

Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688 Telephone 415-865-7960 • Fax 415-865-4325 • 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, Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts

Finance Division

DATE: November 30, 2007

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals

(RFP), as posted at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp.

Project Title: California Real DUI Court in Schools Project Evaluation

RFP Number: CFCC-071108-RB

PROPOSAL DUE

DATE:

1:00 p.m., December 14, 2007—See section 1.5 of the RFP for additional key

dates

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS:

Proposals must be delivered to:

Judicial Council of California Administrative Office of the Courts

Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP #CFCC-071108-RB

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Seventh Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

- 1. I will be out of the country from 12/19-1/1. This overlaps with the period during which you may interview finalists for the award. Do you anticipate that this would be a problem if I were among those considered to be finalists?
 - Answer: We still encourage you to submit a proposal. When submitting your proposal, please specify your availability to us and we will consider that when scheduling interviews (if necessary).
- 2. How will the students at the schools be selected to take part in Real DUI? Will this be left up to the schools, or will specific guidelines for student selection be specified in the "How to Implement Your Program" manual?
 - Answer: Student selection is not specified in the manual because that will vary among schools. It is up to individual schools on student level of participation. Some schools may want the entire school to attend; others may select only one grade level. Audience size will vary. This is why we are requesting a sampling methodology proposal.
- 3. Would it be possible for the AOC to make the draft "How to Implement Your Program" manual available to potential bidders for the evaluation RFP?
 - Answer: The manual is not ready for distribution, however for an overview of the three program models, you may want to view a recent broadcast produced at the AOC by pasting the following into your browser:

http://easylink.playstream.com/aocstream/priv/6098.wvx

- 4. Can you provide an estimate of how many students total will need to be assessed?
 - Answer: At each of the nine implementation court's programs, we anticipate all participating students will complete the assessment (pre and post surveys). However, we will work with the selected evaluator to determine an ideal sample size for each program.
- 5. Can you provide an idea of where stakeholders will be located geographically?
 - Answer: Stakeholders will be located in the following counties: Fresno, Contra Costa, Sonoma, San Joaquin, Orange, Nevada, Solano, Santa Cruz, and Tulare. The evaluator will not be expected to hold all interviews in person. Phone interviews will also be acceptable.
- 6. In Section 4.13, a "Sample data collection tool" developed for a previous project is asked for. What do you mean by "Sample data collection tool"? Can you give an example?
 - Answer: We would like to see an example of a data collection tool e.g. a survey, a pretest, post-test instrument, or an interview guide that you developed for a previous project. We are essentially looking for a demonstration of your ability to develop and tailor data collection tools to a specific project.

- 7. Please indicate what part of the scope of work and other costs are expected to be covered by the initial \$50k and which by the additional \$25k? Is this at the discretion of the proposer?
 - Answer: Yes. It is at the discretion of the applicant to explain what can be done for \$50k and what could be enhanced with an additional \$25k.
- 8. Where are each of the mini-grant recipients located (please specify city)?
 - Answer: Recipients will be located in the following counties: Fresno, Contra Costa, Sonoma, San Joaquin, Orange, Nevada, Solano, Santa Cruz, and Tulare.
- 9. About how many youth do you expect will participate in the program during the program (please specify by site if possible)?
 - Answer: It is up to individual schools on student level of participation. Some schools may want the entire school to attend; others may select only one grade level. Audience size will vary. This is why we are requesting a sampling methodology proposal.
- 10. Where can we obtain a copy of the curriculum and/or manuals for the 3 components of the program (Real DUI Court in Schools Sentencing Program, Real DUI Court in Schools Trial Program, Courage to Live Program)? Do sites have to do all 3 components (if not, what are the minimum requirements)?

Answer: When completed, we can provide you with a copy of the curriculum which includes the how to manual and also explains all three models. For more information, please view a recent broadcast produced at the AOC by pasting the following into your browser:

http://easylink.playstream.com/aocstream/priv/6098.wvx

- 11. What is the structure of the program delivery for each of the 3 components? Specifically for each component, is it done in a classroom setting or other setting? How many times do they meet and what is the length of each session/meeting?
 - Answer: The program is flexible so the program length will vary depending on the school's level of participation and schedule, the facilitator's approach, and program model. The "Courage to Live" program might be around two hours, the sentencing program might be around 2 hours also, and the full trial program might be around 4 hours to an entire school day. Typically programs are administered in an auditorium setting.
- 12. Has the curriculum been implemented at any sites to date? If so, are any of these sites part of the current evaluation? When were the start dates? If implementation has not begun, when is it projected to begin?
 - Answer: The existing programs are the three models already explained. The AOC developed curriculum has not been given to them to use in the program but rather we have built our curriculum around these models. We would like these participants to be

RFP# CFCC-071108-RB November 30, 2007

included in the evaluation also but only for programs taking place during our contracted grant period.

13. If the program has begun at sites that are part of the current evaluation, have they been collecting data and is it retrievable electronically?

Answer: No

- 14. How many court staff are involved in the projects at each site? What are their roles (please specify job titles)?
- 15. Answer: If it is a sentencing or trial program, typically a program manager is assigned to handle logistics, coordination with school sites, scheduling, and preparation of materials for the program. The coordinator works closely with the judge, attorneys and other court personnel, who will be needed on the day of the program. The program manager coordinates; the judge hears the case and provide students with information about DUIs. The attorneys, court clerk, and bailiff serve in their usual capacity. The "Courage to Live" model is different and more flexible. The roles could vary based on the development of the program. In our current model, a judge does all the coordination and brings jail inmates to talk about their experience as well as California Highway Patrol officers to talk to students about driver impairment and what they see on the roads.
- 16. Can you please define who the project stakeholders are as identified in the RFP in 3.1.2?

Answer: Stakeholders would include program staff, judges, attorneys, teachers, and school administrators.

17. Are parents expected to comprise part of the sample? Please refer to RFP task 3.1.1. If so, how are parents expected to be involved in the program?

Answer: Parents are not part of the sample.

18. Are there page limitations for the response to the RFP?

Answer: No