

## RFP # EOP-200905-CT

### Assessment of Juror Utilization in the Superior Courts of California

#### Questions and Answers

1) **Question:** The RFP indicates that the assessment of juror utilization will be conducted on 6-8 superior courts (RFP Section 2.2). Have courts already been selected to participate in the assessment? If so, which courts? If not, what are the criteria for participation?

**Answer:** Although not confirmed, the pilot courts that may be included in the study are as follows: Fresno, Los Angeles, Napa, Riverside, Shasta, Siskiyou, and Stanislaus. At this time, these courts are looking to implement panel size reductions in a couple departments within their court for a period of time. Therefore, we would like to include these courts in the study. If for some reason we do not use these courts, the selection criteria would be to include a representative sample of courts: Each region represented (Northern/Central, Bay Area/Northern Coastal, Southern), a selection of different size courts, urban/suburban/rural, etc.

2) **Question:** The RFP specifies that the Contractor will be required to develop metrics to create a baseline measurement (RFP Section 2.4). Does the AOC intend the Contractor to develop new metrics of juror utilization? Or to employ existing, commonly recognized metrics of juror utilization such as % jurors cancelled, % juror to voir dire, % panel used, etc. to create the baseline measurement?

**Answer:** No new metrics of juror utilization will need to be developed. We expect existing metrics of juror utilization will be employed to create the baseline measurement.

3) **Question:** To what extent will AOC staff participate in the site visits (RFP Section 3.2.3) and focus groups (RFP Section 3.2.4)?

**Answer:** AOC staff will participate in site visits and be available for focus group sessions, however, the contractor will be expected to conduct focus group sessions.

4) **Question:** No Deliverable No. 7 is listed in the RFP; the list skips from Deliverable No. 6 to Deliverable No. 8. Can we assume that this a typographical error? Or was another deliverable omitted from the RFP. If so, please describe.

**Answer:** This is a typographical error. There are a total of 10 Deliverables.

## RFP # EOP-200905-CT

### Assessment of Juror Utilization in the Superior Courts of California

#### Questions and Answers

5) **Question:** The RFP deliverables appear to be geared to three general objectives: (1) formal assessment of juror utilization in the participating sites; (2) technical assistance to the participating courts to implement improvement plans; and (3) development of information and educational materials for all superior courts. Please verify if this impression of the project objectives is correct and, if so, please rank the importance of these objectives.

**Answer:** Yes, these are the general objectives. They should be ranked in the following manner: (1) formal assessment of juror utilization in the participating sites; (2) development of information and educational materials for all superior courts; (3) technical assistance to the participating courts to implement improvement plans.

6) **Question:** Deliverable No.6 (RFP Section 3.2.6) specifies that the best practices materials should include ... “sample admonitions” and “speeches for judges to use in the courtroom.” Juror utilization focuses on the extent to which jurors are used (that is, sent to a courtroom and questioned, challenged, excused, or impaneled) after reporting to the courthouse, but does not usually require an action by jurors or communication with jurors. Please explain or give an example of the type of message that would be communicated to prospective jurors in an admonition or speech.

**Answer:** To the extent that these materials can play a role in communications with prospective jurors (orientation to the process or supplemental instructions) or to the extent that the study touches on voir dire practices, they should be included.

7) **Question:** What is the purpose of the focus groups described in Deliverable No. 5 (RFP Section 3.2.5)? Are these intended to elicit information about challenges and/or unexpected benefits encountered in the implementation of panel reduction efforts? Are they meant to inform the development of the best practices materials? Will the written findings be primarily for the benefit of the courts participating in the study or should they be geared as information to assist other courts than might undertake similar efforts?

**Answer:** Yes, the focus group sessions are to gather information (challenges/benefits) from those courts participating in panel reduction efforts. This information is expected to be used to inform the best practices materials. The focus groups may provide information on specific issues that may need to be addressed in the materials as well as what worked for specific courts and what did not. The materials are meant to be a statewide tool to assist other courts who would like to implement similar efforts to improve juror utilization (including panel size reduction).

RFP # EOP-200905-CT

Assessment of Juror Utilization in the Superior Courts of California

Questions and Answers

8) **Question:** How will the 6-8 courts mentioned in section 3.2 be selected? Is it known in advance which courts will be used, and if so, can we find out which courts will be used so we can estimate travel costs?

**Answer:** See answer to Question No. 1.

9) **Question:** How many focus groups are to be conducted (3.2.5) and where are they to be held? Would it be possible to conduct these focus groups in the course of conducting site visits (3.2.3) in order to streamline work and conserve budget?

**Answer:** The thought was to conduct a single focus group (no more than 2) to be held at one of the AOCs regional offices with those judges/courts that participated in the panel reduction efforts. We wanted to conduct the focus group after enough time had passed to be able to gather information about how it went. However, for the reasons identified, it may be possible to hold the focus group sessions at the time of site visits if a plan can be proposed where both events can produce useful information.

10) **Question:** Section 5.2.6.2.4 of "Proposed data collection methods and methodology" indicates that vendors will be evaluated on "proposed methods for outreach to, discussion with, and recording of the impressions of possible potential jurors." However, there does not appear to be any specification for this task in the SCOPE of SERVICES. What is the intent of this specification? Is there an expectation that the vendor will conduct data collection with jurors and potential jurors as a part of the study?

**Answer:** Section 5.2.6.2.4 has been deleted. The vendor will not be expected to conduct data collection with jurors or potential jurors as part of this study.

*End of Questions and Answers*