

**RFP No. 05-EOP-45065049-01,
Evaluation of Court Interpreters State Examination**

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Q1. *What sources of representative documentation, if any, are available to the Contractor for conducting analyses of the language requirements of a court interpreter? If documentation is available, what types can the successful bidder obtain (e.g. transcripts, actual recordings, reports, forms used in the CA judicial system, etc.) and what is the mechanism for obtaining such documentation?*

A1. The Court Interpreter Program (CIP) will provide the proposer awarded the contract as a result of this RFP No. 05-EOP-45065049-01 (“the contractor”) with available pertinent documents. These include transcripts and other documents typically used in the courtroom. Also available is a form used where a presiding judge provisionally qualifies someone who is a non-certified or non-registered interpreter. The contractor will be expected to schedule informational visits with trial courts and other stakeholders. Direct requests to the courts and CIP will be the mechanism for obtaining necessary documents. Additionally, the contractor will be expected to conduct several focus groups with representative members of the current pool of court interpreters found within the State of California, as well as with court administrators and with judicial officers (these sessions will be separate sessions conducted around the state at least within the three administrative regions, Northern Coastal, Northern Central, and Southern California) as another means to identify the functional tasks associated with being an effective interpreter.

Q2. *Will the successful bidder be provided with data on candidates who took previous administrations of exams, including characteristics of those candidates and Pass/Fail results? In general, what other information is available about previous examinees?*

A2. The contractor will be provided with pass/fail test results by language, by geographic area for the period from 2000 through current. Some profile data aggregated by characteristic is available for certified and registered interpreters, e.g., count by age, count by language, count by years on file, etc. Additionally, a limited survey is currently being conducted of the written exam test takers which will include: demographic characteristics and interpreting experience.

Q3. *Will the successful bidder be provided with a matrix on the Pass/Fail rate for previous administration of examinations?*

A3. Yes, the contractor will be provided with the pass/fail rate for the previous administration of examinations back through the year 2000.

Q4. *What existing data on the current pool of interpreters, if any, will the successful bidder have access to?*

A4. The contractor will have access to demographic information such as: target language, date of birth, place of birth, U.S. Citizenship, employment status, and location.

Q5. *Is information available on the Scorers, i.e. how they are selected, trained, etc?*

A5. We assume that this question references exam raters and their normative training for consistency in rating oral examinations. Basic information on rater selection criteria, qualifications and the training process and hours spent will be provided to the contractor.

Q6. *Is the Master List located online the only source of contact information for the current interpreter pool that the successful bidder will have access to? If not, what other information will be available?*

A6. Additional contact information is available through CIP to the contractor, with the consent of the interpreter.

Q7. *On what basis was the 70% cutoff score set for the written examination, and will the successful bidder have access to documentation supporting the correlation between this percentage and the success rate of examinees taking the oral component?*

A7. We are unfamiliar with “70% cutoff” citation. The contractor will be asked to provide a recommended method for determining the cut score. A correlative analysis has not been conducted between those that pass the written and those that take the oral. Please see question 8 (see A8, below) for further explanation.

Q8. *Will the bidder be able to obtain data on the correlation between overall written and oral exam results?*

A8. A correlative analysis has not been conducted between those that pass the written and those who take the oral. Because those who pass the written may take the oral multiple times within a 48 month period, a correlation analysis has not been conducted. However, the gross figures by exam for both the written and the oral are available.

Q9. *Will the successful bidder be able to obtain data on previous validation studies relevant to the examinations?*

A9. The contractor will have access to the two previous validation studies. The last validation study was conducted in 1993.

Q10. *The RFP lists the individual processes of registering, pre-qualifying, and taking each part of the exam. Could you define the pre-qualifying process and explain what is involved at this step?*

A10. The only pre-qualifying process required is the necessity to pass the written examination component in order to take the oral examination. The written examination does not have a prerequisite.

Q11. *What is the reason for issuing the RFP at this point in time? For example, is there any statutory requirement, etc.?*

A11. There is no statutory requirement mandating this review. This review is being conducted as a good business practice to ensure that both examinations and the testing process achieve program goals. The review is being conducted now to assist in the development of the next set of language exams subsequent to the findings of this evaluation.

Q12. *Does work done on this RFP preclude or otherwise disqualify the same vendor from contracting to do future work on test development or test administration of the California Court Interpreters Examination(s)?*

A12. To prevent a conflict of interest, the contractor will be ineligible to compete for award of the future, subsequent contract, which will be based upon recommendations made by the contractor. Reference Addendum No. 1 to RFP No. 05-EOP-45065049-01, posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>.

Q13. *When does the current contract term for exam administration expire with the AOC's current test administration vendor?*

A13. The current contract will expire on August 31, 2006.

Q14. *Must the selected vendor secure and expense facilities for discussion groups in Deliverable #7?*

A14. The Administrative Office of the Courts can provide meeting space for the discussion groups at any of its three regional offices, which are in San Francisco, Sacramento, and Burbank. These rooms include standard AV equipment such as microphones, Polycoms, overhead and laptop projection. Any additional meeting expenses, such as meeting materials, supplies or refreshments, and meetings at other locations, will be the responsibility of the vendor.

Q15. *In Attachment B – Contract Terms, several amounts are indicated as \$TBD. Is the state assigning these amounts, or have they intentionally been marked as TBD for the contractor to specify?*

A15. In the contract resulting from this RFP No. 05-EOP-45065049-01, the Administrative Office of the Courts will replace the "\$TBDS" with amounts, based upon the proposed fee schedule of the proposer awarded the contract as a result of this RFP.. Please refer to Items 4.2 and 4.3 on page 9 of the RFP regarding Attachment B. The Administrative Office of the Courts does not expect a proposer to submit a revised Attachment B with proposed numbers inserted as replacements for the "\$TBDS."

Q16. *In the RFP for Report #8 you ask for a comprehensive report that is of “Professional Quality and Appearance.” A wide range of publication formats could satisfy such a requirement and vary widely in printing cost, depending on type of paper, number of colors of ink used for graphics, page length, etc. Would you please provide a few more specifics about those matters? Perhaps you can refer us to one or more Judicial Council publications from the past few years that the authors of this RFP would find satisfactory?*

A16. The report will be provided to the leadership of the judicial branch, including the Chief Justice, the Administrative Director of the Courts, members of the Judicial Council of California and one or more of its advisory committees. The report should give a serious, professional impression as well as be inviting to read. The modest use of color in graphics, tables, charts, and text should be used in order to enhance readability. A printed cover on appropriate card stock is required. The report should be bound in a way that allows the pages to lay flat. Spiral binding is acceptable. Ring binders and 3-hole fasteners are not acceptable. The following two reports are provided as examples of the level of quality desired. The first report was produced by staff; the second by a consultant.

1) *Evaluation of Early Mediation Pilot Programs*

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/empprept.pdf

2) *Trust and Confidence in the California Courts, Part I*

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/4_37pubtrust1.pdf

Q17. *Will a history of appeals, based on score, be available to the successful bidder?*

A17. A history of appeals based on score cannot be supplied. However, the number of appeals by language, by year, can be supplied for the years 2000 – 2006 to the contractor.

Q18. *Can the agency please provide additional guidelines of its impression of professional binding as required in Deliverable #8?*

A18. Please refer to A16, above, for guidance.

Q19. *Is shipping of the individual 2,000 hard copy final reports the responsibility of the vendor, or shall we simply provide AOC with the 2,000 hard copies? If it is the responsibility of the vendor, by what method would you like the 2,000 hard copies of the final report to be shipped, i.e. regular mail, etc?*

A19. The 2,000 hard copies are to be provided to the AOC at its San Francisco office by the due date at the expense of contractor. The method of delivery method is up to the contractor as long as the due date of June 11, 2007 is met.

Q20. *Will the AOC be utilizing the 5% Small Business point advantage for registered small California businesses as a basis of evaluation for award?*

A20. No.