

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

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

CFCC-2017-08-ML

September 8, 2017

1. Are prior consultants eligible to respond to this RFP?

ANSWER: Yes.

2. Were prior consultants' performance evaluated? If yes, can those evaluations be shared?

ANSWER: No.

3. Section 3.3: does the Judicial Council have an expectation for the number and frequency of site visits?

ANSWER: The contractor will be expected to visit each of the sites during the first year of the contract.

4. Section 3.4: there is no section 3.4, is there a section missing?

ANSWER: This is a typographical error. There is no Section 3.4.

5. Section 3.5: does the Judicial Council have an expectation for the number and frequency of field visits?

ANSWER: The Judicial Council expects that there will be at least one site visit to each project during the first year of the contract. The Judicial Council expects that it will provide assistance with legal case file review under the research direction of the consultant.

6. Section 8.1: does the 25 page limit include all required attachments? (8.1.7 and 8.1.8)

ANSWER: No.

7. Section 8.1.2: in Attachment 2, Appendix A, Services is not populated, should the proposal contain the elements listed in 8.1.2?

ANSWER: Yes, please provide the elements listed in Section 8.1.2.

8. Section 8.1.3: Please confirm the information requested. Also, will the Judicial Council accept international clients?

ANSWER: Please provide contact information: Contact name, Firm, Address, Phone and email for contact. A brief description of the project would be most helpful. International clients will be accepted as references.

9. Section 8.2: in Attachment 2, Appendix A, Services Deliverables are not populated, should the proposal contain the elements listed in Section 3.8?

ANSWER: Yes, please set out the elements listed in Section 3.8.

10. Section 11.2: Should a budget justification be included as part of the cost proposal? (i.e. a narrative section?)

ANSWER: Yes, please set out a narrative budget justification as part of the cost proposal.

11. On pages 2-3, the RFP states that the evaluation should address, among several other areas, "community impacts." Namely, "can community factors be identified that impact litigant outcomes and/or that are impacted by litigant outcomes?" Does the Judicial Council have particular interest in specific community factors to be investigated? If so, can you please provide examples?

ANSWER: Some examples include:

Community factors that may impact litigant outcomes:

- Collaboration with community partners/support agencies, availability of and connection with support services (e.g., housing support services, mental health assistance and other resources that might address underlying issues for litigants)
- Local housing laws (e.g., rent stabilization laws.)
- Rental vacancy rates in the area
- Availability of transportation to access services/geographical barriers
- Resources available to Child Protective Services and their policies regarding investigation of cases that may impact child custody and guardianship actions
- Other legal services available in the community

Factors that may be impacted by litigant outcomes:

- Prevention of homelessness and other outcomes that are associated with homelessness reduction
- Reduction of costs for other agencies providing assistance to clients
- Impact on systems designed to assist children and dependent adults as a result of services provided to relative caregivers who are either custodial parents or guardians.

12. On page 3, also in the list of research questions, the RFP states that the evaluation should examine “unmet legal needs” in the community. Can you clarify the types of legal needs that are of interest here? For example, is the interest in determining the unmet need for legal services in housing, child custody, and guardianship cases, beyond what the pilot projects are able to provide? Or is the interest in identifying the unmet legal need for other types of cases? If so, just civil legal cases?

ANSWER: For this evaluation, the hope is to determine how much additional need remains in the community for this type of service.

For example, the evaluation should try to address how many low-income tenants in a community are not being served by a Shriver project and to obtain information regarding why those service gaps continue to exist.

13. In section 3.5, the RFP states that the contractor “will be responsible for taking the lead in organizing and conducting field work including activities such as courtroom observations, litigant interviews, and case file reviews.” Should the contractor budget staff time for the review of court case files? Or would these reviews be done by legal professionals, with oversight and collaboration by the contractor?

ANSWER: The reviews of court files will be conducted by legal professionals employed by the Judicial Council. The contractor will be responsible for oversight of the evaluation methodology, developing sampling strategy, developing the data collection tool in collaboration with legal professionals, entering data if not collected electronically, and analyzing the data.

14. In section 8.1.2.4, the contractor is asked, in the proposal, to “list major milestones and activities for each Deliverable and create a timeline for completing individual tasks required for each Deliverable.” Does this refer to Deliverables 1-9? Or 1-19?

ANSWER: This refers to Deliverables 1-9. A timeline for developing major milestones and a timeline for Deliverables 10-19 should be developed upon determination that the Option to Renew will be exercised.

15. It is assumed that the cost proposal (section 8.2) should relate only to Deliverables 1-9 (in the Initial Term). Can you please confirm that is correct?

ANSWER: Yes.

16. Can it be assumed that any of the funded pilot projects would be amenable to conducting a limited period of a random assignment protocol, with sufficient support from the contractor?

ANSWER: Yes.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS