



# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS (AOC)**

**REGARDING:**

Addendum 1 to this  
RFP No. CPAS-201101-RB,  
Court Interpreter Exam Administration

**PROPOSALS DUE:**

February 6, 2012, no later than 1:00 p.m. Pacific time

This Addendum 1 hereby modifies the RFP as follow:

1. Deletions in the RFP or any of its attachments are shown in ~~strikeout font~~ (~~strikeout font~~); insertions are shown in **bold underlined font**. Paragraph numbers refer to the numbers in the original RFP document.
2. Attachment 2, AOC Standard Terms and Conditions is hereby replaced with Attachment 2, AOC Standard Terms and Conditions, Revision No. 1, attached hereto. The following change was made to Attachment 2, AOC Standard Terms and Conditions:

“2.6 Exam Administration Activities for Bilingual Oral Proficiency Exams

2.6.1 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to test administration activities for both the English and foreign language bilingual oral proficiency screening exams:

2.6.1.1 Administer valid, defensible computer-based or telephonic bilingual oral proficiency screening exams in English and in as many languages as possible. Bilingual oral proficiency screening exams should be administered at least twice per calendar year, but preferably on demand. Bilingual oral proficiency screening exams in all available languages must measure oral proficiency skills and assess an individual’s ability to comprehend and communicate according to the Interagency Language Roundtable Skill Level Descriptions<sup>1</sup> **(or an equivalent system or rubric)**. The service provider may subcontract for the use of already established bilingual proficiency exams or for the performance of certain administrative tasks.

2.6.1.2 In order to realize cost-savings for candidates and create efficiencies, the service provider should attempt to create incentives for candidates to take both the bilingual oral proficiency screening exams and written examinations in one sitting.

2.6.1.3 Develop and implement an appeals process to address and track examinee complaints concerning the administration of the bilingual oral proficiency screening exams. Grounds for an appeal include evidence of bias, fraud, discrimination, significant irregularity in the exam administration, or inappropriate application of ADA or other accommodations. Appeals based on exam content will not be considered.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.govtilr.org/>

- 2.6.2 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to rating the bilingual oral proficiency screening exams:
- 2.6.2.1 Secure the services of qualified language professionals or an organization as subcontractors to rate and record the results of the bilingual oral proficiency screening exams. The service provider will secure the services of raters both inside and outside of California, when possible;
  - 2.6.2.2 Establish and publicize methods by which raters are identified, recruited, screened, and evaluated;
  - 2.6.2.3 Raters should have adequate training to accurately score exams. In addition, raters should attend training sessions provided by the service provider or subcontractor. Training should cover rating and scoring processes, use of the scoring rubric, reporting methods, and review of the AOC established Rater Code of Ethics. Ensure that raters use the scoring processes and scoring rubric as taught during training sessions;
  - 2.6.2.4 Ensure that each bilingual proficiency screening exams is rated by qualified language professional(s) or an organization and an established method is employed to resolve rater conflicts, discrepancies in ratings, and/or appeals based on ratings; and
  - 2.6.2.5 Ensure that subcontracted Raters for bilingual proficiency screening exams 1) are administratively independent of the Contractor in their evaluation of individual applicants, 2) are free of any conflicts of interest or influence from any external source on decisions affecting Examination results, and 3) that no Rater shall have a vested financial interest in the outcome of the applicant’s performance.”

*END OF ADDENDUM 1*