

# ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### RFP #EOP-090318-RB

#### 2010 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study

April 08, 2009

- 
1. What are the data elements that are currently captured by the CIDCS? §2.5

Answer: These data fields are present in the CIDCS system

Interpreter ID  
Interpreter Name  
Interpreter Status  
Assignment ID  
Session (half, full, night)  
Total number of interpretations  
Daily rate  
Mileage  
Overtime  
Language  
With Detail (Y/N)  
Unusual Expenses (Y/N)  
Home court  
Pay for food  
Pay for airfare  
Pay for lodging  
Cancellation fee  
Negotiated pay rate  
Negotiated mileage  
Pay for transportation  
Premium  
Case number  
Number of interpretations  
Case type  
Other case type

## RFP #EOP-090318-RB

### 2010 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study Administrative Office of the Courts

---

Event type  
Other event type  
Session (AM, PM)

2. What reports are currently defined and generated by the CIDCS system? §2.5

**Answer:** All of the data fields as shown in the answer to Question 1 may be extracted for purposes of “reporting”. No reports are automatically generated by CIDCS. Courts using alternative systems may have the ability to produce some reports to meet local needs.

3. Since the nature of existing data will inform much of the proposals sought by this RFP, will Bidders have access to sample CIDCS data and reports to inform the development of their proposals?

**Answer:** The data in CIDCS is considered to be confidential. However, the 2005 Language Study is based on CIDCS data and is a public document. You may wish to review this study found at: [http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/4\\_19interp.htm](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/4_19interp.htm)

4. For the recommendations for a “mini-study” (§2.2), does the AOC have a preference for either
- a. a random sample of courts and languages, or

**Answer:** Please see RFP Attachment B, Exhibit D, Section 2, Scope of Work, Paragraph G, subparagraphs i, and ii (page 26) for a description of this deliverable, which involves sampling courts in each of the four regions.

- b. a purposive sample (for example, urban and rural courts; north, south, central, and coastal courts; large, medium, and small courts; Spanish and ASL)?

**Answer:** See answer to 4.a. above.

5. Does the study anticipate capturing use of languages or interpreting for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing other than ASL? If so, are those languages currently captured in any information system?

**Answer:** ASL and spoken language interpretation will be captured in CIDCS. Interpreter use involving other forms of deaf communication may be found in ADA accommodation request. The consultant will not be asked to identify number or frequency of relay interpreting situations.

6. In §1.2.6, the RFP states that “interpreter use” will include half-day and full-day, as well as actual time spent on interpretation. Later, in §2.3, the RFP seems to suggest that actual time on interpretation is not currently collected and that “data collection systems only capture interpreter use as scheduled in full- and half-day increments.” Since California courts use both staff interpreters who are salaried employees and work a full work day and contract interpreters who are paid by the half or full day (not by the amount of actual interpretation done), how does the AOC envision combining these two metrics into a single unit of analysis of “interpreter use?”

## RFP #EOP-090318-RB

### 2010 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study Administrative Office of the Courts

---

Answer: Employee Interpreters and contract interpreters are assigned through CIDCS in the same way – half or full day assignments. There are not two sets of metrics involved.

7. In §2.3, the RFP indicates the need to collect data on small claims proceedings. Since small claims court is not a court of record, how does the AOC envision documenting the use of interpreters in small claims cases?

Answer: Please see RFP Attachment B, Exhibit D, Section 2, Scope of Work, Paragraph H, subparagraphs i and ii (pages 26-27) for a full description of this deliverable relating to non-mandated proceedings. The AOC is interested in your recommended methodologies.

8. For the non-mandated proceedings referred to in §2.3, does the AOC contemplate capturing information about ad hoc use of family and friends as interpreters by litigants, or only the assignment of a court interpreter by the court itself to those proceedings? If the former, how does the AOC envision capturing that information, and what definition of an “interpretation” would be used to qualify that event for inclusion in the study?

Answer: Please refer to Attachment B, Paragraph H, starting on page 26 for a description of this deliverable. The AOC does not contemplate capturing information about ad hoc use of family and friends as interpreters by litigants.

9. In §2.5, the RFP states that the Bidders should not expect or rely on court personnel to gather data. At the same time, the RFP indicates that local court staff will be available for focus groups and interviews and as survey respondents. This seems contradictory. Also, if the information on interpreter use is contained in the local court’s case management system, does this mean that court staff will not make this data available, and that the only method of data collection would be direct observation?

Answer: Court Staff cannot be made available to accomplish the legwork of data collection. They cannot serve as data gatherers; the consultant will be expected to carry out the actual collection of data required to produce deliverables. However, some court staff and judicial officers may be made available to participate in focus groups or respond to simple **brief** surveys. Every court will make existing CIDCS (or other local systems) data available for the purpose of this study.

*[END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS]*