

Questions and Answers
RFP# EOP-0905
Public Trust and Confidence in the California Courts, Phase 2

10/14/05

1. Will out of state firms be considered for this contract?

Yes, but all transportation (and related costs) must be clearly stated in the proposal.

2. Will the AOC provide a list of judicial officers and trial court administrators, with home addresses, phone numbers and email addresses, to the contractor?

We have already begun to solicit participant courts. Final phase 2 participants, including court users, must authorize us to release necessary contact information. The contractor will be responsible for review and follow-up on all contact information provided by the AOC and/or trial courts—including using the information to set up focus groups.

3. Will the AOC provide a letter of introduction to judicial officers and court administrators to inform them of the project and encourage them to participate?

Yes. See response to Question # 2, above.

4. In reference to your desire to interview stakeholders (court users), could the chosen firm expect to be provided with a list of recent stakeholders in order to conduct exit interviewing among this population?

While the AOC will identify courts and provide a list of appropriate contact persons, it will be the responsibility of the contractor to develop both an adequate sampling strategy and a representative sample of court users (relative to the service area of the court) by working directly with the project courts. There are many alternatives to obtaining this information, including court websites, legal advance sheets from FindLaw, and computerized systems such as Lexis and Westlaw. A successful researcher will take a direct role in developing the sample, and ideally, will minimize need for court staff. See also response to Question # 2, above.

5. Will the winning bidder have access to the raw survey data (analysis file and codebook) from Phase I so that they may independently review and explore the data related to the major substantive issues that are the focus of Phase 2 research?

It is not the AOC's policy or practice to provide raw data from any research project to outside entities. However, requests by the phase 2 contractor for supplemental summary analyses may be considered if the rationale is deemed sound and appropriate. It should be noted that research and methodological reports for phase 1 are currently available. Further, the phase 2 contractor is not being asked to produce new or revise existing findings presented by the phase 1 study. Rather the phase 2 study is intended to delve more deeply into the 6 substantive areas of findings identified in phase 1.

6. What other Phase 1 findings are, or may be deemed, relevant by the AOC or Judicial Council representatives for investigation in Phase 2, in addition to the six areas noted in the RFP?

RFP response proposals must place a clear emphasis on covering all aspects of the Phase 2 focus areas specified in RFP sections 2.7.1 through 2.7.6. A rationale for any additional research questions must be provided in the proposal.

7. On page 21 of 21, deliverable #1 has a completion date of “On or about May 12, 2006.” Is this deliverable and due date in the right place? Should it instead be deliverable #6?

The Deliverables in Table 1, Project Deliverables, are incorrectly sequenced. The Deliverables will be re-sequenced in date order as follows:

Deliverable Number	Will Become Deliverable Number
1	5
2	1
3	2
4	3
5	4
6	No Change
7	No Change
8	No Change
9	No Change

8. How many courts are to be included in the study? Do you have a have a minimum number of courts in mind? How will the courts be selected?

Courts from each of the 3 major AOC geographical regions will need to be included in the study, with a minimum of 2 courts/counties per region. Phase 2 participants, to the extent possible, should be selected in a manner that provides a representative sample of the public in the court's service area. See also response to question # 2.

9. How many court users do you want involved in the study? Do you have a minimum number of court users and/or focus groups in mind?

The AOC shall rely on the expertise of potential contractors to identify a representative sample of court users, given the focus areas of phase 2. This information should be included in RFP responses under proposed methodology and should include the contractor's rationale for proposed participation in focus groups, on-line or site-specific surveys, or other methods. There is no minimum number of focus groups or participants, but, as is noted above in the response to Question # 8, the methodology must be conducted in each AOC region. The research data must also identify possible means of improving the delivery of justice.

10. How many judges and court administrators are to be included in the study? Do you have a minimum number of judges and court administrators in mind? How will they be selected?

The AOC shall rely on the expertise of potential contractors to identify a representative sample of judges and court administrators, given the focus areas of phase 2. This information should be included in RFP responses under proposed methodology and should include the contractor's rationale for proposed participation in focus groups, on-line or site-specific surveys, or other methods. There is no minimum number of focus groups or participants, but, as is noted above in the response to Question # 8, the methodology must be conducted in each AOC region. The research data must also identify possible means of improving the delivery of justice.

11. Do you want the study to obtain the input of just court administrators and executives or of other court staff as well? If the answer is other court staff, which other court staff do you want included in the study?

Court staff input should be restricted to judicial officers and court administrators (the latter category would include court executive officers, assistant court executive officers, upper and mid-level managers and administrators, and operations officers). Specific choices may vary based on court size and/or region.

12. Please advise on whether there is any significance to the following: On the "Reference Page," "trial court administrators" is one of the three groups to be studied. At the top of page 3 of the RFP, the term used is "court administrators". On the same page in section 2.4, the term used is "certain groups of court staff". Can you define the target group of interest?

“Court administrators” or “court staff” as used in the RFP applies to court executive officers (CEOs), assistant court executive officers, upper and mid-level court managers and administrators, and/or operations officers. See also response to Question # 11 above.

13. There are numerous recommendations contained in the recent public opinion survey report issued by the AOC other than those mentioned in the RFP. We would like to confirm that the only issues to be addressed in Phase II of this project are the specific numbered recommendations: 2.7.1 Receiving and Seeking Court Information; 2.7.2 Experience in a Court Case: Incidence and Consequences; 2.7.3 Barriers to Taking a Case to Court; 2.7.4 Diversity and the Needs of a Diverse Population; 2.7.5 Fairness in Procedures and Outcomes; and 2.7.6 Expectations and Performance.

RFP response proposals must place a clear emphasis on covering all aspects of the Phase 2 focus areas specified in RFP sections 2.7.1 through 2.7.6. Potential recommendations contained in the recent public opinion survey report may be explored during phase 2. However, phase 2 will focus on the issues and unmet public needs identified in RFP sections 2.7.1 through 2.7.6, and shall result in:

- **the development of actionable short term policy recommendations,**
- **practical operational planning strategies, and**
- **programmatic responses that the JC Planning Committee may consider for adoption and immediate implementation.**

A rationale for any additional research questions must be provided in the proposal.

14. The project timeline appears to allow limited time for actual completion of focus group meetings and other data collection between the February field testing deadline and the first report due March 17. Is the project timeline negotiable? Could we (a) move up the methodology design process so that focus groups could actually begin in January/February, (b) complete the methodology design, focus group recruiting of participants, and field testing concurrently, or (c) extend the project completion deadline to provide sufficient time to complete the needed research?

The project completion deadline cannot be extended; however, there is some room for flexibility on the project's front-end. The AOC would be willing to consider proposals calling for earlier agreement on methodology design, focus group recruiting, and field testing, providing delivery dates for draft and final reports—including project completion—are not affected.

15. Is it appropriate to assume that the numbering scheme in the RFP is a typographical error, and that those subparagraphs numbered 5.7.1, 5.7.2, 5.7.3, and 5.7.4 should actually be read and cited to as 5.8.1, 5.8.2, 5.8.3, and 5.8.4?

You are correct. The subparagraphs under paragraph 5.8 on page 8 are to be re-numbered 5.8.1, 5.8.2, 5.8.3, and 5.8.4 instead of 5.7.1, 5.7.2, 5.7.3, and 5.7.4.

16. Are AOC resources in regional offices available to help support completion of the project, i.e., can regional offices be used as locations for focus group sessions, and will regional AOC staff and trial and appellate courts personnel be available to help with identification of potential participants to be invited to participate in focus groups, and to support meetings onsite? If regional office meeting sites are not available, what cost do you want us to use to calculate the cost of meeting rooms in each region?

It is possible that AOC regional offices could be used for some focus group sessions. However, many courts are not located near the 3 regional offices; thus, some focus groups may need to be held in other locations. The AOC shall rely on contractors to identify appropriate meeting room and stipend costs, which should be included in RFP response proposals. Although our evaluation of proposals will take into account the appropriateness of each contractor's response in this category, we also reserve the right to impose a reasonable allowance for costs in this category. See also response to Question # 2, above.

17. Diversity appears to be a significant issue that we are to address. That means ensuring involvement of individuals from communities that are often not well-connected to the judicial system. Will the AOC regional offices or court personnel be able to assist in identifying local diverse organizations through which to recruit participants? Will the AOC provide any stipend for the cost of interpreter services or be able to help recruit volunteer interpreters to assist in the meeting process? If we are to budget for the cost of interpreters, please give us some idea of the number and types of languages and an acceptable interpreter pay rate, by region as appropriate.

Diversity is identified as a major theme in the RFP and should be addressed in all proposals. To the extent they are able, regional as

well as court staff will help identify local diverse organizations through which to recruit participants. RFP respondents must include the cost of interpreters in their response proposals. The AOC employs regional court interpreter coordinators who can assist the selected contractor in obtaining certified interpreters at cost effective rates in all 3 AOC regions. Please note that phase 1 of the Public Trust and Confidence research was conducted in the following languages: English, Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin. Average certified interpreter rates in California can range from \$265 to \$800 per day.

18. Ordinarily, true focus group participants in market and other research are reimbursed for their time in amounts such as \$100 per person. Does the AOC anticipate providing any stipend to focus group participants, and, if so, how much? Also, if no stipend is provided, will travel costs (mileage and meals) be reimbursed to participants? Are consultants to include these costs in the budget prepared for the project or are these separate costs for which the AOC will be responsible? If consultants are to include these costs in the proposal, how much should be calculated per focus group participant?

Respondents are to include all focus group costs in the budget prepared for the project. For purposes of proposals, we cannot provide information on how much should be calculated per focus group participant. Judicial officers and court employees may not be eligible to receive a stipend to participate in focus groups. See also response to Question # 16.

19. Is it possible to submit the final report on CD or DVD rather than printing so many hard copies?

Delivery of 2,500 copies of the final report must be as specified in the RFP. Also, the final report must be delivered electronically in a format acceptable to the AOC, which shall be suitable for posting on an AOC web site. For reference, the final report for phase 1 is posted at:

http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/4_37pubtrust1.pdf

The contractor and AOC will work together to develop the final report for phase 2.

20. To help us design the best research methodology, can you please provide the following additional information for each region: population by county, number of court staff by county, number of judicial officers by county?

Population information for California, including county population figures, is publicly available from the U.S. Census Bureau (<http://www.census.gov>). Court information for California, including statistical reports, is publicly available at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/>.