



Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7960 • Fax 415-865-4325 • 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 BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Finance Division

DATE: April 16, 2008

**SUBJECT/PURPOSE
OF MEMO:** ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS REGARDING REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Project Title: Evaluation of 2008 California On My Honor:
Civics Institute for Teachers

RFP # EOP-0308-RB

**PROPOSAL DUE
DATE:** Proposals must be received by no later than **1:00 p.m. on April 28, 2008**
See Section 3.1 of the RFP for additional key dates.

**SUBMISSION OF
PROPOSAL:** Proposals must be sent to:

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP# EOP-0308-RB
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

**FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION:** E-MAIL:
Solicitations@jud.ca.gov

1. Regarding subparagraph 4.7.2.2., students independently studying the Web site: What is the evaluator's responsibility in identifying the students who will be independently going through the module featured on the site?

Answer: It will be the responsibility of the evaluator to work with the school's administration to identify students to work with the Web site independently. Furthermore, it will be the responsibility of the evaluator to design and implement a full informed consent process. With that said, keep in mind that the evaluator will be selecting a school from a limited universe of possibilities. There are anticipated to be 50 total teachers participating in the 2008 institute, 25 at the northern institute, 25 at the southern institute. Each of the 50 teachers will have the option to use or not use the Courts in the Classroom Web site as part of their institute developed lesson plan. Only those schools at which teachers participating at the 2008 institute teach at in the 2008-2009 school year will be eligible as a school site. Furthermore, the school will only be eligible if that school's teacher who attended the institute chose to use the Courts in the Classroom Web site as part of their institute developed lesson plan. Because of this connection to the 2008 California On My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers, the evaluator will have an avenue into the school. Also, it would be perfectly acceptable for the evaluator to work exclusively with their teacher subject, in that, several of the teachers will likely teach more than one class period of the same subject and grade level. It might be arranged that one class period taught by the subject teacher can be used for the independent user evaluation, and another class period of that same teacher can receive the teacher's full lesson plan. Or, it may be necessary to use a classroom of a different teacher at the same school which is closely comparable.

2. Will the evaluator be expected to identify schools, classrooms, and students who will be involved in this phase of the work plan?

Answer: Yes, but see answer to the above question.

3. We would appreciate clarification of this point and how you envision activities related to this subparagraph to proceed and the evaluator's responsibility.

Answer: With regard to how we envision activities to proceed, see RFP page 5, and RFP page 9 sections 4.7, 4.7.1, 4.7.2, 4.7.2.1, and 4.7.2.2.

To give an example of how one might approach it: if the subject teacher elects to do a lesson plan on the *What is Due Process* module of the Web site, the evaluation might begin with a prepared test on the subject material in the *What is Due Process* module of the Web site. (The evaluator would need to prepare the test and rating scale.) A day or two later, the subject teacher (with evaluator) would take this class to the computer lab

and have the students work through the *What is Due Process* module of the Web site. The next day, the teacher (with evaluator) would then retest. In addition, the evaluator might interview the students since testing does not always reflect what students actually learn. (The evaluator would need to prepare interview questions, conduct the interviews, record results, etc. all in conformity with informed consent.) The results of this would then be compared to how well students do in the same measurements when the *What is Due Process* module is part of a lesson plan-that is, when the/a teacher mediates the content of the Web site.