



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
February 1, 2005	Please Review
To	Deadline
Potential Bidders	N/A
CJER 1215 RFP	
From	Contact
Administrative Office of the Courts	Martha Kilbourn
Education Division	Manager, Branchwide Education Initiatives
	Education Division/CJER
	415-865-7825 phone
	415-865-4335 fax
Subject	martha.kilbourn@jud.ca.gov
Addendum No. 1 to Request for Proposal (RFP) #CJER1215 entitled Instructional Design for CJER Staff	

These questions were submitted by one of the potential consultants for this training. We want to make the answers available to all who might be considering submitting a proposal.

1. The scope of services 3.1 asks for 5 days of consulting services prior to the March training. What is the purpose of the five days? What type of consulting are you expecting? Will the five days be consecutive or broken up over time? Can some of this time be used remotely as well as in person consulting?

Answer: The consulting time prior to the training can all be done via conference calls, emails, and faxes. We would expect the consultant to learn about our current curriculum process so that he or she could better tailor the training to meet the needs of our staff. We will also want to share information about our organization and the work the participants in the training do every day.

2. The scope of services 3.2.3 asks for free follow-up service for one year for 20 people via email or telephone. Are you willing to clarify your expectation and place a limit on the number of hours of free follow-up?

Answer: As the staff begin to apply the principles learned in the training, they will want and need to chat about it with the course instructors to make sure they are doing things correctly. I expect this will be more frequent in the beginning and taper off over time as the group who went through the training becomes its own support group.

3. The Purpose of this RFP, 2.0 describes attorneys and education specialists who will create design phase III products. What prior train-the-trainer or instructional design training have these people received to create Phase I and Phase II materials?

Answer: All prior training for these folks has been done through in-house staff who have some expertise in curriculum development. Based on other job responsibilities of these in-house staff, the training has not been extensive enough for the attorneys and education specialists to feel confident and competent in creating the Phase III plans.

4. Will the 20 people each be working on different topics, or are they organized into design teams and share the work to create a course? How many topics/courses are the 20 people creating?

Answer: Each of the 20 staff will be working on different topics, but they can be grouped into more general topics for the purposes of the class. For example, several of the attorneys could work on a design for jury instructions, while the education specialists might work on a design for communication

5. Specifics of a responsive proposal, section 4.8 asks that the consultant build upon competencies recommended by IBSTPI. IBSTPI has three sets of competencies: for instructors, for course designers, for training managers. Which set(s) of competencies are you using?

Answer: We are referring to the IBSTPI competencies for course designers.