**Q1:** In thinking about our overall approach, does the Judicial Council have a preferred evaluation frame?  For example, some funders have a strong preference for a randomized control trial or including a qualitative evaluation.  Does the Judicial Council have a desired approach?

A1: The JC expects a quasi-experimental design using the data collected for the pilots. An additional qualitative evaluation is also permissible.

**Q2:** The RFP emphasizes that there are many data sources that will be employed.  We understand that there are multiple counties that use different systems.  Within counties, will the different systems have universal identifiers to facilitate individual matching?  Or, will we have to match individual cases using other means?

A2: County criminal justice system agencies vary in their level of integration. At least two counties have fully integrated systems that will not require probabilistic or other sophisticated matching algorithms. Other counties use a combination of state identification numbers and local identifiers. The quality of the matches is likely to vary from county to county. The JCC seeks a contractor with experience in matching algorithms and sensitivity analyses associated with matching procedures.

**Q3:**In section 1.4.i, the RFP states that the evaluation shall utilize baseline pre-pilot data.  How far back does that data go?  How does it vary with county?

A3: January 1, 2015 is the start date for the historical data baseline. Some counties were unable to produce data extending back this far due to changes in case management systems. For the purposes of the pre-/post-analysis, the start date of the historical data need not be fixed at January 1, 2015 and may be adjusted based on data availability.

Q4: Will the Contractor be responsible for cleaning the data?  Or, does the Judicial Council execute that function with guidance from the Contractor?

A4: Data cleaning is currently underway at the Judicial Council. The contractor will be provided raw data extracts and all R programming scripts used by the Judicial Council. The contractor will also be provided with a JC data preparation plan outlining data cleaning steps and will have access to Judicial Council programming staff as questions arise. The contractor will be expected to affirm that the Judicial Council programming has been properly conducted.

**Q5:** In order to submit a responsible budget, would it be possible to know the maximum available funding?  Our goal is not to target the highest amount but rather to ensure that we can accomplish the work within the allocated funding.

A5: To ensure the most advantageous terms for the State, the Judicial Council will not be disclosing the available budget amount. Bidders should be aware that over 90% of the $75M appropriation was awarded to the trial courts, and remaining funds are not exclusively dedicated to research and evaluation.

**Q6:** What is the length of the Program with this one-time funding of $75 million? In other words, when is that supposed to start and end for participating courts?

A6: All participants are expected to be fully operational by June 30, 2020 and will submit or have submitted data according to the following schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Due Date | Period Covered |
| Jan 15, 2020 | Jan 2015-Dec 2019 |
| July 15, 2020 | Jan-June 2020 |
| January 15, 2021 | July-Dec 2020 |
| July 15, 2021 | Jan-June 2021 |
| Jan 15, 2022 | July-Dec 2021 |

**Q7:**Have the participating courts selected a risk assessment tool already or do some of them need research support with the selection or development of a tool as well?

A7: All participants have selected risk assessment tools.

**Q8:**Section 7.5 of the RFP says “Only written proposals will be accepted. Proposals must be sent by registered or certified mail, courier service (e.g. FedEx), or delivered by hand. Proposals may not be transmitted by fax or email.” Would the Judicial Council of California consider accepting proposals by email in an effort to help mitigate the spread of COVID-19?

A8: We will accept the proposals and cost bids electronically. Proposers must submit the proposal in two (2) parts the Technical proposal and Cost proposal as separate file attachments, to the solicitations mailbox at [*Solicitations@jud.ca.gov*](mailto:Solicitations@jud.ca.gov) . Addendum 2 has been posted at <https://www.courts.ca.gov/43520.htm> to change Section 7.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS (instructions) and Section 10.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS (CRITERION -MAXIMUM NUMBER OF POINTS). Please reference the above link to Addendum 2 for complete information.

**Q9:**Is the following person level data available for analysis?

* 1. All charges filed initially for each case
  2. The judge on each case
  3. Case outcome, such as guilty/not guilty/dropped for each initial charge, whether case was adjudicated through a plea or trial, and punishment (e.g., probation, incarceration, and term for each)
  4. Data on public safety that also includes jail and prison time for new crimes

A9: The court data include all charges filed for each case. Individual judges are not identified in the court data. Case outcomes such as guilty/not guilty/dropped for each initial charge are included as disposition types for each charge. Sentence terms and plea types are considered supplemental data elements and are available for some counties. A link in the RFP includes all of the data elements requested both mandatory and supplemental. The primary source of rearrest and conviction data is the California DOJ. To the extent that counties submit the data it also has sentence type and term for those who are convicted. It is also possible to supplement missing statewide data with local data.