

**Evaluation Design for Equal Access Fund Report to the Legislature  
Request for Proposals - Bidders' Conference  
April 26, 2002**

<b>Participant Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
<b>Consultants</b>	
Berkeley Miller	American Institutes for Research
Charlie Frances	KPMG
Jannelle Kubinek	MGT of America
Hampton Smith	Kate Harrison Consulting
Linda Bidrossian	DPK Consulting
Mary Durkin	National Center for State Courts
<b>AOC/CFCC Partners</b>	
Judy Garlow	State Bar of California
Mary Viviano	State Bar of California
Stephanie Choy	Public Interest Clearinghouse
Yvonne (?) Sterling	Legal Aid Society of San Diego
<b>AOC/CFCC Staff</b>	
Bonnie Hough, Equal Access Project Manager	
Diane Nunn, Director	
Suzanne Murphy, Managing Attorney	
Charlene Depner, Manager	
Rowena Rogelio, Administrative Coordinator	
Deana Piazza, Research Analyst	

**Q & A**

Question 1: In reference to Section 2.0 (page 4) of the RFP, is there a prescribed or required format or content for the outline of the report to the legislature?

➤ *No.*

Question 2: Can you elaborate on Section 3.2.8 of the RFP, with respect to the type of information that should be included in the outline of the report to the legislature?

➤ *The report to the Judicial Council regarding what should be included in the report to the legislature should address the initial progress of the projects and how to present the data most effectively, as well as how to gather additional data*

*that would be useful for evaluation purposes but is not currently collected. In formulating their recommendations, applicants should consider potential burdens on legal services groups related to additional data collection.*

*The report should also speak to the fact that this is a multi-site effort with a wide range of promising practices and explore what common indicators of efficiency and effectiveness may be measured across projects.*

- Question 3: Page 4 of the RFP states, “The requirements regarding eligibility and use of funds are reflected in regulating rules and grant conditions approved by the State Bar Board of Governors and Judicial Council and incorporated into a written agreement with each grant recipient.” Are copies of the regulating rules and a sample agreement available?
- *Yes. Grant recipient budget forms, project descriptions, and any other pertinent rules and regulations that are currently available in electronic format will be posted to the CFCC Web site.*
- Question 4: Will the evaluator have routine access to forms, rules, and regulations as part of the initial phase of the project?
- *Yes.*
- Question 5: Will a list of the bidders be posted to the CFCC Web site?
- *No. Although this may be common with other organizations, it has not been the practice of the AOC.*
- Question 6: Does the RFP have a DVBE requirement?
- *DVBE participation is a goal but not a requirement of AOC contracts. DVBE forms are being mailed as an addendum to the RFP and should be completed by all applicants.*
- Question 7: Will there be a small business consideration in the evaluation of the proposals?
- *No.*
- Question 8: Is there any sort of “snapshot” of the projects available?
- *Due to the large number of projects, it would not be feasible to provide a description of each of them. However, a brief synopsis of many of the projects with general information on populations served and services delivered will be posted to the CFCC Web site.*

Question 9: If one of the legal services projects has an existing relationship with a potential bidder, would applying for this grant be perceived as a conflict of interest?

- *An existing relationship with one of the projects will not automatically disqualify a potential bidder. However, the bidder should disclose the nature of the relationship and the selection committee will review the information and determine potential conflicts on a case-by-case basis. A list of participating projects will be posted to the CFCC Web site so that potential bidders may determine with which (if any) projects they have worked previously.*

Question 10: Section 5.0 (Cost Proposal) states that the terms of the engagement are May 24, 2002- November 30, 2002. Is there any flexibility with these dates?

- *No. The six-month timeline is firm.*

Question 11: What if applicants have additional questions?

- *Additional questions should be e-mailed to Bonnie Hough ([bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov](mailto:bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov)). The questions and answers will then be posted to the CFCC Web site.*

#### **Additional Questions Submitted After the Bidders' Conference**

Question 12: What's been the reporting requirements in the past with respect to program evaluation? What are the requirements today?

- *The funds have only been distributed for three years, so the process hasn't changed much. The general process for submission of reports for Equal Access Funds is set out in the RFP. A copy of the forms that are used by the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission for reporting purposes will be posted on the website. The general approach is to ask for a narrative description of what the impact has been along with substantiating numbers.*

Question 13: How would your Office define "successful" evaluation process?

- *Our office would define a "successful" evaluation process as one in which the programs being evaluated were actively involved in discussing the design, and that utilized the results of the evaluation to enhance services for clients.*

Question 14: What changes would you like to see in the current evaluation process?

- *We would like to see ways to describe the impact of the activities of 102 programs more effectively. We would like to determine additional ways to analyze the*

*programs' success in meeting the objectives of the legislature in allocating these funds.*

Question 15: What have been some of the barriers to successful program evaluation in the past?

- *The AOC has not undertaken this type of program evaluation of legal services programs in the past, so I am unaware of what barriers have been faced.*

Question 16: What's the risk in launching this revised program evaluation process?

- *This is not necessarily a revised program evaluation process. The proposal requests that a consultant review and analyze the material currently provided, determine what other information may be required and develop a plan to ensure that a thoughtful report is provided to the legislature.*

Question 17: What is the level of participant expertise with respect to program evaluation?

- *The level of participant expertise among the legal services programs with respect to program evaluation probably ranges dramatically among the 102 programs. Some programs are more sophisticated than others.*

Question 18: When's the report due to the legislature?

- *The report is due to the legislature on March 1, 2005.*

Question 19: How many organizations are there in the pool?

- *There are 102 legal services organizations funded by the Equal Access Fund.*

Question 20: Would your offices be responsible for handling logistics for meetings?

- *The Administrative Office of the Courts will work with the State Bar's Legal Services Trust Fund Commission staff, the Legal Aid Association of California and the Commission on Access to Justice to handle the logistics for meetings.*

### **Additional Information on the Evaluation**

- The evaluation is not intended to be comparative of individual grants; it should be a synthesis of how the projects are working overall. Further, it should document the progress of the projects toward filling the need of civil legal services.