



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – Questions & Answers

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
(AOC)**

RFP Title:
**EVALUATION OF PILOT PROJECTS UNDER THE
SARGENT SHRIVER CIVIL COUNSEL ACT**

RFP Number:
CFCC 10-11-LM

**PROPOSALS DUE:
FEBRUARY 24, 2012, AT CLOSE OF BUSINESS (PST).**

**CONSOLIDATED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
(QUESTIONS SUBMITTED DURING PRE-PROPOSAL DIAL-IN CONFERENCE OF
JANUARY 25, 2012 AND QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SOLICITATIONS' MAILBOX
BY JANUARY 27, 2012)**

- Question #1.* When submitting the cost proposal in the sealed envelope, should we identify ourselves (applicant) on the outside of the envelope or leave that information only on the documents inside the envelope?
- Answer #1.* You are welcome to identify yourself on the outside of the envelope.
- Question #2.* Does the technical proposal need to go into a sealed envelope too? Should that envelope be labeled with our (applicant's) name?
- Answer #2.* No, the technical proposal does not need to be in a sealed envelope.
- Question #3.* Does the CD need to be outside of the two envelopes? Should the CD include the entire proposal, meaning both the technical and cost sections?
- Answer #3.* The CD does not need to be outside of the two envelopes. It should include the entire proposal.
- Question #4.* Does the funder really want us to send resumes for the clients who are serving as our references?
- Answer #4.* Yes, resumes must be provided.
- Question #5.* Will any additional information be made available on the pilot programs and the number of people they serve?
- Answer #5.* The necessary information needed for a proposal for CFCC 10-11-LM has been provided.
- Question #6.* The RFP refers to an ongoing process to establish outcome measures: where does that stand, when will it be completed, will we have access to those outcome measures before we submit proposals?
- Answer #6.* The topic areas for outcome measures in Attachment 2, page 2 of 11 section 2.1.2 is all that we will make available for bidders beforehand.
- Question #7.* Has baseline data been gathered before the pilot projects began?
- Answer #7.* No, it has not been gathered before the pilot projects began.

- Question #8.* The deliverables and the timeframes list one report required at the end of the second term. Otherwise, the evaluator is expected to submit data regularly during the project but not any report or analysis of that data.
- Answer #8.* The criteria and deliverables are set forth in the RFP.
- Question #9.* The period for the experimental design period, with 9 months of data collection, appears to be too short to collect enough data to analyze and report by December 2013.
- Answer #9.* The experimental design study data collection should begin February 2013. Several preliminary analyses of comparative study data are asked for during the period between February and November 2013. The final deliverable for December 31, 2013 reads, "Provide final report on comparative study data collection". Proposals should focus on work to be accomplished in 2012 and 2013. In no sense will acceptance of a proposal that projects collecting data in calendar year 2013 imply that the AOC intends to fund efforts beyond Dec. 31, 2013.
- Question #10.* Is it the AOC's intent that the same contractor will be asked to conduct both terms of the evaluation, or are you going to be issuing a separate RFP for term two?
- Answer #10.* There will be one award for both terms.
- Question #11.* Should the proposal contain an assessment of continuing unmet legal need?
- Answer #11.* No, that is not in the scope of this RFP.
- Question #12.* Who is responsible for determining the selection criteria and making the selection of the pilot programs that will eventually be in the experimental design?
- Answer #12.* The evaluation will be provided by the AOC staff only.
- Question #13.* Please describe the standardized data collection tools that will be provided to the 9 programs. Is the AOC providing them or the programs developing them?
- Answer #13.* Please refer to Exhibit C, Work to be performed, Scope of Services 2.1.1.
- Question #14.* Are additional terms of work contemplated beyond 2013, and is the proposer expected to carry funds beyond 2013 to conduct that work?
- Answer #14.* No. Any work conducted after Dec. 31, 2013 will be based on a new solicitation process and new contracts. All funds budgeted for this RFP must be encumbered by December 31, 2013 and expended by the liquidation deadline.
- Question #15.* In the RFP under section 2.2.2 there is a link to a document that does not work.
- Answer #15.* Links on this website are dynamic and sometimes unstable. An alternative way to access this document is at www.leginfo.ca.gov by searching for Assembly Bill 590 (AB 590-Feuer) in the 2009-2010 Assembly session.

Question #16. Are there page limits or format requirements for the proposal?

Answer #16. No page limits.

Question #17. Our group desires to include on its proposed team for this evaluation an academic with extensive experience in designing and conducting experimental studies of legal services. As a condition of participating in the evaluation, this individual will require acknowledgement of her or his right to publish in appropriate academic journals an article or articles on the evaluation and its results. S/he is willing to agree to postpone publication for a reasonable amount of time to allow for an official report to be written and published in advance of the publication of her/his article and, of course, to disclaim to be representing any point of view or opinion other than her or his own. Is there any standard contract condition that would be included in the contract for this evaluation that would preclude our group, as the contractor, from giving this academic such an acknowledgement? If the answer is yes, what alternative course of action would the AOC suggest to make possible the involvement of this academic and her/his extensive experience and expertise in the evaluation and recognize her/his academic freedom subsequently to write an article about the evaluation?

Answer #17. The RFP contains required minimum contract terms and conditions (posted at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/CFCC-10-11-LM-Exhibit-A-Terms-Conditions.docx>). Exhibit A, section 27, subsections A and B, states that the Contractor, for itself and any of its personnel, shall assign all right, title and interest to Data and Materials resulting from the project to the State (AOC). Subsection C of section 27 requires that "The Contractor shall not publish or reproduce such Data in whole, or part, or any manner or form, or authorize others to do so without the written consent of the State." Unfortunately, prior to any contract award resulting from the RFP, the AOC cannot give a prospective respondent any indication whether such consent, if sought, would be granted.

END OF DOCUMENT