JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA Request for Proposals California JusticeCorps Program Evaluation Services

RFP No: CFCC-2025-07-DM

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

April 25, 2025

Question #1: Who was the incumbent for this project's evaluation, if any?

Answer: Philliber Research and Evaluation.

Question #2: Section 7.2 "Cost Proposal" includes Roman Numerals i. and iii. Can you please confirm that there isn't a section ii?

Answer: There's no Section ii under Section 7.2.

Question#3: How do the recent funding cuts to AmeriCorps affect this RFP's funding?

Answer: AmeriCorps program operations are always dependent on the availability and appropriation of federal funding. However, the recent cuts do not affect this RFP's funding.

Question#4: Are focus group and survey incentives allowed for JusticeCorps members and self-represented litigants?

Answer: Focus group and survey incentives may not be included in the budget responding to this RFP. However, if the awarded vendor chooses to provide incentives without requesting reimbursement from this contract, that is allowable.

Question#5: What platform does JusticeCorps use for reporting (e.g., AmericaLearns)?

Answer: JusticeCorps submits reports to its funder, California Volunteers, (CV) via CV's internal Salesforce platform.

Question#6: Page 4 of Attachment 10, Evaluation plan, Section 8 Timeline, 1st bullet: What materials will be provided to the vendor to build the training materials library? Is the vendor expected to obtain materials beyond those directly provided by the Judicial Council, for example by soliciting them directly from sites?

Answer: The training materials will be created by the vendor based upon the final, AmeriCorps-approved evaluation plan. The materials will be designed to train project partners who may be executing certain tasks within the evaluation plan. **Question#7**: Page 4 of Attachment 10 - Evaluation plan - Section 8 Timeline, 4th bullet: How many regional site supervisors are there? Is it correct to assume there is one regional site supervisor per site in the proposal (i.e., one for San Diego, one for LA, and one for Bay Area?)

Answer: There are 29 court-based service sites. Each service site has one primary site supervisor and a team of site staff who also oversee members.

Question#8: Page 4 of RFP Section 2.4, Deliverables and Page 4 of Attachment 10 Evaluation Plan, Section 8, Timeline: Will the Judicial Council please clarify the timeline for the evaluation and highlight any differences between the proposed contract timeline in the RFP and the evaluation timeline in the evaluation plan submitted to AmeriCorps? For example, the timeline in the RFP indicates Deliverable 8 (Submit Draft Evaluation Study Report to Judicial Council) will be completed August 1, 2027. However, the timeline in the Evaluation Plan (attachment 10) indicates the final evaluation report will be submitted in June 2028.

Answer: The contract resulting from this RFP will be based on the timeline included in the RFP (Section 2.4, Page 4). The final evaluation study report is due to the Judicial Council by the end of the Option Term (October 2027).

Question#9: Can you please share the dates of all previous evaluations of this program and links to resulting evaluation reports?

Answer: No.

Question#10: Who developed the evaluation plan (attachment 10) that was submitted to AmeriCorps in 2024? And if developed by an external evaluation consultant, are they eligible to bid on this RFP to implement this evaluation?

Answer: Philliber Research and Evaluation. Yes, they are eligible to submit a bid.

Question#11: Typically, we would provide incentives (e.g. gift cards) to evaluation participants who participate in surveys and/or interviews/focus groups. However, some organizations do not allow incentives to be offered for program staff when they are participating in the evaluation as a part of their job (e.g. in this case, possibly regional site supervisors and Members). We assume incentives are acceptable for SRLs who participate in surveys. Can JusticeCorps' clarify their position on appropriateness of incentives?

Answer: Focus group and survey incentives may not be included in the budget responding to this RFP. However, if the awarded vendor chooses to provide incentives without requesting reimbursement from this contract, that is allowable.

Question#12: Are observations of onsite and virtual services a mandatory component of the evaluation? If so, when are they estimated to occur? The observation component is not included in the draft evaluation plan timeline, even though observations are described as part of data collection procedures.

Answer: Program observation should be included in the proposal. Exact timing for observation will be determined by the final AmeriCorps approved evaluation plan.

Question#13: The project timeline in the draft evaluation plan suggests that the final report is due in June of 2028. In the RFP, however, the estimated completion dates for the draft evaluation study report and final report to the Judicial Council are August and October 2027, respectively. Can you please explain this potential discrepancy and confirm that a final evaluation study report is due to the Judicial Council by the end of the Option Term (October 2027)?

Answer: The contract resulting from this RFP will be based on the timeline included in the RFP (Section 2.4, Page 4). The final evaluation study report is due to the Judicial Council by the end of the Option Term (October 2027).

Question#14: According to the outline of proposal contents in the RFP (section 7.0), key staff member résumés are to be included as part of the technical proposal. Is it acceptable for proposers to also provide more information about their firm's qualifications and experience in the proposal narrative, or should this information be confined solely to individual team member résumés?

Answer: It is acceptable for proposers to provide more information about their qualifications and experience in the proposal narrative.

Question#15: Has an external evaluator been engaged for previous evaluations of the JusticeCorps program?

Answer: Yes.

Question#16: How many site visits to LA, the Bay Area & San Diego are expected as a part of the evaluation?

Answer: Proposers may recommend the appropriate number of site visits based on the desired scope of work in the RFP.

Question#17: Are there any restrictions on the use of funds, such as for profit or private inurement?

Answer: AmeriCorps regulations are found primarily in Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Proposers can view this information in detail at: https://www.americorps.gov/about/agency-overview/statutes-regulations

Question#18: What, if any, flow-down provisions apply from the original grant?

Answer: AmeriCorps regulations are found primarily in Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Proposers can view this information in detail at: <u>https://www.americorps.gov/about/agency-overview/statutes-regulations</u>

Question#19: Is this solicitation still active given the recent administrative changes to AmeriCorps?

Answer: Yes

Question#20: Do you have a preference for California-based contractors?

Answer: No.