



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: **May 27, 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 May 25, 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: Facilitate Strategic Planning on Information Sharing for Juvenile Courts and Child Welfare Partners

RFP Number: CFCC 06-11- LM

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: Proposals must be received by **June 6, 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 06-11-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

Introduction: Questions 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 21 relate to an understanding of the issues involved that potential proposers must acquire on their own. Policy statements, advisory body rosters, reports and documents related to child welfare data exchange are available on the web sites of child welfare stakeholders in California and nationally.

Question 1: What is the reason for the contract end date of September 30, 2011?

Answer: September 30 is the last day of the Federal fiscal year. The contract is funded with the Federal Juvenile Dependency Court Improvement Program. In addition, the work in this contract must be completed in a timely way to ensure the agencies involved can begin to use the information the project will provide.

Question 2: Per section 1.3.2 of Attachment 2 – Contract Terms, Exhibit D, Scope of Work, the end deliverable is to provide products of the statewide session to all stakeholders. Does the AOC have a desired format for this deliverable?

Answer: Any generally used format for a summary of conference proceeding with key attachments is acceptable.

Question 3: In section 6.3.2 of the RFP, you state that we must “provide a minimum of 3 client references for which the proposed key personnel has conducted similar services.” Does this mean 3 references per person or 3 reference total?

Answer: RFP section requires a minimum of three (3) references for the total proposed key personnel that have conducted similar services.

Question 4: Can the vendor propose alternative deliverable timeframes as long as the work is completed by September 30, 2011?

Answer: Alternative deliverable timeframes are not considered in the criteria set forth in RFP, section 5.4.

Question 5: Can the services be performed after September 30, 2011 if the funding is encumbered by September 30, 2011, and the services completed no later than 90 days thereafter?

Answer: Work must be completed by September 30. (See Question #1.)

Question 6: The RFP references the work of the Child Welfare Council in creating a statewide policy in information sharing. Would it be possible to review this policy in constructing a response to the RFP?

Answer: See Introduction paragraph, above.

Question 7: What criteria were most important in determining the sites identified for the strategic planning sessions?

Answer: Criteria such as diversity of geography, county size, and locations that would allow the maximum number of stakeholders to participate were the major criteria used.

Question 8: What are a few of the challenges or barriers that have currently been identified to information sharing in California?

Answer: See Introduction paragraph, above.

Question 9: What priority does California assign to using the data exchange to facilitate the tracking of quantitative and qualitative data, including national dependency court performance measures?

Answer: See Introduction paragraph, above.

Question 10: What judicial employees will be principally involved to assist with this project?

Answer: RFP, Section 1.3.2 states that employees of the AOC will provide the logistical support to the conference. The AOC will also provide professional staff to collaborate with the contractor on all aspects of the project.

Question 11: Do you have an existing theory of change and logic model? If so, can prospective bidders review that information prior to replying to the RFP? If not, would you like a logic model to be developed, in collaboration with stakeholders, to guide ongoing efforts?

Answer: There is no formal theory of change and logic model. Respondents to the RFP are welcome to propose developing a logic model, or other facilitation tools they believe will be effective.

Question 12: RFP Item 1.3.2, paragraph 4, page 2 of 8 notes "...4 local sessions lasting 2 days each..." Attachment 2, Exhibit D, item 2.4.2 defines local sessions as "Facilitate one-day sessions....." Please clarify how long the sessions are expected to last?

Answer: See Addendum #1.

Question 13: Regarding "...these problems and others related to inadequate information sharing, and recommended solutions, are well-described in the reports and recommendations of these three bodies," are these reports available for review to provide insight to the consultant?

Answer: See Introduction paragraph, above.

Question 14: Regarding "...the foundation of this project is already in place through the work of the CWC in creating a statewide policy on information sharing and convening state department heads, and the AOC in analyzing the legal issues around information exchange," is this information available as a resource and information to the consultant?

Answer: See Introduction paragraph, above.

Question 15: Regarding “the AOC and its partners will provide the administrative support for holding the local and statewide sessions, and will provide necessary travel and lodging costs for participants and faculty (not including consultant and staff),” does this mean the AOC will provide the facilities for each meeting as well?

Answer: The AOC will secure and pay for facilities.

Question 16: Regarding #15 above, does this mean this will not be a cost to the contractor?

Answer: Facilities will not be a cost to the contractor.

Question 17: Regarding #15 above, will the AOC provide administrative support to send announcements and invitations to participants and faculty?

Answer: The AOC will provide administrative support for such task.

Question 18: Regarding “It is expected that the project will include 4 local sessions lasting 2 days each, 4 information gathering and consensus building trips of 2 or more days each; and one statewide session of 3 days,” Are the 4 local sessions in the Sacramento area?

Answer: The 4 local sessions will be in the cities listed in the RFP, page 2 of 8.

Question 19: Regarding #18 above, how many attendees are projected to attend each meeting session?

Answer: See RFP, Sections 2.4.2 and 2.5.

Question 20: Does the AOC have a list of participants it would like to attend each session for both local and statewide sessions)?

Answer: It is the expectation of the AOC to collaborate with the contractor on developing the participant list for all the sessions.

Question 21: Does the AOC have a list of stakeholders already identified for this project, for State, Federal, philanthropic and policy organizations fidelity to the model is required for a site to participate?

Answer: See Introduction paragraph, above.

END OF FORM