



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7739 • Fax 415-865-7217 • 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 PROPOSERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Center for Families, Children & the Courts Division

DATE: November 19, 2007

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, seeks to recruit and train courts to participate in drug court cost study; develop concept paper to expand DUI court projects; and support the development and review of "How to Manual" for Implementing the Real DUI Court in Schools Program."

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (RFP), as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>:

Project Title: CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE JUSTICE COURT RECRUITMENT,
TRAINING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

RFP Number: CFCC 070510 CJP-LM

QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to solicitations@jud.ca.gov by **Wednesday, November 21, 2007, no later than 1 p.m. (PST).**

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
Proposals must be received by **Thursday, November 29, 2007, no later than 1 p.m. (PST).**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. CFCC 070510 CJP-LM
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 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.

1.2 THE CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

1.2.1 The Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), a division of the AOC, provides a range of services to Courts in California, including research and technical assistance for juvenile and family Courts, collaborative justice Courts, cases involving self-represented litigants, and cases involving family violence.

1.2.2 The Collaborative Justice Program (CJP) is one of the units within the CFCC, a division of the AOC. CFCC is dedicated to improving the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, youth, families, and self-represented litigants in the California courts. CJP staff is responsible for providing support to the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee (CJCAC). The CJCAC is responsible for monitoring and recommending improvements to California's collaborative justice or treatment courts through advisory duties to the Judicial Council.

1.3 COLLABORATIVE JUSTICE PROJECTS

1.3.1 This RFP encompasses two AOC Collaborative Justice Projects: The California Drug Court Cost Analysis Project and the Real DUI Court in School Program. The AOC is seeking a consultant with experience with the Drug Court Cost Study to recruit courts to participate and train them on using the tool. Additionally, the consultant will write a concept paper to expand projects related to Collaborative Justice DUI courts and DUI prevention programs and will support the development and review of the How to Manual for Implementing the Real DUI Court in Schools Program.

1.3.1.1 California Drug Court Cost Study Project

The AOC contracted with NPC Research, Inc. to conduct a statewide cost benefit study of adult drug courts. The study is being conducted in three phases. Phase I consisted of an in-depth cost analysis of three case study courts and developed the methodology for conducting the statewide study. Phase II applied and tested the methodology in six additional courts and resulted in the development of a drug court cost self evaluation tool that is being tested and launched statewide in the third phase of the project, currently underway.

Nine pilot sites were chosen to participate in the first two phases of the project. These sites were used to test the cost study methodology and generate preliminary results on the effectiveness of drug courts. Phase III of the project involves recruiting and training approximately 40 drug courts on the self evaluation tool.

1.3.1.2 Real DUI Court in Schools Program

In fall 2006, the Judicial Council of California, AOC received a grant from the California Governor's Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) to implement the Real DUI Courts in Schools project. Under this grant project, there are three project program models (described below) being made available to California superior courts for development and implementation.

The consultant will review for coherence a section from a "How to Implement the DUI Court in Schools" project manual that deals with three programs (real DUI proceedings, sentencing, and Courage to Live). Using resources provided, the consultant will consolidate and write a description of the effects of alcohol on the brain and body and make revisions to the manual as necessary.

1.3.1.2.1 Real DUI Court in Schools Sentencing Program

This model combines a real DUI sentencing hearing with the judicial outreach and education model described below to emphasize to students the short- and long-term consequences of driving under the influence. The sentencing portion is an actual courtroom set up at the school site where actual DUI cases involving young adults are adjudicated. This provides realistic information to better help students form opinions of driving under the influence. In addition to the question and answer period at the conclusion of the sentencing portion, the judicial officer addresses the students directly, highlighting the consequences of driving under the influence.

1.3.1.2.2 *Real DUI Court in Schools Trial Program*

This model involves a full, live young adult DUI trial. An actual courtroom is set up at a middle school or high school, complete with judicial officer, bailiff, defendant, attorneys, witnesses, a “jury” made up of students, and other appropriate court staff. At the completion of the trial, students are allowed to ask questions of everyone present regarding the case. In addition, judicial officers have an opportunity to engage the students and speak personally to them about the consequences of DUI.

1.3.1.2.3 *Courage to Live Program*

This judicial outreach and education model is run and facilitated by a superior court judge and includes appropriate court staff and guest speakers. Emphasis is placed on the lively presentation of information and materials specific to teen driving and driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. In this model, various multimedia tools, including PowerPoint presentations, are used to communicate to students the effects of alcohol on the body and to aid in effective interactive learning. In addition, dynamic speakers bring real-life courtroom experiences to teach teens about the potentially tragic consequences of driving under the influence.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

- 2.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events from the time of the issuance of this RFP through the intent to award contract. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	KEY DATE
RFP issued to http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/ :	Friday November 19, 2007
Deadline for questions to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	Wednesday November 21, 2007 No later than 1 p.m.
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	Thursday November 29, 2007 No later than 1 p.m.
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 30, 2007 and December 3 and 4
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	Friday, December 7, 2007
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	Friday December 21, 2007

3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

- 3.1 The AOC seeks for the services of a consultant of high professional repute with expertise in recruiting and training courts and writing grants. The trainer should have experience with drug courts, with the California Drug Court Cost Study, with writing and implementing training curricula and with grant research and writing.
- 3.1.1. The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to secure a contract for the services of a consultant of high professional repute with expertise in recruiting and training courts and writing grants. The trainer should have experience with drug courts, with the California Drug Court Cost Study, with writing and implementing training curricula and with grant research and writing.
- 3.1.2 The Contractor will be responsible for the following:
- 3.1.2.1 Recruit adult drug courts to participate in the drug court cost study;
 - 3.1.2.2 Train recruited courts on using the drug court self evaluation tool;
 - 3.1.2.3 Research potential grants and write a concept paper to assist in the expansion of the DUI prevention programs;
 - 3.1.2.4 Review for coherence the “How to Implement the DUI Court in Schools” project manual;

- 3.1.2.5 Write a description of the effects of alcohol on the brain and body;
- 3.1.2.6 Develop supplemental resources and materials to be used by middle and high school teachers on the effects of alcohol and other drugs; and
- 3.1.2.7 Make revisions to the manual.

4.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

4.1 Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:

- 4.1.1 Attachment 1 - Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in *Attachment 1, in preparation and submittal of their proposals.*
- 4.1.2 Attachment 2 - Contract Terms. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as *Attachment 2 - Contract Terms* and include: *Exhibits A through E.*
- 4.1.3 Attachment 3 - Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Contract Terms, as set forth in *Attachment 2 - Contract Terms*, or clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in this *Attachment 3.*
 - 4.1.3.1 If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of *Attachment 2 - Contract Terms*, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.
- 4.1.4 Attachment 4 - Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each vendor prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, vendor's proposal must include a completed and signed *Payee Data Record Form, set forth as Attachment 4.*

5.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- 5.1 Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria, in order of descending priority:
 - 5.1.1 Quality of work plan submitted.
 - 5.1.2 Experiences on similar assignments, particularly those involving drug court cost studies, court operations and programs, and grant writing.

- 5.1.3 Reasonableness of cost projections.
- 5.1.4 Credentials of staff to be assigned to the Project.
- 5.1.5 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the Project.

6.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

- 6.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content
- 6.2 The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal:
 - 6.2.1 Quality of work plan submitted.
 - 6.2.1.1 Method to complete the Project.
 - 6.2.1.1.1 Proposed recruitment strategy that will be employed to recruit 35-40 drug courts using the Drug Court Cost Self Evaluation Tool (DC-CSET). Include venues that will be used to advertise project and methods that be used to encourage court participation.
 - 6.2.1.1.2 Proposed training and development plan. Include methods that will be employed to develop training as well as potential venues to conduct training sessions for 35-40 drug courts.
 - 6.2.1.2 Contact information. Provide proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers.
 - 6.2.1.3 Tax recording information. Complete and submit *Attachment 4 - Payee Data Record Form*. Note that if an individual or sole proprietorship, using a social security number for tax recording purposes, is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.
 - 6.2.1.4 Compliance with Contract Terms. Complete and submit *Attachment 3 - Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms*. If changes to *Attachment 3* are proposed, then also submit red-lined version of *Attachment 3- Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms* as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.

6.2.2 Experiences on similar assignments.

6.2.2.1 Provide the names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of two (2) clients for whom the proposer has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer.

6.2.2.2 Proposer has demonstrated experience with cost benefit studies of adult drug court and curriculum development.

6.2.2.3 References are provided for similar types of prior work, including training and curriculum writing and development, including manuals.

6.2.2.4 Proposer has experience with Court operations and programs.

6.2.2.5 Proposer has experience with grant writing.

6.2.3 Reasonableness of cost projections. See below, *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal*.

6.2.4 Credentials of staff to be assigned to the Project. Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project. Provide professional qualifications and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities. Submit hardcopy of key staff's information in proposal as well as electronically. (*See RFP: 8.0 Submissions of Proposals*)

6.2.5 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the Project. Overall plan with time estimates for completion of all work required.

7.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE COST PROPOSAL

7.1 The following information shall be included as the cost portion of the proposal:

7.1.1 Reasonableness of Cost Projections.

7.1.1.1 As a separate document, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the services for each of the six Deliverables specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed*. This budget should identify unique hourly rates, titles, and responsibilities for each "Key Personnel," but can group this information for other personnel in a more general manner. Staff rates

should be fully burdened, including indirect costs, overhead and profit. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled "Budget Justification."

- 7.1.1.2 The total cost for consultant services will range between ***\$50,000.00*** -***\$60,000.00***, inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead rates, travel and profit. The method of payment to the consultant will be by cost reimbursement for each of the four deliverables specified in *Attachment 2 Contract Terms, Exhibit D - Work to be Performed.*

8.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 8.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in items *RFP: 6.0 Specifics of a Responsive Technical Proposal* and *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal*, above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 8.2 Proposers will submit ***one (1) original and three (3) copies*** of the technical proposal and cost proposal signed by an authorized representative of the proposer, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 8.3 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP.
- 8.4 Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.
- 8.5 In addition to submittal of the original and three copies of the proposals, as set forth in item 8.2, above, ***proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM.***

9.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

10.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

It may be necessary to interview prospective service providers to clarify aspects of their submittal.

If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted by telephone conference call. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

11.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

The Administrative Office of the Courts policy is to follow the intent of the California Public Records Act (PRA). If a vendor's proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under the PRA, the material will be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a vendor is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then it should not include such information in its proposal.