



**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 2, 2008**

**SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:** REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
EVALUATION OF 2008 CALIFORNIA ON MY HONOR: CIVICS  
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS

**ACTION REQUIRED:** You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (“RFP”):  
  
Project Title: Evaluation of the 2008 California On My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers professional development program for K-12 teachers including the Courts in the Classroom Web site.  
RFP Number: EOP-0308-RB

**DEADLINE:** **Proposals must be received by 1:00 p.m. April 28, 2008**

**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**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**GENERAL INFORMATION** ..... 3

**PURPOSE OF THIS RFP** ..... 4

**RFP SCHEDULE AND GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS** ..... 6

**SCOPE OF SERVICES**..... 7

**SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL**..... 9

**FEE PROPOSAL** ..... 11

**RIGHTS**..... 11

**EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**..... 11

**ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS**..... 11

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS**..... 12

The following documents are incorporated into this Request For Proposals (RFP) by reference:

- Attachment A - Administrative Rules Governing Request For Proposals
- Attachment B - Terms and Conditions
- Attachment C - Technical Proposal
- Attachment D - Fee Proposal
- Attachment E - Contract Exceptions
- Attachment F - Payee Data Record

## 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

### 1.1 Background

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 Background on California On My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers

The judicial branch of California endeavors to increase public understanding of the courts and the role that courts play in a democratic society. Local superior courts, appellate courts, and the state Supreme Court participate in numerous outreach and education programs that bring groups of citizens and students to the courts, and brings judges into the community. The branch also imparts Web site and written information about the courts and provides volunteers and staff for self-help centers in courthouses, in addition to other efforts to engage the public.

Despite the diligent efforts of schools and our courts, scientific research about perceptions of our courts has shown that public knowledge about the judicial branch of government generally, and about our courts in particular, needs improvement. As part of the judicial branch overall approach to improve citizen knowledge, court staff are working in collaboration with California State University San Marcos, College of Education to offer an in-depth training institute for interested California K–12 teachers.

The purposes of this training are for participant teachers to:

- Review the current K–12 curriculum standards related to civics education;
- Increase knowledge of the role of courts and the operations of courts;
- Experience models of existing K–12 court and law-related education programs, including a visit to the local courthouse and meeting with judges;
- Refresh knowledge of principles of effective lesson plan design and impact evaluation;
- Learn about exciting ways to use technology in teaching about civics;
- Prepare unique lesson plans to use in participants' classrooms, tailored to individual classrooms and communities; and
- Report back to institute leaders and participants at a later date after implementation and evaluation of the lesson plan.

2008 marks the third cycle AOC has been involved in this program now known as *California On My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers*. The first institute occurred in the summer of 2006. AOC was asked to provide financial support to a local effort that included San Diego County area K-12 teachers who were taught about California's judicial branch at California State University, San Marcos, in collaboration with the Superior Court of San Diego County, Vista Courthouse. In 2007 AOC funded a statewide pilot of the program, contracting with CSU, San Marcos to plan the expansion of the program and recruitment to teachers statewide, further revise the institute curriculum, and conduct a residential institute. The final follow-up session for those statewide teachers was February 22, 2008.

Plans are in place to contract with CSU to further expand the program to include two residential institutes in the summer of 2008, one in northern California and one in southern California. Each institute will include roughly 25 participant teachers, four teacher leaders, and the program director. The evaluation will be focused around the 2008 institute program and participant teachers and a sub-set of students at the schools in which institute participant teachers work.

### ***Evaluation Component***

A thorough evaluation is important to the further development of this program. An evaluation will allow the AOC to determine to what degree this professional development program for K-12 teachers is meeting its goals, what changes would benefit the program, and if there is substantial enough effectiveness of this programmatic approach to warrant further expansion beyond 2008. Another important aspect of an evaluation is that it has the potential to document sufficient effectiveness to garner outside funding to support this program. Please note that certain groups and/or individuals that would be the subject of the evaluations may not participate in this RFP, including employees and contractors of Cal State San Marcos and any participating teacher of the *California On My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers* program.

## **2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP**

The AOC seeks the services of a consultant with expertise in: 1) evaluation of professional development programs, and 2) assessment of K-12 student learning, with 3) strong knowledge of civics education, with particular emphasis on the judicial branch of government.

The contractor will serve as an independent evaluator(s) to assess the effectiveness of the *California On My Honor: Civics Institute For Teachers* program as a professional development effort. A complimentary component of this program, and one that will also need to be evaluated by the contractor, is the *Courts in the Classroom Web site*. The evaluation of the institute program and the Web site would examine the following topics:

### **Civics Institute**

The overarching evaluation question is the following: *What impact does participating in the institute program have on the knowledge, skills and abilities of participating teachers to teach civics with a judicial emphasis in their classrooms?* The investigation of this question may include but is not limited to the following sub-questions:

- 1) Does participating in the institute increase teachers' level of knowledge of the role and functions of the judicial branch?
- 2) Were participant teachers better able to incorporate civics standards and the judicial branch into their existing curriculum, and if so in which curricular areas?
- 3) Whether the techniques and principles of effective lesson plan design and evaluation were utilized by the teachers attending the institute.
- 4) Did teachers participating in the institute create curriculum that was designed using Bloom's taxonomy to effectively elicit higher order thinking by students about the role and function of the courts?
- 5) Did teachers develop curriculum that actively engaged students and enhanced their understanding of the big idea and essential questions developed for the institute?
- 6) What changes in the institute would further enhance the effectiveness of the program? (These could be but are not limited to: program design, institute lesson content, etc.)

In addition to the above evaluation, the consultant will be asked to assist the AOC in the development of evaluation tools for future institute staff and participants to use in self-assessment.

### **Courts in the Classroom Web site**

For purpose of this component of the evaluation, the successful candidate will be asked to evaluate teacher understanding and student learning from one of the programs introduced at the institute: *Courts in the Classroom Web site*. The site is located at:  
<http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/lre2/CourtsLRE/index.html>.

Questions to be considered in this evaluation include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Do students working independently with the site understand more about the role and functions of the judicial branch than students not using the site?
- 2) Is there an increase in students' understanding of the role and functions of the judicial branch when the site is used in conjunction with teacher lesson plans?
- 3) Were teachers able to effectively incorporate use of the site into their curriculum?

### 3.0 RFP SCHEDULE AND GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 3.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events from RFP issuance through notice of contract award. All key dates are subject to change at the AOC's discretion.

<b>EVENT</b>	<b>Key Dates</b>
Issue RFP	April 2, 2008
Deadline for Proposer Requests for Clarifications or Modifications	April 9, 2008
AOC Posts Clarification / Modification Response (estimated)	April 16, 2008
Proposal Due Date and Time	1:00 p.m. April 28, 2008
Notice of Intent to Award (estimated)	May 12, 2008
Execution of Contract (estimated)	May 25, 2008.

- 3.2 The RFP and any addenda that may be issued will be available on the following website:

<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/> ("Courtinfo website")

- 3.3 Proposal Submittal Address:

Nadine McFadden  
RFP# EOP-0308-RB  
Judicial Council of California  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

- 3.4 Request for Clarifications or Modifications

- 3.4.1 Vendors interested in responding to the solicitation may submit questions by e-mail only on procedural matters related to the RFP or requests for clarification or modification of this solicitation document, including questions regarding the Terms and Conditions in Attachment B, to the Solicitations mailbox referenced below. If the vendor is requesting a

change, the request must set forth the recommended change and the vendor's reasons for proposing the change.

**Solicitations mailbox:** [solicitations@jud.ca.gov](mailto:solicitations@jud.ca.gov)

- 3.4.2 All questions and requests must be submitted by email to the Solicitations mailbox no later than the date specified in Section 3.1, RFP Schedule and General Instructions. Questions or requests submitted after the due date will not be answered.
- 3.4.3 All email submissions sent to the Solicitations mailbox **MUST** contain the RFP number and other appropriate identifying information in the email subject line. In the body of the e-mail, always include paragraph numbers whenever references are made to content of this RFP. Failure to include the RFP number as well as other sufficient identifying information in the email subject line may result in the AOC taking no action on a vendor's email submission.
- 3.4.4 Without disclosing the source of the question or request, the AOC Contracting Officer will post a copy of the questions and the AOC's responses on the Courtinfo website.
- 3.4.5 If a vendor's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the vendor may submit the question in writing, conspicuously marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive. If the AOC concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence. If the AOC does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the vendor will be notified.

#### **4.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES**

- 4.1** Services are expected to be performed by the consultant between May, 2008 and June 30, 2009.
- 4.2** The following paragraphs 4.3 through 4.7.4 are specific tasks and deliverables the contractor must perform to complete this project.
- 4.3** The consultant will design a protocol for evaluating the *California On My Honor: Civics Institute for Teachers* and the *Courts in the Classroom Web site* (a sub-component of the overall evaluation), conduct the evaluation, and submit a written

report on the findings. In addition, the consultant will submit self-assessment evaluation tools for future use by the sponsoring agency, staff and participants of the institute, and conduct presentations on the findings.

#### **4.4 Initial Planning For Both Institute and Courts in the Classroom Web site**

- 4.4.1 Meet with project sponsors and program directors
- 4.4.2 Train consultants on program elements to include institute and Web site content

#### **4.5 Assessing impact of civics institute participation on teachers**

- 4.5.1 Design and implement pre-and post-institute phone interview questionnaire with institute participants.
- 4.5.2 Design and implement civics institute observation rubrics, includes attending to observe and record at institute sessions: #1 San Marcos, CA in San Diego County, June 30-July 3, 2008; #2 San Francisco, July 8-July 11, 2008; #3 Institute Follow-Up Session, 1 Day (assume Northern and Southern institutes do 1 joint follow-up), location to be determined.
- 4.5.3 Design and implement post-institute teacher classroom observation rubric, approximately 15 teachers in fall 2008-spring 2009 (Selection of teachers must include at least 6 of whom have used Courts in the Classroom Web site as part of their institute developed lesson plan).
- 4.5.4 Conduct analysis and prepare reports on formative and summative evaluation elements.
- 4.5.5 Assist in development of self-evaluation tools for future use by agency.
- 4.5.6 Prepare and conduct presentations on evaluation of institute as requested.

#### **4.6 Measuring impact of Courts in the Classroom Web site on teachers**

- 4.6.1 Develop protocol for evaluating teacher's ability to incorporate site information into civics or other subject matter lesson plans.
- 4.6.2 Develop protocol for evaluating degree to which teachers found the site a useful tool for their own reference.
- 4.6.3 Implement protocols.
- 4.6.4 Analysis and report.



#### **4.7 Courts in the Classroom Web site student knowledge acquisition assessment**

**4.7.1** From the pool of teachers who participated in the 2008 civics institute, identify two school sites in which to conduct an evaluation of students. Evaluation design should be robust and likely will involve at least 120 students (60 student participants from each school). This portion of the study is limited to grades 8-12.

**4.7.2** Develop protocol for assessing student knowledge acquisition through pre and post tests of these two group:

**4.7.2.1 Students Receiving Class Instruction Incorporating the Web site:** assessment of student knowledge of a selected subject area featured on the Courts in the Classroom Web site after a class instruction in which the teacher used the site as part of the lesson plan. (These will be teachers who participated in the civics institute who developed curriculum incorporating the site.)

**4.7.2.2 Students Independently Studying the Web site:** assessment of student knowledge of a selected subject area (module) featured on the Courts in the Classroom Web site after the student has independently gone through the module featured on the site. These students will be given the Web site address and access to a specific subject matter area, and instructed to study that section by themselves. (In contrast to group (a) above, this group will not have the benefit of instruction by a teacher who incorporated site content into a lesson plan.)

**4.7.3** Implement protocols

**4.7.4** Analysis and Report

#### **5.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL**

5.1 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.

5.2 Proposals shall be submitted in the following manner:

- One printed and signed hard copy
- Three copies of the printed and signed hard copy. The printed hard copies of the Proposal must be signed by a representative of the

company, including name, title, address, e-mail address, and telephone number of one individual who is the company's designated representative.

- One CD containing all proposal files.

5.3 Bidders must complete and submit the following documents in its proposal:

- Attachment C – Technical Proposal
- Attachment D – Fee Proposal
- Attachment E – Contract Exceptions, and
- Attachment F – Payee Data Record

5.4 The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal:

- 5.4.1 Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and federal tax identification number. Note that if a sole proprietorship using its social security number is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.
- 5.4.2 Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
- 5.4.3 Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project.
- 5.4.4 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of five (5) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.
- 5.4.5 Overall plan with time estimates for completion of all work required.
- 5.4.6 Method to complete the evaluation project, including:
  - 5.4.6.1 A description of methodologies to be used for testing the program.
  - 5.4.6.2 A description of the methodologies to be used for testing curriculum effectiveness.
  - 5.4.6.3 Data collection methods.
- 5.4.7 Project team organization, which should include resumes of the team members and full description of each members role and responsibilities in the evaluation. Include description of prior experience in obtaining human test subjects authorization for students and teachers.

5.5 Failure of the proposer to comply with the requirements set forth in this Section may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive to the RFP and being rejected.

## **6.0 FEE PROPOSAL**

6.1 The estimated range for this project is between \$80,000 and \$100,000, inclusive of any travel and allowable expenses. Pricing shall be proposed as firm fixed pricing per deliverable with a not-to-exceed ceiling amount for the project. Using Attachment D, Fee Proposal, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the services for each deliverable.

6.2 The method of payment to the consultant will be by cost reimbursement

## **7.0 RIGHTS**

Proposers awarded a contract will have no ownership right in any of the forms produced or revised under the requirements of the contract contemplated by this RFP and the proposer cannot copyright them. The AOC reserves the right to develop and make available for public use all translated forms, documents, and text at no cost to the public.

## **8.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria, in order of descending priority:

- a. Quality of work plan submitted
- b. Experience on similar assignments
- c. Reasonableness of cost projections
- d. Credentials of staff to be assigned to the project
- e. Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project
- f. Reference checks

## **9.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

9.1 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.

**10.0 ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS**

- 10.1 Incorporated in this RFP, and attached as Attachment A, is a document entitled “Administrative Rules Governing Requests for Proposals. Bidders shall follow these rules in preparation of their proposals.
- 10.2 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. Generally, the terms of the contract will include, but are not limited to the terms and conditions in Attachment B of this RFP