

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

COS-2017-03-LB

Court Interpreter Exam Administration and Development

May 19, 2017

1. RFP, paragraph 2.2 – Will proposers submitting applicant fees outside the stated ranges be disqualified from consideration?

ANSWER: The proposed rates for applicant fees provide a range for the 3 exams and only proposers within the stated range will be considered.

2. RFP, paragraph 3.2 and 6.0 – Please provide timing and dial-in information for the referenced pre-proposal conference as soon as possible.

ANSWER: No pre-proposal conference will be held for this RFP.

3. RFP, paragraph 3.2 – Please update the estimated dates for interviews (and any other event dates) as necessary given the proposal due date of July 7, 2017.

ANSWER: The estimated date for interviews, if necessary, is July 14, 2017.

4. RFP, paragraph 10.2.3 – Re: an incentivized payment structure to encourage candidates to take the Written and Oral Proficiency Exams in one sitting – we did not see a place to identify such an incentive in the cost proposal. Where should we put any incentives in our proposal, if offered?

ANSWER: The proposer can include their “incentivized payment structure to encourage candidates to take both exams (Written Exam and Oral Proficiency Exams) in one sitting” under DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES AND DELIVERABLES 2.2.

5. Attachment 2, Judicial Council Standard Terms and Conditions, Exhibit B, Special Provisions, Sections 17.A. and B - Regarding_Ownership of Intellectual Property, Etc., (“Section 17”), in providing our solution to the requirements in the RFP, the Contractor will propose the use of our proprietary item storage systems, test delivery systems, and software programs, including associated source code(s), in performing services under this Agreement that were developed prior to or may be developed during the term of an ensuing contract that are owned and used by the Contractor in our normal course of business. The software, source codes, and systems were not specifically created for the Judicial Council of California (Judicial Council), nor will the Judicial Council purchase these items with Contract funds; however, they may be included in the services and examinations provided to the Judicial Council under a contract. Please confirm that Contractor’s proprietary software, source codes, and systems mentioned above and used in providing services under a resulting contract are 1) exempt from the terms “Data”, “Material(s)”, “Deliverable(s)”, “Submittal(s)”, “Work for Hire”, and “Creation(s)” as defined in Appendix B; 2) are excluded from the description of Intellectual Property, Etc., listed in subsections 17.A. and 17B. *Ownership of Intellectual Property, Etc.*; 3) are specifically recognized as Contractor’s proprietary intellectual property; and 4) at no time shall ownership of same be vested in, assigned to, or transferred to the Judicial Council, the State or its agencies.

ANSWER: The Judicial Council agrees that the Contractor proprietary item storage systems, test delivery systems, and software programs, including associated source code(s) are 1) exempt from the terms “Data”, “Material(s)”, “Deliverable(s)”, “Submittal(s)”, “Work for Hire”, and “Creation(s)” as defined in Appendix B; 2) are excluded from the description of Intellectual Property, etc., listed in subsections 17.A and 17B *Ownership of Intellectual Property, etc.*; and 3) are specifically recognized as Contractor’s proprietary intellectual property; and 4) at no time shall ownership of same be vested in, assigned to, or transferred to the Judicial Council, the State or its agencies.

6. Attachment 2, paragraph 8.4 – This section requires paper invoices (original and copies) mailed to the Judicial Council. Would the Judicial Council accept a digital invoice as an alternative solution?

ANSWER: Yes, the Judicial Council will accept digital invoices.

7. Attachment 2, paragraph 2.2.4 – Please provide clarification of #5 Contractor will report on data capturing system elements and rate of successful functionality.

ANSWER: “Data capturing system elements” refers to psychometric elements, such as Pi value and biserial number, and their analysis.

8. Attachment 2, paragraph 3.4.1 under Exam Administration Activities for Written Exams includes a requirement for SME Review of content, which seems like it is an Exam Development Activity. Should this requirement belong in another section?

ANSWER: This is not an exam development activity. This is an administrative activity of the Written Exam and confirmation of all formats, including electronic formats, need to be performed prior to the Written Exam.

9. Attachment 2, paragraph 3.4.6 requires a print out of the Written Exam score report at the test center. Would the Judicial Council accept a digital score report upon completion of the exam as an alternative solution?

ANSWER: The Score report is a hard copy print out that the candidate receives immediately after completion of the Written Exam. The Judicial Council does not receive any individual Written Exam score reports for any one candidate.

10. Attachment 2, paragraph 3.4.23 – Please provide an estimate of the number of Written Exam score report template updates anticipated annually.

ANSWER: Although rare, the need to update a template may occur. This section clarifies that necessary changes will be made at no additional expense to the Judicial Council.

11. Attachment 2, paragraph 4.8.1 – Please confirm the number of Bilingual Interpreter Exam languages. This section references 12 and 13.

ANSWER: There are currently 13 certified languages with dedicated Bilingual Interpreter Exams. However, this number could change in the future if another language is designated as a certified language. Contractor will be notified if and when this happens.

12. Attachment 2, paragraphs 4.31.6 and 4.31.7 – Please confirm the minimum number of times the faculty must meet daily during training – morning/midday/end of day vs. at least twice per day.

ANSWER: The Judicial Council requires a minimum of three faculty meetings per day. These include morning, midday, and end-of-day, but meetings may occur more often per the discretion of the faculty.

13. Attachment 2, paragraph 4.47.1 and 4.47.15 – This section has separate categories of exam development project for NCSC and California-only exams, except for 9) Stand-alone scoring guide update. Should this type of project also have separate options for NCSC and California-only?

ANSWER: There are ‘stand-alone scoring guide’ update projects that will be undertaken with NCSC and also California-only update projects.

14. Attachment 2, paragraph 4.47.7.f – Should “TDB” really be “TDM”? If not, what is a “TDB”?

ANSWER: This should have read “TDM” (Test Development Manager)

15. Attachment 2, paragraph 4.47.9.d – Is the reference to “Spanish CA 8” in error?

ANSWER: Yes, this was noted in error. This should read “new exam”.

16. Attachment 2, paragraph 7.7 – This section indicates, “Contractor will pay any necessary funding to secure NCSC services to the degree requested by the Judicial Council.” Without a better understanding of the potential expense impact, proposers are unable to develop pricing. Can the Judicial Council provide additional information about the anticipated level of effort?

ANSWER: There may be instances when the contractor may have to work with NCSC on shared projects where NCSC expertise is needed. The cost will be based on rates established by NCSC depending on the specific project. However, the Judicial Council will determine these shared projects in advance and will collaborate with the Contractor on selection of projects.