



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 of Finance

TO: POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

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

DATE: May 1, 2007

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, seeks the services of a consultant to recruit participants for and conduct discussion groups of stakeholders in juvenile dependency court, including youth, parents, victims, and community organizations. Specific tasks will include recruiting contacts to host the groups, overseeing the recruitment of participants, arranging space and incentives for the groups, and conducting and taping the groups.

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: STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCES WITH THE JUVENILE DEPENDENCY COURT: QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION

RFP Number: CFCC 05-07 Stakeholder-LM

QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to solicitations@jud.ca.gov by **May 7, 2007, no later than 1 p.m. (PST)**.

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
Proposals must be received by **May 15, 2007, no later than 1 p.m. (PST)**.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. CFCC 05-07 Stakeholder-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

1.1.1 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 THE CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

1.2.1 The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), a division of the AOC, provides a range of services to Courts in California, including research and technical assistance for juvenile and family Courts, collaborative justice Courts, cases involving self-represented litigants, and cases involving family violence.

1.3 THE CALIFORNIA BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE AND NEED TO DOCUMENT THE EXPERIENCES OF JUVENILE DEPENDENCY COURT USERS

The California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care (Commission) is a broad-based, multi-disciplinary commission. It was established by the Judicial Council to provide leadership and recommendations to improve the ability of the federal government, California's state and local agencies, and the courts to protect children in California by helping them to become part of a permanent family that will provide a safe, stable, and secure home.

The commission will explore the causes and consequences of court-based delays and make recommendations on how to improve the ability of courts to move children quickly out of the legal limbo of foster care into safe, permanent homes. The commission will also explore how to strengthen courts' accountability for their use of public dollars in protecting and supporting children who have suffered abuse and neglect. Commissioners will study more flexible approaches to federal funding that would give California as well

as other states the freedom to decide whether foster care is the right choice for an individual child or whether other options might keep children safe and secure.

The blue ribbon commission will solicit first-hand accounts from children, parents, caregivers judges, administrators, and others in California to depict the high-stakes decisions courts make, as well as the obstacles to children's exiting foster care within a reasonable time, such as court delays, lack of information, and the failure of all parties to collaborate in the decision-making process.

The subject of this RFP is the qualitative research associated with collecting first-hand accounts from parents and caregivers. These accounts will be collected through facilitated discussion groups with line social workers, parents, relative and non-relative caregivers who have participated in dependency court proceedings. These accounts will give the commissioners a view of the courts from the perspective of those directly involved in court proceedings, helping them to make more informed recommendations and to provide the quality of leadership that will serve the needs of all Californians.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

- 2.1 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
RFP issued to http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/ :	May 1, 2007
Deadline for questions to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	May 7, 2007 No later than 1 p.m.
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	May 15, 2007 No later than 1 p.m.
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 15, through May 18, 2007
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 31, 2007
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	June 8, 2007

3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

- 3.1 The AOC seeks the services of a consultant with expertise in qualitative research and data analysis, preferably in a court setting, to assist AOC research and legal staff in the implementation of facilitated discussion groups.

- 3.2 The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to secure a contract to plan, schedule and conduct facilitated discussion groups; and provide recordings and a summary of findings. The discussion groups will take place from June 1 through October 12, 2007. The contractor must conduct at least six (6) facilitated discussion groups of a minimum of ten (10) persons each with the following stakeholder groups: line social workers (two groups), parents (two groups), and caregivers (one group of relative caregivers and one group of non-relative caregivers).

Specific tasks expected of the contractor will include: making initial contact with point persons provided by the AOC and identifying the best contacts in each target county for recruiting and hosting discussion groups; assisting the county contacts in recruiting participants, locating venues, and providing support for the groups; facilitating payment of incentives for group participants and for other service providers associated with the groups; converting the topic guide provided by the AOC into discussion group scripts; providing informed consent agreements and other written materials for the groups; traveling to the counties and conducting the discussion groups with one or more AOC staff members; providing complete tape recordings to the AOC transcriber or providing complete transcripts; providing any notes or electronic transcriptions taken during the course of the groups; providing notes from each facilitated discussion group to the AOC; checking transcripts for accuracy; and providing a summary of major findings.

- 3.3 The Work of this RFP is provided in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed*.

4.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

- 4.1 Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:

4.1.1 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*.

4.1.2 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 - Contract Terms* and include: *Exhibits A through E*.

4.1.3 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 – Contract Terms*, or clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in this *Attachment 3*.

- 4.1.3.1 If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of *Attachment 2 – Contract Terms*, that

clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.

- 4.1.4 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:

- 5.1 Quality of work plan submitted.
- 5.2 Credentials of staff to be assigned to the Project.
- 5.3 Experiences on similar assignments, including gathering qualitative data for the use of public policy making bodies.
- 5.4 Innovative nature of methods proposed to conduct and transcribe the proceedings of the discussion groups.
- 5.5 Reasonableness of cost projections.
- 5.6 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the Project.

6.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

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 project and organization.
 - 6.1.1.2 Proposed methodology. Include plan for identifying discussion group participants and conducting facilitated discussion groups.
 - 6.1.1.3 Proposed methods to encourage participation in discussion groups.
 - 6.1.1.4 Proposed method for recording or otherwise transcribing discussion groups.

- 6.1.1.5 Proposed plan for protecting subject confidentiality
- 6.1.2 Contact information. Provide proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers.
- 6.1.3 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.
- 6.1.4 Compliance with Contract Terms. Complete and submit *Attachment 3 - Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms*. If changes to *Attachment 3* are proposed, then also submit red-lined version of *Attachment 3- Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms* as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.
- 6.2 Credentials of staff to be assigned to the Project. Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project. Provide professional qualifications and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities. Submit hardcopy of key staff's information in proposal as well as electronically. (*See RFP: 8.0 Submissions of Proposals*)
- 6.3 Experiences on similar assignments.
 - 6.3.1 Provide the names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the proposer has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer.
 - 6.3.2 Proposal includes examples of other qualitative research projects.
 - 6.3.3 Proposer has demonstrated experience with qualitative research related to the functioning of juvenile court.
 - 6.3.4 References are provided for similar types of prior work, including structured discussion group facilitation.
 - 6.3.5 Proposer has experience working in a Court or related setting [desirable but not necessary].
- 6.4 Innovative nature of methods proposed to conduct and transcribe the proceedings of the discussion groups. Experience with computer-mediated group discussion techniques is desirable.

- 6.5 Reasonableness of cost projections. See below, *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal*.
- 6.6 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the Project. Overall plan with time estimates for completion of all work required.

7.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE COST PROPOSAL

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

- 7.1 Reasonableness of Cost Projections.
 - 7.1.1 As a separate document, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the services for each of the four Deliverables specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed*. This budget should identify unique hourly rates, titles, and responsibilities for each “Key Personnel,” but can group this information for other personnel in a more general manner. Staff rates should be fully burdened, including indirect costs, overhead and profit. The cost proposal should also include separate line items for postage/ mailing costs and travel and lodging. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled “Budget Justification.”
 - 7.1.2 The total cost for consultant services will range between \$35,000.00 - \$40,000.00, inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead rates, travel and profit. The method of payment to the consultant will be by cost reimbursement for each of the four deliverables specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed*.

8.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 8.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in items *RFP: 6.0 Specifics of a Responsive Technical Proposal* and *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost 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.
- 8.2 Proposers will submit one (1) original and three (3) copies of the technical proposal and cost proposal signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder’s designated representative.

- 8.3 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP.
- 8.4 Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.
- 8.5 In addition to submittal of the original and three copies of the proposals, as set forth in items 8.2, above, proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM.

9.0 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.

10.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

It may be necessary to interview prospective service providers to clarify aspects of their submittal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted by telephone conference call. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

11.0 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.