

RFP Title: California Risk Assessment Pilot Project: Inter-Rater Reliability Studies
RFP Number: CJCSO-1301-RB



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS (AOC)

RFP Title: California Risk Assessment Pilot Project: Inter-Rater Reliability Studies

RFP Number: CJCSO-1301-RB

Due Date and Time: February 12, 2014, 1:00 P.M. Pacific Time

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Organizational Background

- 1.1.1. The Judicial Council of California, 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 other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.
- 1.1.2. The AOC is located in San Francisco. It is comprised of three divisions, including the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, of which the Criminal Justice Court Services Office (CJCSO) is a part. CJCSO oversees and coordinates the AOC's efforts related to criminal justice, including the 2011 Criminal Justice Realignment Act and community corrections, in order to improve efficiencies and assistance to the courts, justice partners, and the public. CJCSO also provides legal, program, and research assistance.

1.2. Study Background

- 1.2.1. The California Risk Assessment Pilot Project (CalRAPP) began in 2009 as a joint project of the AOC and the Chief Probation Officers of California, and is funded by the National Institute of Corrections and the State Justice Institute.
- 1.2.2. The pilot project is designed to explore the ways in which evidence-based practices (EBP), specifically offender risk/needs assessment information, could successfully be used in adult felony sentencing and violations of probation proceedings to reduce offender recidivism and improve offender accountability. With assistance from the CJCSO, four California counties (Napa, San Francisco, Santa Cruz and Yolo) are participating in the pilot project. Recidivism rates of offenders at baseline (i.e., prior to program implementation) will be compared to the recidivism rates of a comparison group of offenders at a designated follow-up period (i.e., after EBP implementation).
- 1.2.3. Since the start of the project, California enacted two laws that have significantly changed the state's criminal justice landscape generally and the CalRAPP specifically.

- 1.2.3.1. In 2010, the California Community Corrections Performance Incentive Act (SB 678) went into effect. SB 678 authorized the state to allocate money each year to a Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund in each county to fund evidence-based supervision of adult felony probationers. SB 678 may have initially delayed CalRAPP implementation in the pilot counties, but over time this legislation has been effective in expanding the probation departments' implementation and use of evidence-based supervision practices in the CalRAPP counties and across the state.
- 1.2.3.2. In 2011, California adopted the Criminal Justice Realignment Act which shifted or "realigned" responsibility for low-level offenders and parolees from the state to the local jurisdictions. This realignment legislation has been called the most dramatic change in California adult corrections since statehood.
- 1.2.4. As part of CalRAPP, the probation departments in the four participating counties are focusing on Quality Assurance and Continuous Quality Improvements (QA/CQI) as it relates to the implementation, use, and sustainment of EPB in their departments. Each of the four counties have developed specific 18-month work plans which identify several priority areas including, an assessment of the reliability and validity of their risk and needs assessment tools, and the monitoring of the quality of their intervention services.
- 1.2.5. This pilot project also includes a research/evaluation plan designed to measure the success of the four pilot sites. This evaluation plan includes both process and outcome measures. The process evaluation is designed to measure the implementation and use of evidence-based practices in the CalRAPP counties and the outcome evaluation is designed to assess recidivism of offenders under supervision in the four pilot counties. Both quantitative and qualitative data are being collected. Quantitative data include baseline individual level data on all new felony probation grants, including an 18-month follow-up period for these individuals, as well as site level data on caseloads. Qualitative data include progress reports by the probation departments, attitudinal surveys of probation department managers and staff and their justice system partners, departmental policy changes implemented over the course of the project, site visit reports, and trainings.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES AND DELIVERABLES

2.1. Description of Services

2.1.1. This solicitation seeks a consultant to assess the inter-rater reliability of the existing risk and needs assessment tools used by the Adult Probation Departments in the four CalRAPP counties. The CJCSO seeks a single firm with demonstrated experience in conducting inter-rater reliability studies.

2.1.2. Proposers should have knowledge of and experience with current generation, actuarial risk and needs assessment instruments for correctional populations. Each CalRAPP county's probation department is currently using a different risk and needs assessment tool, as noted below:

- Santa Cruz County Probation Department - Correctional Assessment and Intervention System (CAIS)
- City & County of San Francisco Adult Probation Department - Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)
- Napa County Probation Department – Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI)
- Yolo County Probation Department – Static Risk and Offender Needs Guide (STRONG) and will soon be using the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

2.2. Project Objectives

2.2.1. Determine probation officer levels of training (e.g., hours of training received) and experience (e.g., number of risk and needs assessments administered) with the risk and needs assessment tools in each of the four counties

2.2.2. Assess the inter-rater reliability of the risk assessment portion of the tools across probation staff in each department

2.2.3. Assess the inter-rater reliability of the needs assessment portion of the tools across probation staff in each department

2.2.4. Provide site-specific recommendations for each probation department that address ways to improve inter-rater reliability

2.2.5. Provide site-specific plans for each probation department that outline the sustainment of an ongoing inter-rater reliability process in each county

2.3. Proposed Methodology

Proposers are expected to submit a proposal that details the research plan and specific study methodology to be used to assess the inter-rater reliability of officers administering the above-mentioned risk and needs assessment instruments to diverse clientele in the four CalRAPP counties. The proposal must include details on the proposed study's purpose, goals, and objectives; the project timeline and task plan; information describing project capabilities and competencies; the plan for collecting and analyzing data; and a proposed budget.

2.4. Project Deliverables

2.4.1. Complete dataset including all data collected, entered, and analyzed as part of the study, a complete data dictionary of variables, and syntax used for analyses.

Due Date: TBD

2.4.2. Materials used and produced to assess the inter-rater reliability of officers administering the risk and needs assessment instruments to diverse clientele in the four counties, including but not limited to, case vignettes, video/CD-ROM/DVD materials, other documents/materials.

Due Date: TBD

2.4.3. Four site-specific final professional-level reports including a project summary, results, recommendations and sustainment. Results, recommendations and sustainment information must address the objectives outlined in Section 2.2. Project Objectives. Each of the four site-specific final professional-level reports shall be provided electronically to the AOC and the individual county.

Due Date: TBD

2.4.4. Final professional-level report for the entire project (all 4 sites) that includes a project summary, methodology, results, challenges, recommendations for increasing inter-reliability, and plans that outline the sustainment of ongoing inter-rater reliability efforts. This final report shall be submitted electronically to the AOC. In addition, final study findings shall be presented (via video conference or teleconference to AOC staff, consistent with #2 in Section 2.5 "Table of Required Meetings". Due date for presentation of study findings: TBD. Due date for final report:

Due Date: TBD

- 2.4.5. Presentation materials (e.g., power point documents, instructional documents, or other materials created as part of the inter-rater reliability study).

Due Date: August 22, 2014.

2.5. Table of Required Meetings

Meeting Number	Purpose & Audience	Location	Date(s)
1	One in-person meeting with key AOC and Probation Department staff to discuss methodology and roles/expectations	San Francisco	TBD (March, 2014)
2	One video conference or conference call with key AOC staff to discuss all study findings	Video or Teleconference	TBD (August, 2014)

3. TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

The AOC has developed the following list of key events related to this RFP. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	DATE
RFP issued	Wednesday, January 08, 2014
Deadline for submission of questions	Wednesday, January 22, 2014
Answers to questions posted	Wednesday, January 29, 2014
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	Wednesday, February 12, 2014, 1:00 pm Pacific Time
Interview of top candidates (estimate only)	Tuesday, February 18, 2014 through Friday, February 22, 2014
Evaluation of proposals completed (estimate only)	Wednesday, February 26, 2014
Notice of Intent to Award posted (estimate only)	Wednesday, March 05, 2014
Anticipated start date (estimate only)	Wednesday, March 12, 2014
All deliverables completed	Friday, August 22, 2014

EVENT	DATE
Contract end date and final invoice submitted.	August 29., 2014

4. RFP ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are included as part of this RFP:

ATTACHMENT	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 1	<u>Administrative Rules Governing RFPs (Non-IT Services)</u> These rules govern this solicitation.
Attachment 2	<u>Standard Terms and Conditions</u> If selected, the person or entity submitting a proposal (the “Proposer”) must sign Standard Form Agreement containing these terms and conditions.
Attachment 3	<u>Proposer’s Acceptance of Terms and Conditions</u> On this form, the Proposer must indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. Note: The provisions marked with an (*) are minimum contract terms and conditions (“Minimum Terms”). A proposal that takes a material exception (addition, deletion, or other modification) to a Minimum Term will be deemed nonresponsive. The AOC, in its sole discretion, will determine what constitutes a material exception.
Attachment 4	<u>Payee Data Record Form</u> This form contains information the AOC requires in order to process payments and must be submitted with the proposal.
Attachment 5	<u>Darfur Contracting Act Certification</u> On this form, the Proposer must certify that they are not a “scrutinized company” doing business in the African nation of Sudan (of which Darfur region is a part) and submit the completed certification with its proposal.
Attachment 6:	<u>Conflict of Interest Certification Form</u> Proposer must complete Conflict of Interest Certification and submit the completed certification with its proposal
Attachment 7:	Pricing Form Proposers must submit this form along with their budget details regarding each deliverable.

5. PAYMENT INFORMATION

- 5.1. The fund allocation for this project is anticipated to be in the range of \$50,000 to \$60,000, including allowable expenses.
- 5.2. Subject to the terms in Attachment 2, Standard Terms and Conditions, Exhibit C, Payment Provisions, payment will be made upon completion of each deliverable; travel expenses will be allowable and reimbursable.

6. SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 6.1. Proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements of the "Proposal Contents" section below. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the RFP's instructions and requirements, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 6.2. The Proposer must submit one (1) original and five (5) copies and one (1) electronic version of its entire proposal with the RFP title and number on the outside of a sealed envelope or box. The original must be signed by an authorized representative of the Proposer and the electronic files must be contained on a CD-ROM in PDF, Word, or Excel formats.
- 6.3. Late proposals will not be accepted. Proposals must be delivered by the date and time listed on the coversheet of this RFP to:

Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP # CJCSO-1301-RB
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

- 6.4. 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.

7. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

The following information must be included in the technical proposal. A proposal lacking any of the following information may be deemed non-responsive.

- 7.1. Proposer's information: Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and federal tax identification number. Note that if Proposer is a sole proprietor using his or her social security number, the social security number will be required before finalizing a contract.

- 7.2. Proposer's designated representative: Name, title, address, telephone number, and email address of the individual who will act as Proposer's designated representative for purposes of this RFP.
- 7.3. Resumes: A resume for each key staff members describing the individual's background and experience, as well as the individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
- 7.4. References: Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three 3 clients for whom the Proposer has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by Proposer.
- 7.5. Research Plan and Methodology. Describe the proposed research plan and the project's purpose, goals and objectives. Proposers should refer to section 2.0 "Description of Services and Deliverables" of this solicitation, including the subsection on project objectives, in explaining the study methodology. Describe how the goals will address the overall project purpose. Relative to probation department staff, provide an estimate of the amount of time and number of probation officers needed to complete the study and describe activities required of probation department staff.
- 7.6. Project Timeline and Task Plan: Attach an overall project timeline that identifies each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or agency. All deliverables must be completed by August 22, 2014 and a final invoice submitted by August 29, 2014.
- 7.7. Capabilities and Competencies: Describe the project staffing/management plan. Identify key person(s) and their respective roles. Describe knowledge, skills, and experience as they relate to the following:
 - 7.7.1. current generation, actuarial risk and needs assessment instruments for correctional populations, including the specific tools mentioned in section 2.1.2 of this RFP;
 - 7.7.2. conducting reliability and/or validity studies generally, and conducting inter-rater reliability studies specifically;
 - 7.7.3. capability of key individual(s)/agencies to implement the project, including gathering and analyzing data and producing professional level final reports; and
 - 7.7.4. recently published applicable results in peer-reviewed journals.
- 7.8. Analysis, Sustainment and Plan for Collecting Data: Describe the current ability to collect and analyze data. Outline how and what data and information will be

collected and analyzed to determine the inter-rater reliability of officers administering the risk and needs assessment tools to diverse clientele. Describe how training and experience levels of probation officers will be defined, measured, documented, and analyzed. Describe how inter-rater reliability results will be analyzed to produce recommendations for improving inter-rater reliability and for supporting and sustaining ongoing inter-rater reliability efforts in each county.

7.9. Acceptance of the Terms and Conditions

- 7.9.1. On Attachment 3, the Proposer must either indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or clearly identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. An “exception” includes any addition, deletion, or other modification.
- 7.9.2. If exceptions are identified, the Proposer must also submit a red-lined version of the Terms and Conditions that clearly tracks proposed changes, and a written explanation or rationale for each exception and/or proposed change.
- 7.9.3. A proposal that takes a material exception (addition, deletion, or other modification) to a Minimum Term will be deemed nonresponsive. The AOC, in its sole discretion, will determine what constitutes a material exception.

7.10. Certifications, Attachments, and other requirements. Proposer must include the following items in its proposal:

- 7.10.1. Using Attachment 6, Proposer certifies that it has no interest that would constitute a conflict of interest under California Public Contract Code sections 10365.5, 10410 or 10411; Government Code sections 1090 et seq. or 87100 et seq.; or rule 10.103 or rule 10.104 of the California Rules of Court, which restrict employees and former employees from contracting with judicial branch entities.
- 7.10.2. Using Attachment 5, Proposer must complete the Darfur Contracting Act Certification.
- 7.10.3. If Proposer is a corporation, proof that Proposer is in good standing and qualified to conduct business in California. AOC may verify by checking with California’s Office of the Secretary of State.
- 7.10.4. Copies of current business licenses, professional certifications, or other credentials.

7.10.5. Proof of financial solvency or stability (e.g., balance sheets and income statements).

7.11. Cost Proposal. The cost proposal, which must cover the entire project period, shall be complete, with costs tied to deliverables. For evaluation purposes, hourly rates, estimated travel, and other expenses (as anticipated) must be provided and substantiated with a detailed budget. Costs must be reasonably allocated to each deliverable. The following information must be included in the cost proposal:

7.11.1. A completed Attachment 7, Pricing, with “not to exceed” amount for labor, travel and other allowable expenses for each deliverable payable under the contract, if awarded.

7.11.2. A detailed line item budget showing your budget justification for each deliverable.

NOTE: It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within this state to sell or use any article or product as a “loss leader” as defined in Section 17030 of the Business and Professions Code.

8. OFFER PERIOD

A Proposer's proposal is an irrevocable offer for ninety (90) days following the proposal due date. In the event a final contract has not been awarded within this period, the AOC reserves the right to negotiate extensions to this period.

9. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

9.1. At the time proposals are opened, each proposal will be checked for the presence or absence of the required proposal contents.

9.2. The AOC will evaluate the proposals on a 100 point scale using the evaluation criteria set forth in the table below. Award, if made, will be to the highest-scored proposal and an Intent to Award notice will be posted at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm> .

EVALUATION CRITERIA	REFERENCE	MAXIMUM POINTS
Reasonableness of Cost	7.11, Attachment 7	30
Quality of research plan and methodology	2.3, 7.5	20
Capabilities and competencies	7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.7	15
Quality of proposed analysis plan, sustainment, and plan for collecting	7.8	15

EVALUATION CRITERIA	REFERENCE	MAXIMUM POINTS
data		
Acceptance of Terms and Conditions	7.9, 7.10, Attachments 2 through 6	15
Quality of timeline and task plan	7.6	5

10. INTERVIEWS

The AOC may conduct interviews with Proposers to clarify aspects set forth in their proposals or to assist in finalizing the ranking of top-ranked proposals. The interviews may be conducted in person or by phone. If conducted in person, interviews will likely be held at the AOC’s offices. The AOC will not reimburse Proposers for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The AOC will notify eligible Proposers regarding interview arrangements.

11. CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

PROPOSALS ARE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE AND RULE 10.500 OF THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT. The AOC will not disclose (i) social security numbers, or (ii) balance sheets or income statements submitted by a Proposer that is not a publicly-traded corporation. All other information in proposals will be disclosed in response to applicable public records requests. Such disclosure will be made regardless of whether the proposal (or portions thereof) is marked “confidential,” “proprietary,” and regardless of any statement in the proposal (a) purporting to limit the AOC’s right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring the AOC to inform or obtain the consent of the Proposer prior to the disclosure of the proposal (or portions thereof). Any proposal that is password protected, or contains portions that are password protected, may be rejected. Proposers are accordingly cautioned not to include confidential, proprietary, or privileged information in proposals.

12. DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS

The AOC has waived the inclusion of DVBE participation in this solicitation.

13. PROTESTS

Any protests will be handled in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Judicial Branch Contract Manual (see www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf). Failure of a

RFP Title: California Risk Assessment Pilot Project: Inter-Rater Reliability Studies
RFP Number: CJCSO-1301-RB

Proposer to comply with the protest procedures set forth in that chapter will render a protest inadequate and non-responsive, and will result in rejection of the protest. The deadline for the AOC to receive a solicitation specifications protest is the proposal due date set forth in Section 3, Timeline For This RFP. Protests should be sent to:

AOC – Business Services
ATTN: Protest Hearing Officer
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102