F. Evaluation process

1. An evaluation team will review in detail all proposals that are received to determine the extent to which they comply with solicitation document requirements.
2. If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may cause a bid to be rejected.
3. Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if in the State's opinion the information was intended to mislead the state regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.

4. Cost sheets will be checked only if a proposal is determined to be otherwise qualified. All figures entered on the cost sheets must be clearly legible.
5. During the evaluation process, the State may require a vendor's representative to answer questions with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a vendor to demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are in fact true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal nonresponsive.

G. Rejection of bids

1. The State may reject any or all proposals and may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a bid. The State's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or excuse a vendor from full compliance with solicitation document specifications. The AOC reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, to award the contract in whole or in part and/or negotiate any or all items with individual vendors if it is deemed in the AOC's best interest. Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to make no selection if proposals are deemed to be outside the fiscal constraint or against the best interest of the government.

H. Award of contract

1. Award of contract, if made, will be in accordance with the solicitation document to a responsible vendor submitting a proposal compliant with all the requirements of the solicitation document and any addenda thereto, except for such immaterial defects as may be waived by the State.
2. The State reserves the right to determine the suitability of proposals for contracts on the basis of a proposal's meeting administrative requirements, technical requirements, its assessment of the quality of service and performance of items proposed, and cost.

I. Decision

1. Questions regarding the State's award of any business on the basis of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation document, or on any related matter, should be addressed to

Attn: Alexa Hirst
Center for Families Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Phone: 415-865-7566
Fax: 415-865-7217

Email: alexa.hirst@jud.ca.gov

J. Execution of contracts

1. The State will make a reasonable effort to execute any contract based on this solicitation document within 30 days of selecting a proposal that best meets its requirements.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal must be prepared to use a standard state contract form rather than its own contract form.

K. Protest procedure

1. The Administrative Office of the Courts intends to be completely open and fair to all vendors in selecting the best possible system within budgetary and other constraints described in the solicitation document. In applying evaluation criteria and making the selection, members of the evaluation team will exercise their best judgment.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal may protest the award if it meets all the following conditions:
 - a. the vendor has submitted a proposal which it believes to be responsive to the solicitation document;
 - b. the vendor believes that its proposal meets the state's administrative requirements and technical requirements, proposes items of proven quality and performance, and offers a competitive cost to the State; and
 - c. the vendor believes that the State has incorrectly selected another vendor submitting a proposal for an award.
3. A vendor submitting a proposal who is qualified to protest should contact the Contract Officer at the Administrative Office of the Courts at the address given below or call him at 415-865-7989.

Stephen Saddler
Contracts Officer
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

4. If the Contract Officer is unable to resolve the protest to the vendor's satisfaction, the vendor should file a written protest within five working days of the contract award notification. The written protest must state the facts surrounding the issue and the reasons the vendor believes the award to be

invalid. The protest must be sent by certified or registered mail or delivered personally to:

Grant Walker
Business Services Manager
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

A receipt should be requested for hand-delivered material.

L. News releases

1. News releases pertaining to the award of a contract may not be made without prior written approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

M. Disposition of materials

1. All materials submitted in response to this solicitation document will become the property of the State of California and will be returned only at the State's option and at the expense of the vendor submitting the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and become a public record. However, any confidential material submitted by a vendor that was clearly marked as such will be returned upon request.

N. Payment

1. Payment terms will be specified in any agreement that may ensue as a result of this solicitation document.
2. **THE STATE DOES NOT MAKE ANY ADVANCE PAYMENT FOR SERVICES.** Payment is normally made based upon completion of tasks as provide in the agreement between the State and the selected vendor. The State may withhold ten percent of each invoice until receipt of the final product. The amount of the withhold may depend upon the length of the project and the payment schedule provide in the agreement between the State and the selected vendor.



Application for Funding
EVALUATION OF UNIFIED COURTS FOR FAMILIES—MENTOR COURTS
PROGRAM
Fiscal Year 2001–2002

Name of applicant:	
Name and title of staff contact:	
Address:	Phone:
	Fax:
	E-mail:
Total number of pages of application (including this page):	

Signature

Date

Title (must be authorized agency representative)

This application should be completed and submitted by U.S. Mail, courier, or e-mail to the Administrative Office of the Courts in order to be RECEIVED BY 5 p.m. on May 10, 2002. E-mailed applications must be followed by paper copies postmarked by May 10, 2002.

_____ Check here to receive e-mail confirmation of receipt of your application. Include your e-mail address, above.

Applications should be submitted to

Alexa Hirst, Senior Research Analyst
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Ave., 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Phone: 415-865-7566
E-mail: alexa.hirst@jud.ca.gov