

Ingham County Request for Proposals
Mental Health Court Program Process and Outcome Evaluations
Packet #224-19

ADDENDUM NO. 2

The following clarifications, modifications and/or revisions to the above project shall be considered a part of the original specifications:

1. What is the desired funding range per year for the evaluation? It would be helpful in planning to understand the financial limitations of the annual evaluation funding, as there are many suggested evaluation components that could be added to the basic process and outcome requirements of this RFP to make the findings more meaningful and useful.

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should feel free to attach various price tags to evaluation components as they see fit. However, this RFP has been specifically designed to enhance creativity of proposals rather than limiting it.

2. Can a tutorial and training on DCCMIS and DCAS be provided to the evaluation team upon award of an evaluation contract? The RFP states that a tutorial may be provided prior to proposal submission, but with limited time available in the next month, our team would be interested in receiving the tutorial after the contract is awarded.

Answer: Yes, the tutorial can be provided upon award of an evaluation contract.

3. Are there expected regular in-person meetings that the evaluation team will be attending? There is no mention in the RFP of regularly scheduled meetings (e.g., monthly, quarterly) that the evaluation team would be expected to be at either to observe or to report current findings.

Answer: There are near weekly team meetings and court sessions (48 of 52 weeks). Attendance at some would be necessary to gain an understanding of the program and to evaluate the processes, but attendance at all meetings would not be mandatory. Meeting attendance and frequency was anticipated as a mutual decision made by the judge, chief probation officer, and contractor upon award of the contract. Again, we are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine the scope and breadth of these evaluations.

4. How will the Court expect evaluation findings to be shared? It is assumed that an annual written report is expected, but are there additional reporting expectations such as presentations at meetings, presentations at conferences, articles written, etc.?

Answer: We don't know yet, because the answer will depend on the nature of the findings. We anticipate this will be a mutual decision made by the judge, chief probation

officer, and contractor upon receipt of the findings. There will be periodic updates/presentations to the Ingham County Board of Commissioners. The nature and scheduling of these updates will be determined by the judge and chief probation officer in coordination with the secretary of the board.

5. Is there a budget range for this project?

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should feel free to attach various price tags to evaluation components as they see fit. However, this RFP has been specifically designed to enhance creativity of proposals rather than limiting it.

6. How can we access the tutorial on DCCMIS and DCAS data systems?

Answer: Contact Da'Neese Wells, Chief Probation Officer and Specialty Courts Coordinator. Ms. Wells can be reached at dwells@Ingham.org or by calling 517-676-8424.

7. The RFPs propose three year contracts. Do either of the courts have a target date for attempting SCAO certification? If yes, are the target dates during or after the three contracts? What I am really asking is what is the real timeline for getting an evaluation completed? Are the courts seeking three evaluations, one each year with recommendations for improvement, or one evaluation that takes three years? That is a big difference in hours of labor and deliverables. I am assuming that the courts are requesting one evaluation a year, each building on the year before.

Answer: SCAO provisional certification has already been awarded, and a site visit for continued certification is expected in the next two years. We will not be notified of the site visit until approximately three months prior, and have not received notification yet. However, while the evaluation is a best practice, it is not a *required* practice for certification. We had envisioned a three year process leading to one final report, but would consider alternatives proposed by the contractor.

8. Both RFPs refer to matched datasets for non-problem solving court participants from the Michigan State Court Administrative Offices to ensure mastery of the data sets prior to analysis and that any applicant may request and be provided a tutorial on these systems prior to proposal submission. How quickly can this be arranged given any further questions are due by 11/21 and proposals 12/3/2019?

Answer: The matched datasets would be provided by SCAO once the project is underway. The deadline for proposal submission is being extended to December 18, 2019, to allow for tutorials if requested.

9. The RFPs also require the vendor to have experience with 3 comparable evaluations equal in scope in the past 5 years. Do these need to be specifically evaluations with other Problem Solving Court specialty courts?

Answer: No.

10. Can you please provide information on how to set up the tutorial?

Answer: To request a tutorial contact Da'Neese Wells, Chief Probation Officer and Specialty Courts Coordinator. Ms. Wells can be reached at dwells@Ingham.org or by calling 517-676-8424.

11. Do you have a budget for this project you can share (either an annual budget or a full three-year budget)?

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should feel free to attach various price tags to evaluation components as they see fit. However, this RFP has been specifically designed to enhance creativity of proposals rather than limiting it.

12. What is the source of funding for this project?

Answer: It is the court's intention to seek funding from the Ingham County Board of Commissioners for these evaluations. Funding requests will be based upon proposals received and determined appropriate by the judge and chief probation officer. All funding is, of course, at the discretion of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners

13. What is the desired frequency of reporting over the course of the projects?

Answer: We don't know yet, because the answer will depend on the nature of the findings. We anticipate this will be a mutual decision made by the judge, chief probation officer, and contractor upon receipt of the findings. There will be periodic updates/presentations to the Ingham County Board of commissioners. The nature and scheduling of these updates will be determined by the judge and chief probation officer in coordination with the secretary of the board.

14. How can we access the data systems tutorial referenced on page 18?

Answer: To request a tutorial contact Da'Neese Wells, Chief Probation Officer and Specialty Courts Coordinator. Ms. Wells can be reached at dwells@Ingham.org or by calling 517-676-8424.

15. Does the Mental Health Court have dates set with the State Court Administrator's Office for the certification review? If yes, what are the dates?

Answer: SCAO provisional certification has already been awarded, and a site visit for continued certification is expected in the next two years. We will not be notified of the site visit until approximately three months prior, and have not received notification yet. However, it should be noted that while the evaluation is a best practice, it is not a *required* practice for certification.

16. What is the frequency of Mental Health Court status hearings? What is the day of the week/time of day that the Mental Health Court status hearings generally occur?

Answer: The status review hearings occur most weeks, on Wednesdays at 1pm (48 of 52 weeks).

17. Do the Mental Health Court team meetings occur immediately prior to the status hearings? If not, what is the day of the week/time of day that the Mental Health Court team meetings occur?

Answer: The team meets immediately prior to the status hearings, at 11:30am.

18. When was the last time the 55th District Court's Mental Health Court had a process and/or outcome evaluation completed? Who completed that evaluation? Are the results available to inform the proposed evaluation process?

Answer: This will be the first process and outcome evaluation of the program. Progress reporting is completed annually by the chief probation officer, and those results will be available.

19. It is noted that the length of the contract is three years with the option to renew for an additional two-year period. Should the budget proposal cover the entire three-year term of contract or be presented as an annual budget?

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should feel free to state all funding requirements as they see fit. However, this RFP has been specifically designed to enhance creativity of proposals rather than limiting it.

20. Section 7.5 of the RFP indicates that the contract term is anticipated to be for three years, beginning January 1, 2020. Is it the expectation that a process evaluation will be completed each year of the three-year contract?

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should feel free to state all funding requirements as they see fit. However, this RFP has been specifically designed to enhance creativity of proposals rather than limiting it.

21. Section 9.4 indicates that the 55th District Court will work with the SCAO to provide matched dataset for non-problem solving court participants. Would the 55th District Court staff and/or the SCAO be able to provide problem-solving court participant data for other mental health court programs in the state, and if so, has the 55th District Court identified peer programs they would like to compare to? Is there an interest in benchmarking against other programs operating nationally?

Answer: The SCAO provides limited problem-solving court participant data aggregated to reflect statewide averages, but likely will not provide data for individual programs as

they administer the funding and it is a competitive process. Further, we are not interested in benchmarking against individual programs because they can be significantly impacted by regional issues that such comparison would be invalid.

22. In section 9.2, it indicates that simple statistics are recommended for the process evaluation. Are more advanced statistical analyses expected for the outcome evaluation measures? For example, regression analysis for measures on recidivism, abstinence, and success rates.

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should also recommend the best methods of measurement.

23. What is the budget the County of Ingham has set to complete these evaluations?

Answer: We are relying on the expertise of those submitting proposals to determine scope and breadth of these evaluations. Those submitting proposals should feel free to attach various price tags to evaluation components as they see fit. However, this RFP has been specifically designed to enhance creativity of proposals rather than limiting it.

Please acknowledge your receipt and understanding of the aforementioned Addendum by signing below and returning it with the submittal of your proposal.

_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Print Name	_____ Title
_____ Company Name	_____ Phone #