

RFP No. OCR-01-05,
Inventory and Assessment of Performance-related Work at the AOC and the California Trial Courts
Questions and Answers

Question #1. In reference to RFP item #2.2: How do you define performance-related projects? Please provide some examples. We understand the general concept and usage here, but greater specificity would allow us to tailor a winning solution from the outset.

Answer #1. We would like to define performance-related projects as broadly as possible to capture a variety of projects with some that specifically involve performance standards (e.g., Evaluating Performance Standards in Conservatorship Case Processing), and other projects that have a goal of improving court performance or operation (e.g., Developing Effective Practices in Criminal Caseflow Management).

There are two broad areas where courts and the AOC are seeking improvement in performance. The first relates to improved *efficiency* in court operations defined as providing court services at the lowest possible cost. The second relates to *effectiveness* in court operations. Effectiveness is somewhat more difficult to define because it relates not only to providing the highest quality service to the public but also to trial court compliance with statutory, procedural, and constitutional requirements.

Question #2. In reference to RFP item #2.2: Approximately how many performance-related projects will be included in the analysis?

Answer #2. We do not know but this will be part of the inventory process, as set forth in RFP item #3.0, provided by the proposer awarded the contract resulting from this RFP (“the contractor”).

Question #3. In reference to RFP item #3.2.2.1: Will the AOC give the contractor a list of all performance-related projects to be included in the analysis?

Answer #3. This will be part of the inventory process.

Question #4. In reference to RFP item #3.2.2.2 and RFP item #3.2.3.1: How many AOC staff will need to be interviewed? Also, in reference to RFP item #3.2.3.2: How many trial court researchers, analysts and managers will need to be interviewed?

Answer #4. This will depend on the number of projects, but we anticipate that it would involve between 5 and 10 interview sessions with AOC staff and a similar number of sessions with trial court researchers, analysts and managers..

Question #5. In reference to RFP item #3.2.2.3 and RFP item #3.2.3.4: Are the exit interviews described in these two subtasks expected to be formal presentations?

Answer #5. No, the exit interviews will be conducted in a discussion format where the contractor will summarize the work performed within the phase and be able to get any additional information necessary to complete the work.

RFP No. OCR-01-05,
Inventory and Assessment of Performance-related Work at the AOC and the California Trial Courts
Questions and Answers

Question #6. In reference to RFP item #3.2.3.3: How many site visits to trial courts do you expect the contractor to make?

Answer #6. This will depend in part on the number of projects, but it will be a manageable number to fit within any budget constraints. There could be an opportunity to meet with some trial court staff from different courts in a single, central location (such as the AOC or one of the two Regional Offices).

Question #7. In reference to RFP item #3.2.3.5: Could the inventory be provided as an addition to the Serranus database?

Answer #7. Yes, that is possible, given that the inventory would be an internal resource for AOC and trial court staff.

Question #8. In reference to RFP item #3.2.4.5: What is meant by "areas that are not being addressed"? How does this relate to priority issues defined in the AOC's strategic plan?

Answer #8. Part of the assessment would identify areas that the contractor believes the AOC or the trial courts should be conducting additional work. These areas could relate to the issues defined in the Strategic Plan, though this is not required.

Question #9. In reference to RFP item #3.2.4.6: What process do you contemplate for the development of the strategic plan described in this subtask?

Answer #9. This could be a series of recommendations that identify areas where the AOC and the trial courts should collaborate on similar performance-related projects, or the AOC should focus additional work based on the gap analysis.

Question #10. What is the approximate and scope and level of effort that you envision for this project to meet your success criteria?

Answer #10. This should be specified at a high level in the proposal, and will be finalized during the Project Planning Phase. Scope and level of effort will depend in large part on the first level inventory of the number of projects currently underway in the courts and at the AOC.

Question #11. What are the basic success criteria for this assessment?

Answer #11. This should be specified at a high level in the proposal, and will be finalized during the Project Planning Phase. Thoroughness of analysis both in terms of capturing the entire universe of performance related projects as well as identifying gaps between current work and work that the AOC and trial courts should be focused on.

RFP No. OCR-01-05,
Inventory and Assessment of Performance-related Work at the AOC and the California Trial Courts
Questions and Answers

Question #12. Who (responsible organization/individual) develops the success criteria?

Answer #12. This should be specified at a high level in the proposal, and will be finalized during the Project Planning Phase. The success criteria for the project deliverables are broadly defined in paragraph 7, Acceptance of the Work, in Exhibit TBD, Special Provisions of Attachment B, Contract Terms.

Question #13. After the assessment stage of this project, will there likely be follow on process improvement and/or other performance related sub-projects?

Answer #13. Unknown, though the work defined in this RFP is part of a larger effort by OCR to contrast the court system with other public and private organizations in their usage of performance measurements as a tool for accountability, quality assurance, and organizational improvement.

Question #14. What is the approximate size of the organization to be assessed in terms of the number of potential interviews. Will the work occur primarily in one geographic area/location (where?) or at multiple sites?

Answer #14. This will depend on the number of projects, but it will be a manageable number to fit within any budget constraints. The AOC is centrally located in San Francisco, but the trial courts are spread out among the 58 counties. However there could be an opportunity to meet with some trial court staff from different courts in a single, central location (such as the AOC or one of the two Regional Offices).

Question #15. What is the approximate organizational level or mix of levels of potential interviewees (individual contributors, middle management, senior management)?

Answer #15. It will most likely be senior management though a group interview with a variety of project staff is also possible.

Question #16. Do you see the assessment as being primarily quantitatively or qualitatively based in terms of data acquisition and analysis?

Answer #16. It will most likely be primarily qualitative though we are open to any reasonable approach.

Question #17. Is there an incumbent?

Answer #17. No, there is no incumbent.

Question #18. If there is an incumbent, who is the incumbent, and what contract are they working under?

RFP No. OCR-01-05,
Inventory and Assessment of Performance-related Work at the AOC and the California Trial Courts
Questions and Answers

Answer #18. Not applicable. See Answer #17.

Question #19. Is there another consultant performing similar work for the State of California, or the California Trial Courts in particular?

Answer #19. We are not aware of another consultant performing similar work for the State of California or the California Trial Courts.

Question #20. Does the OCR currently have any consultants conducting performance measurement or similar projects?

Answer #20. The AOC uses a variety of consultants for projects such as these.

Question #21. If there are consultants performing this work, what are the contract numbers?

Answer #21. Such information should be requested under an entirely separate process from this solicitation process. Please contact James Carroll, Manager of the Office of Communications at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), for requests of information disclosable to the public. Mr. Carroll's direct line is 415-865-7451. Please note, however, there would be no guarantee that a response to such a request would precede the due date for proposals for this solicitation.

Question #22. If this work was performed in the past, what are the contract numbers?

Answer #22. Please refer to Answer #21.

Question #23. The time period and estimated costs may not match a proposed process. Is the RFP written to provide a Period of Performance and ceiling that allows for an expanded scope of work?

Answer #23. We expect that all of work, costs and the timeframe will fit within the specifications defined in the RFP.

Question #24. While the phases proposed is an accepted practice for conducting organizational assessments, will a process that a firm has utilized in the past that incorporates four phases and similar deliverables be accepted?

Answer #24. As long as the project work, including the phases and deliverables, as identified in RFP item #3.0, is completed to the satisfaction of the project manager (see paragraph 7, Attachment B of the RFP); provide sufficient detail in the proposal to ensure that this proposed process will meet our project objectives.

RFP No. OCR-01-05,
Inventory and Assessment of Performance-related Work at the AOC and the California Trial Courts
Questions and Answers

Question #25. The RFP references a meeting with OCR staff to review the process and propose changes. Does the OCR have specific steps that must be accomplished that can be incorporated into a proposal prior to submission?

Answer #25. There needs to be sufficient detail in the proposal to evaluate the approach and methodology proposed by the contractor. The first phase of the project will allow for a more thorough discussion of the proposed approach and methodology, and we anticipate that there could be some changes based on this phase.

Question #26. Who are the key stakeholders, products/services delivered, customer organizations, and service/product providers?

Answer #26. The Office of Court Research, the AOC's Executive Office, the Judicial Council, and the California trial court administrators.

Question #27. What are the key high priority areas for improvement?

Answer #27. We are relying upon the contractor to assist OCR in defining these areas as part of the assessment process.

Question #28. Do individual and section performance standards currently exist for the areas that will be assessed/inventoried?

Answer #28. No

Question #29. In reference to RFP item #3.1: This section specifies the period of performance from June 15, 2006 through September 30, 2007. A) Can you confirm the 15-month period of performance? B) Does the AOC expect the four required phases will take 15 months to complete?

Answer #29. Per Addendum No. 2, the period of performance during which the work is to be completed has been changed to June 15, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

Question #30. In reference to RFP item #3.2.1.2: The AOC desires a systematic approach for organizing and cataloguing performance-related projects at the AOC and the California trial courts. Can you provide an estimate of the current number of performance-related projects within the AOC and California trial courts?

Answer #30. Please refer to Answer #2.

Question #31. In reference to RFP item #3.2.2.2: Developing the inventory will require a series of informal interviews with AOC staff in a number of target groups. A) Can you provide a general estimate of the number of target groups who would need to participate in the interview process? B) Are the members of the target groups centrally located?

RFP No. OCR-01-05,
Inventory and Assessment of Performance-related Work at the AOC and the California Trial Courts
Questions and Answers

Answer #31. This will depend on the number of projects, but it will be a manageable number to fit within any budget constraints. The target groups will be from different courts across the state, but there could be an opportunity to meet with some trial court staff from different courts in a single, central location (such as the AOC or one of the two Regional Offices).

Question #32. In reference to RFP item #7.1.2: “The total cost for the consultant services are expected to be between \$75,000 and \$90,000 inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead rates, and profit.” A) Is the budgetary estimate of \$75,000 - \$90,000 inclusive of all four phases or per deliverable? B) Does this budget cover a 15-month project period? C) Does the budgetary estimate include travel costs associated with baseline work in the San Francisco/Sacramento area and site visits to trial courts?

Answer #32. The estimated budgetary range, set forth in RFP item #7.1.2, is inclusive of all four phases including all deliverables, as set forth in RFP item #3.0, covering a possible 12-month project period, as revised per Addendum No. 2, but is exclusive of estimated travel expenses, as addressed in RFP item #7.1.1. The AOC will encumber funds for travel related expenses in the resulting contract, and payment of such expenses will be made in accordance with paragraph 3, Compensation for Allowable Expenses, as set forth in Exhibit TBD, Payment Provisions, of Exhibit B, Contract Terms.