



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TITLE: CASEFLOW MANAGEMENT CONSULTING

RFI NO.: BMS-2024-45-SB

RESPONSES DUE BY: FEBRUARY 3, 2025

NO LATER THAN 2:00 P.M. PACIFIC TIME

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. OVERVIEW**
 - II. INVITATION TO RESPOND**
 - III. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE**
 - IV. REQUIREMENTS**
 - V. RESPONSE FORMAT**
 - VI. CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSION AND CONTACT INFORMATION**
 - VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
 - VIII. CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION**
 - IX. INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
 - X. STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS**
- APPENDIX A: GRANT APPLICATION PROGRAM NARRATIVE**

I. OVERVIEW

The Judicial Council of California (Judicial Council), 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 functions prescribed by law.

The primary purpose of the Judicial Council's Research, Analytics and Data group is to provide data, research, and analytics to inform branch decision-making. As part of its effort to better understand trial court workload, the Judicial Branch is undertaking a study of caseflow management. In her 2024 State of Judiciary address, California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero highlighted caseflow as one of her priority projects that would increase transparency, improve efficiencies, and increase productivity without sacrificing quality.

II. INVITATION TO RESPOND

You are invited to respond with information to assist the Judicial Council in identifying prospective consultants who would be willing to partner with the Judicial Council in a caseflow management study.

III. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE

The Judicial Council seeks to partner with a consultant to create a cost-effective and repeatable framework for trial courts to improve caseflow management in all casetypes (civil, criminal, family law, juvenile, mental health, probate), regardless of court analytic capacity, resource levels or previous experience on this topic.

The Judicial Council and consultant will work with a committee of state court leaders to establish a framework for evaluating and improving caseflow management. Committee discussion, interviews, site visits, and data analysis will be used to inform the process. Key workload indicators collected by the Judicial Council, such as time to disposition, will be used to measure progress. The study and resulting framework will help determine the relationship between time to disposition and workload indicators, such as average number of hearings per case or continuances, and the impact of court organizational strategies on caseflow management. The study will examine the issue from both the judicial officer and court executive (administrative) perspective.

The framework will be disseminated to all courts, and the Judicial Council will continue the training and implementation model created by the consultant. Regularly-scheduled meetings of court leaders, including judicial officers and court executive officers, will be used to discuss framework implementation, lessons learned, and to share successes. More detailed information about the project is contained in Appendix A.

The project will commence upon identification of a suitable consultant and will end by December 31, 2025.

IV. REQUIREMENTS

The Respondents providing consulting services can be a firm or an individual and must have at least ten (10) years of experience as a consultant to courts with at least five (5) prior engagements in the area of caseflow management (any case types) and at least five (5) prior engagements in California courts (does not need to be exclusively for caseflow management). Respondents can be located in states other than California, but must be prepared to attend at least one in-person meeting or engagement in California.

Each Respondent must review the Grant Application Program Narrative (Appendix A) and prepare a written response to the following questions:

1. Do you or your firm have the required skills, knowledge, and experience to fulfill the project requirements?
2. Could you or your firm commence working on this project immediately (as soon as a contract is negotiated) and complete the work within the stated timeframe (by December 31, 2025)?

In addition to the responses, Respondents should provide:

3. Resumes of staff who will be assigned to the project.
4. Outline of required experience as stated in the first paragraph of section IV. For the caseflow management experience, please indicate the casetype that was worked on during the project.

V. RESPONSE FORMAT

Technical Response. The following information must be included in the technical response.

1. Title Page must include the following information:
 - a. Response title;
 - b. Date submitted;
 - c. Respondent's name and business name;
 - d. Identification of Respondent as individual, partnership, corporation, public agency, or joint venture of one or more of the preceding;
 - e. Identification of the business structure of the Respondent's representational model (e.g., public agency, private for-profit organizational representation, private non-profit organizational representation, solo practitioner, centrally administered panel, any combination of the preceding, etc.); and

- f. Respondent's contact information (physical and electronic addresses, telephone, and fax).
2. Responses to questions 1 through 4 in section IV.

VI. CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSION AND CONTACT INFORMATION

All submissions are due no later than the closing date of February 3, 2025, no later than 2:00 P.M. (PST). All interested parties must submit an electronic version of the entire response marked "**Response to RFI No. CFCC-2024-45-SB**" to be transmitted by email to the Judicial Council's solicitations mailbox at solicitations@jud.ca.gov.

All communication with the Judicial Council for this RFI must be in writing, include the RFI number, and must be directed to the Judicial Council's solicitations mailbox at the following e-mail address: solicitations@jud.ca.gov.

Interested parties must not contact any other Judicial Council staff, court, or other judicial branch entity regarding this RFI except as provided above.

VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Disclaimer – No Solicitation: This RFI is issued to gather information and is intended for planning purposes only. This RFI does not constitute a solicitation. A response to this RFI is not an offer and cannot be accepted by the Judicial Council to form a binding contract. The Judicial Council shall have no obligation to, and will not, reimburse Respondents (or their agents, contractors or brokers) for any expenses associated with responding to this RFI. Responses to this RFI will not be returned. The Judicial Council shall have no obligation to respond in any manner to a submission.

VIII. CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

California judicial branch entities are subject to rule 10.500 of the California Rule of Court (see https://www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=ten&linkid=rule10_500), which governs public access to judicial administrative records.

If information submitted in the response contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the Judicial Council's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then that information will not be disclosed upon a request for access to such records. If the Judicial Council finds or reasonably believes that the material so marked is **not** exempt from disclosure, the Judicial Council will disclose the information regardless of the marking or notation seeking confidential treatment.

IX. INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Following review of the submitted material, you or your organization may be contacted and asked to participate in an information exchange with the Judicial Council. The objective will be to gain further understanding of your proposed approach.

X. STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

The Judicial Council represents that this RFI, submissions from Respondents to this RFI, and any relationship between the Judicial Council and Respondents arising from or connected or related to this RFI, are subject to the specific limitations and representations expressed below, as well as the terms contained elsewhere in this RFI. By responding to this RFI, Respondents are deemed to accept and agree to this Statement of Limitations. By submitting a response to this RFI and without the need for any further documentation, the Respondent acknowledges and accepts the Judicial Council's rights as set forth in the RFI, including this Statement of Limitations.

This RFI does not create an obligation on the part of the Judicial Council to enter into any retention or agreement, nor to implement any of the actions contemplated herein, nor to serve as the basis for any claim whatsoever for reimbursement for any costs for efforts associated with the preparation of responses submitted to this RFI.

The submission of an RFI response is not required to make any legal services provider eligible to participate as outside counsel in any legal matter for a judicial branch entity, nor does submission of a response preclude Respondents from participation. A submission does not constitute a contract for services.

To the best of the Judicial Council's knowledge, the information provided herein is accurate. Notwithstanding, the Judicial Council makes no representations or warranties whatsoever with respect to this RFI or any legal matters managed by the Judicial Council, including representations and warranties as to the accuracy of any information or assumptions contained in this RFI or otherwise furnished to Respondents by the Judicial Council.

Notwithstanding anything else in this RFI, the Judicial Council has the unqualified right to:

- change any of the dates, schedule, deadlines, process, and requirements described in this RFI;
- supplement, amend or otherwise modify this RFI; and
- elect to cancel or to not proceed with this RFI for any reason whatsoever, without incurring any liability for costs or damages incurred by any interested parties or potential interested parties.

The Judicial Council has the right to require clarification or accept or request new or additional information from any or all interested parties without offering other interested parties the same opportunity, and to interview any or all interested parties. The Judicial Council may independently verify any information in any submission.

The Judicial Council reserves the right to amend or modify one or more provisions of this RFI by written notice posted online at [Bidders / Solicitations | Judicial Branch of California](#) prior to the closing date.

Appendix A: Grant Application Program Narrative

California Trial Courts Caseflow Management Technical Assistance Application T-25-033

Statement of Need

Timely, cost-effective, and procedurally fair justice are the hallmarks of effective caseflow management and aligns with the State Justice Institute's (SJI) priority investment area to improve procedural justice through better practices and outcomes for litigants. While caseflow management is not a new topic and over the last several years in California there have been individual efforts in California trial courts to analyze and improve caseflow management, the timing is right to undertake a statewide effort to examine ways to enhance caseflow. In her 2024 State of Judiciary address, California Chief Justice Patricia Guerrero highlighted caseflow as one of her priority projects that would increase transparency, improve efficiencies, and increase productivity without sacrificing quality. And, as California enters a period of budget uncertainty and all courts are experiencing budget reductions, there is even more reason to find ways for courts to operate more effectively within resource constraints.

California trial courts are incredibly diverse. There is a trial court in each of fifty-eight counties, ranging from small, rural courts serving populations around 10,000 residents up to Los Angeles, the most populous county in the nation, serving about a third of the state, or just under 10 million residents. Another fourteen California counties serve populations that are equivalent to those of other U.S. states. On the other end of the range, fifteen counties are small enough that they have the minimum number of authorized judicial positions (two full time equivalents) in their jurisdictions. One of the challenges of undertaking a statewide study of any type in California is that smaller counties do not have the analytic resources and tools that are necessary to undertake research studies. Another challenge is that there is turnover in court leadership roles; in many courts, the presiding judge role rotates every two years and all courts must regularly plan for succession in administrative leadership roles.

The project proposal attempts to overcome these challenges by creating a framework and self-assessment tool for courts to study and understand caseflow in their courts. The framework will establish an agreed-upon set of key workload indicators and caseflow management metrics for all casetypes (civil, criminal, family law, juvenile, mental health, probate). The proposal will leverage recent legislative investments in modern case management systems that will make it easier to access the data needed to analyze and understand caseflow. The self-assessment tool would allow courts to independently evaluate their caseflow management, identify areas of needed improvement, and make changes as needed. The training component of this proposal will help sustain this work

over the long term and aligns with one of SJI's priority investment areas for this year—building an adaptable and innovative court workforce through training, education, and workforce development.

SJI and the National Center for State Courts have done numerous studies of caseflow management over the years, but more recent activity (2020 onwards) is limited. An SJI grant on this topic was awarded in 2020 (Caseflow Management Maturity Model, though the study subject was not California courts. In California, Santa Cruz and Orange courts (separately) received SJI technical assistance grants in 2013 for criminal caseflow management projects; the Stanislaus Superior Court received an SJI grant to study criminal caseflow management in 2021. These court-specific grants were very useful to the individual jurisdictions but are not comprehensive across case types or generalizable to the state as a whole without additional study.

The Judicial Council does not have dedicated funding for statewide research projects. Proposed budget reductions for the current and subsequent year prevent the Council and courts' from undertaking this much-needed study without supplemental grant funding.

Project Description and Objectives

A joint subcommittee drawing from the court oversight leadership bodies (the Court Executives Advisory Committee and Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee) is being formed to guide caseflow management policy development and coordinate this study, if funded. The grant would be used to hire a consultant with expertise in court caseflow management to work with the newly-formed subcommittee to create the framework and self-assessment tool. A consultant has not yet been retained for this work and would be procured through the standard Judicial Council procurement process. The in-kind portion of the match will be provided in the form of Judicial Council staff time for data collection, data validation, meeting coordination, and other administrative activities.

The data that will support the problem statement is aggregated court workload data that is reported by courts to the state via the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). This data includes workload indicators such as filings and disposition counts and percentages of cases that are disposed within certain timeframes. While additional data may be available at the local court, the concept is to create a framework using data that are consistently available and reported across all courts statewide. The consultant will be asked to conduct diagnostic studies in volunteer courts to determine the relationship between indicators such as time to disposition and measures such as average number of hearings per case, continuances, etc. These workload measures correspond to national court metrics of workload promulgated by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). The consultant will consider the impact of court organizational strategies and will approach this issue from both the judicial officer and court perspective.

The consultant will review available data and work closely with court leaders to develop the framework. While it is expected that a consultant could draw on prior studies of caseflow management conducted in other states and/or supported by SJI grants, it is also expected that the consultant would anchor the framework in the contemporary California courts' context, including recent impactful legislation such as the Racial Justice Act and recent criminal justice reforms that affect post-judgment workload. The consultant should be expected to convene focus groups, hold meetings with court leaders, and conduct site visits to courts if needed. Using a train-the-trainers model, the consultant will also deliver an initial set of trainings to court leaders that could later be replicated by Judicial Council trainers.

The concept of this proposal is to create a sustainable framework that can be replicated in all courts in the future. The consultant will be asked to provide recommendations for implementation and user adoption best practices. As the Chief Justice has made this a priority project, it is expected that she will receive regular updates on implementation from the joint subcommittee. Further, as court leadership changes, new leaders can maintain continuity of focus on caseflow management by receiving this foundational education, repeating the self-assessment, and continuing to implement the framework. The final products will be shared with all California court leaders at no cost.

Project implementation

The joint subcommittee will oversee the project implementation, supported by Judicial Council staff to manage the project plan and administer the program. The approximate project timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
January or February 2025	Retain consultant through Judicial Council procurement process.
February 2025	Project commencement
March 2025	Kickoff meeting with court oversight committee; Initiate bi-weekly status meetings between applicant and consultant
April 2025	Submit first quarterly progress and financial report
May to September 2025	Meetings with oversight committee; interviews with key stakeholders at JCC and in courts.
July 2025	Submit second quarterly progress and financial report
August 2025	Project update at statewide court leaders' meeting

September to December 2025	Finalize research and deliverables (report, framework, self-assessment tool, training plan).
October 2025	Submit third quarterly progress and financial report
January 2026	Submit fourth quarterly progress and financial report

Staff capacity and organizational capacity

The Judicial Council has the internal capacity to monitor grant funds, including tracking expenditures and reporting on grant outcomes. The Judicial Council’s Office of Court Research staff will have primary oversight for the project funds, supported by the accounting and budget units. While the Judicial Council has not received an SJI grant in the last three years, it receives grant funding from other sources and has well-established processes in place for grant management. Leah Rose-Goodwin, the Judicial Council’s Chief Data and Analytics Officer, would be responsible for managing and reporting on the financial aspects of the project.

Evaluation

As part of developing the framework, the consultant will also design an evaluation plan to determine whether the project was effective at promulgating effective caseflow management principles in California and/or resulted in a change in caseflow management metrics. Other units of measure include numbers of courts implementing the framework or numbers of trainings held.

Sustainability

The project includes several factors that will contribute towards its long-term sustainability. For one, the primary output of the project is a framework rather than a study, and, by design, a framework’s design should remain relevant beyond a one-time study or effort. Also, it includes a train-the-trainers approach to ensure that the framework endures beyond the immediate project timeline. Further, the project is sponsored jointly by the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and Court Executives Advisory Committee; having support within the Judicial Council’s committee structure will help ensure its longevity beyond the project. And finally, the project will be sustainable over the long term because caseflow management directly aligns with the branch’s strategic plan in that it impacts timely and effective access to justice, uses resources effectively, and modernizes management and administration.

END OF RFI