



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7960 • Fax 415-865-4325 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

STEPHEN NASH
Director, Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts, Finance Division

DATE: **September 29, 2008**

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: To implement, administer, and assess the exams used for the certification and registration of California state court interpreters, including (1) the provision of oral proficiency screening exams, (2) the administration of certification and registration examinations, and/or (3) the analysis of the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification exams.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to one or more of the three projects incorporated in the attached Request for Proposals (“RFP”):

Project Title: **Administration and Assessment of Court Interpreter Exams**
RFP Number: **EOP-0860801-CT**

DUE DATE FOR SUBMISSION OF QUESTIONS **1:00 p.m. Pacific Time on October 14, 2008**

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO: All questions or requests for clarification are to be submitted to the following email address:
solicitations@jud.ca.gov

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: **Proposals must be received by 5 p.m. Pacific Time on November 5, 2008**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	GENERAL INFORMATION.....	1
2.0	PURPOSE OF THE RFP.....	5
3.0	PROPOSAL CONTENT MATRIX.....	6
4.0	PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE OF RFP KEY EVENTS AND DATES.....	7
5.0	RFP ATTACHMENTS.....	9
6.0	PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF SERVICES: PROJECT A - PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS.....	10
7.0	PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF SERVICES: PROJECT B - ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS.....	18
8.0	PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF SERVICES: PROJECT C - ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS.....	26
9.0	EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROJECT A – PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS.....	32
10.0	EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROJECT B – ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS.....	35
11.0	EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROJECT C – ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS.....	39
12.0	EVALUATION PROCESS.....	41
13.0	SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL: PROJECT A – PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS.....	42
14.0	SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL: PROJECT B – ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS.....	44
15.0	SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL: PROJECT C – ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS.....	46
16.0	COST PROPOSAL: PROJECT A – PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS.....	47
17.0	COST PROPOSAL: PROJECT B – ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS.....	48
18.0	COST PROPOSAL: PROJECT C – ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS.....	49
19.0	SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.....	50
20.0	AOC RIGHTS.....	51
21.0	CONTACT WITH THE AOC.....	51
22.0	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.....	52

23.0	ADMINISTRATIVE RULES.....	52
24.0	MINIMUM CONTRACT TERMS.....	52
25.0	CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.....	53
26.0	DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS	54
27.0	PAYEE DATA RECORD	54

RFP ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A	Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals
ATTACHMENT B	Minimum Contract Terms
ATTACHMENT C	Vendor’s Acceptance of the RFP’s Minimum Contract Terms or Exceptions to Minimum Contract Terms
ATTACHMENT D	Payee Data Record
ATTACHMENT E	DVBE Participation Form
ATTACHMENT F	Reference Form
ATTACHMENT G	Knowledge, Skills and Abilities Essential for Court Interpreters
ATTACHMENT H	Cost Proposal Table – Project A
ATTACHMENT I	Cost Proposal Table – Project B
ATTACHMENT J	Cost Proposal Table – Project C

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.
- 1.1.2 The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is located in San Francisco. It is comprised of ten divisions, including the Executive Office Programs Division, which houses the Judicial Council's Court Interpreters Program. The Court Interpreters Program (CIP) oversees the testing, certification and registration process for statewide qualification of court interpreters, as well as other administrative functions such as statewide recruitment, and statewide scheduling to insure coverage for court proceedings requiring interpreter services.
- 1.1.3 The CIP staff works to increase access to the courts for non-English speaking persons by improving the quality of interpreting and increasing the number and availability of certified and registered interpreters in the trial courts. CIP services include interpreter recruitment, certification or registration, education and compliance.

1.2 Program Authority and Structure

- 1.2.1 The California Constitution states that "a person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings." This right is extended by law to certain civil and juvenile proceedings as well. California's Government Code §§68560-68566 directs the Judicial Council to adopt programs and standards to insure that qualified interpreters are provided in the courts. This responsibility includes adopting standards for the testing and certification or registration of court interpreters. The Council is also responsible for designating the languages for which a program of certification shall be established, based upon a study every five years of language and interpreter use and need in court proceedings. For all languages that are "nondesignated," the Council is responsible for establishing a program of registration.

1.2.2 To assist it with these duties, the Council has appointed a Court Interpreters Advisory Panel. This panel is comprised of judges, court administrators, court interpreters, court staff, and representatives of county offices that are involved in court proceedings. The Court Interpreters Advisory Panel is charged with making recommendations to the Council on, among other things, the certification, registration, renewal of certification and registration, testing, recruiting, training, continuing education, and professional conduct of interpreters.

1.3 General Program Context

1.3.1 The need for qualified interpreters in California is pressing, and it is growing with the increasing racial and ethnic diversity of the state's population. Approximately 40% of California's population speaks a language other than English in the home. This includes over 200 languages and dialects. Roughly 20% of Californians speak English less than "very well," which effectively excludes them from meaningful participation in a judicial proceeding without substantial language assistance. (All data are from the U.S. Census Bureau.)

1.3.2 The 2005 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study, authorized by the Judicial Council, reports that "the top 14 languages by days of interpreter service were Spanish (160,396), Vietnamese (8,477), Korean (3,743), Armenian (3,093), Mandarin (2,439), Khmer (Cambodian) (2,365), Cantonese (2,320), Hmong and Mien (1,824), Russian (1,789), Tagalog (1,215), Farsi (1,072), Punjabi (1,032), Lao (1,011), and Japanese (601). These statistics show the overwhelming predominance of Spanish as the most highly-needed language in the California courts, representing almost 84% of the interpreter service days for the 14 top languages.

1.3.3 The Judicial Council has designated for certification American Sign Language (ASL) and 14 spoken languages. The currently designated spoken languages with Court Interpreter Certification Examinations include Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. Punjabi and Khmer have been designated by the Council, but certification tests for these languages have not yet been developed. To be qualified to interpret in the California courts, the Judicial Council requires ASL interpreters to hold a "Specialist Certificate: Legal" (SCL) issued by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID).

1.3.4 For the 12 designated spoken languages with certification exams, the certification process includes assessment of candidates' language proficiency and interpreting skills. Certification exams include written and oral components in English and the target language. For nondesignated spoken languages, for which there is no certification exam, candidates must pass

written and oral components that assess proficiency skills. Beginning in 2009, candidates of nondesignated languages will be required to pass oral proficiency screening exams in English and the foreign language in order to proceed to the English-only written exam, as outlined in 1.3.8. Interpreters of nondesignated languages qualified through this process become “registered interpreters.”

- 1.3.5 There are approximately 1600 state court interpreters currently certified and registered in California. An estimated 2,804 written and oral examinations were administered from November 2006 – November 2007. Of these, an estimated 2,652 certification exams were administered, of which approximately 1,951 were in Spanish, while an additional 152 registered exams were administered.
- 1.3.6 The Administrative Office of the Courts contracts with an external provider to develop and administer the certification and registration exams, following the standards and guidelines adopted by the Judicial Council. The certification and registration exams are owned by the State. Additional information about the council’s court interpreter program can be accessed at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/courtinterpreters/>. Additional information about the court interpreter testing program can be accessed at <http://www.prometric.com/California/CACourtInt.htm>.
- 1.3.7 In 2006, the AOC contracted for a study of California’s court interpreters testing program (CCIP). The results of that study were published in 2007 as *Study of California’s Court Interpreter Certification and Registration Testing (Study 2007)*. Thirty-two knowledge, skills, and abilities (“KSAs”) were identified as essential to the job of court interpreter, classified into linguistic, speaking, listening, reading, interpreting, and behavioral skills. All but the six behavioral KSAs were found to be measurable through the testing process. At its April 25, 2008 business meeting, the Judicial Council adopted all 32 KSAs as the essential measure of a qualified court interpreter and adopted the 26 measurable KSAs as the basis for California’s court interpreter testing program. Additional findings and recommendations from the Study of California’s Court Interpreter Certification and Registration Testing (*Study 2007*) can be found at: http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/courtinterpreters/documents/alta_study_2007.pdf.
- 1.3.8 In April 2008, the Judicial Council approved the recommendation made in *Study 2007* regarding the implementation of oral proficiency screening (OPS) exams to assess candidates’ core bilingualism in both English and the target foreign language. Beginning in 2009, candidates of both designated and nondesignated languages will be required to take and pass the OPS exams in

English and the target foreign language before proceeding in the testing process.

1.4 Program Context for Project C: Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams

- 1.4.1 For purposes of comparison, *Study 2007* further identified four interpreter testing models considered peer to California's. Of these four models, the testing program of the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification (Consortium) has been selected by the AOC for further study due to its compatibility in both purpose and scope with California's own program.
- 1.4.2 The Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification (Consortium) was officially founded in July 1995 by Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington. This came about as a consequence of findings and professional relationships established during research conducted by the National Center for State Courts between 1992 and 1995 (See Hewitt, William E., *Court Interpretation: Model Guides for Policy and Practice in the State Courts*, Williamsburg, VA, National Center for State Courts, 1995.)¹.
- 1.4.3 The NCSC research showed that establishing an interstate authority with the capacity to coordinate test development efforts and investments on a national scale was both desirable and feasible. In 1994, judicial leaders in Minnesota and Oregon asked the National Center for State Courts for assistance in developing interpreter testing programs of equal quality and effectiveness to those then in existence in New Jersey and Washington (which were studied and documented in the Model Guides publication). Acting on that opportunity, staff of the NCSC invited representatives of those four states to work together with the NCSC to create a voluntary program in which member states could pool financial resources and professional expertise to eliminate duplication of expense and effort, and lower the cost of interpreter test development and administration for all of the member states. Thus, the Consortium was created to counter the high costs of test development and associated proprietary interests by providing a vehicle for exchange of expertise while safeguarding work products.
- 1.4.4 Since 1995, the Consortium has developed oral proficiency examinations in the following sixteen languages²: Arabic (Modern Standard, Egyptian Colloquial, & Levantine Colloquial), Cantonese, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, French, Haitian Creole, Hmong, Ilocano, Korean, Laotian, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese.

¹ This publication is available online at http://www.ncsconline.org/wc/publications/Res_CtInte_ModelGuidePub.pdf

² Full examinations are in use for all but Arabic, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, and Turkish.

1.4.5 The Consortium has prepared and maintains standardized manuals for test construction, test administration (including a candidate information booklet), and test rater training. This documentation is housed at the National Center for State Courts office in Williamsburg, Virginia, on behalf of state court systems in the United States. Further information about the Consortium may be found at http://www.ncsconline.org/D_RESEARCH/CourtInterp/CICourtConsort.html.

2.0 PURPOSE OF THE RFP

- 2.1 The AOC seeks the services of a service provider or consultant(s) with expertise in credentialing and/or certification programs, test development, test administration, and test analysis. The service provider or consultant(s) should have knowledge of the profession of court interpretation and expertise in the practice of language testing.
- 2.2 The purpose of this RFP is to present to service providers and consultants the AOC's requirements for three (3) separate, but related projects to implement, administer, and assess the exams used for the certification and registration of California state court interpreters:
- 2.2.1 Provision of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams (Project A)
 - 2.2.2 Administration of Certification and Registration Examinations (Project B)
 - 2.2.3 Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams (Project C)
- 2.3 The AOC encourages prospective vendors to bid on all three projects (Projects A, B, and C), or on a single individual project, or on any combination of projects as they are outlined in this RFP. The AOC encourages vendors to seek subcontractors to provide additional expertise and/or services, if needed. The nature and scope of the work outlined in Projects A, B, and C may require the use of more than one consultant or service provider, depending on expertise, the scope of services, and/or the level of staffing needed or available.
- 2.4 The RFP is structured so that each of the three (3) projects will be individually evaluated in order to select the best value of services for the AOC. The evaluation process is set forth in Section 12.0 of this RFP. Projects will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria developed for each individual project, as outlined in Sections 9, 10, and 11 of this RFP. The number of projects on which a vendor chooses to propose will not impact how proposals are evaluated.
- 2.5 This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for either the cost of preparing the proposal or any proposer cost associated with any interview, demonstration or additional documentation that may be required.

3.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT MATRIX

3.1 The following Proposal Content Matrix indicates the sections of the RFP that vendors must comply with and address in preparing and submitting their proposals. For example, vendors interested in submitting a proposal for an individual Project, must comply with all sections of the RFP identified with an “x” in the column for that Project. Should a vendor be interested in submitting proposals for multiple Projects, they must comply with all sections noted in the Project column for that respective Project.

Content Section Number	Description	Project A	Project B	Project C
1.0	General Information	x	x	x
2.0	Purpose of the RFP	x	x	x
3.0	Proposal Content Matrix	x	x	x
4.0	Procurement Schedule of RFP Key Events and Dates	x	x	x
5.0	RFP Attachments	x	x	x
5.1.1	Attachment A, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals	x	x	x
5.1.2	Attachment B, Minimum Contract Terms	x	x	x
5.1.3	Attachment C, Vendor’s Acceptance of the RFP’s Minimum Contract Terms or Exceptions to Minimum Contract Terms	x	x	x
5.1.4	Attachment D, Payee Data Record Form* (see note*) <i>*Note: Vendor is only required to submit one copy of a signed Attachment D regardless of the number of Project proposals submitted.</i>	x	x	x
5.1.5	Attachment E, DVBE Participation Form [#] (see note [#]) <i>#Note: Vendors are required to submit a completed and signed Attachment E for each Project proposal submitted.</i>	x	x	x
5.1.6	Attachment F, Reference Form ^{&} (see note ^{&}) <i>&Note: Vendors are required to submit a completed Attachment F for each Project proposal submitted.</i>	x	x	x
5.1.7	Attachment G, Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Essential for Court Interpretation	x	x	x
5.1.8	Attachment H, Cost Proposal Table – Project A	x		
5.1.9	Attachment I, Cost Proposal Table – Project B		x	
5.1.10	Attachment J, Cost Proposal Table – Project C			x
6.0	Purpose and Scope of Services: Project A – Provision of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams	x		
7.0	Purpose and Scope of Services: Project B – Administration of Certification and Registration Exams		x	

Content Section Number	Description	Project A	Project B	Project C
8.0	Purpose and Scope of Services: Project C – Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams			x
9.0	Evaluation Criteria: Project A – Provision of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams	x		
10.0	Evaluation Criteria: Project B – Administration of Certification and Registration Exams		x	
11.0	Evaluation Criteria: Project C – Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams			x
12.0	Evaluation Process	x	x	x
13.0	Specifics of a Responsive Proposal: Project A – Provision of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams	x		
14.0	Specifics of a Responsive Proposal: Project B – Administration of Certification and Registration Exams		x	
15.0	Specifics of a Responsive Proposal: Project C - Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams			x
16.0	Cost Proposal: Project A – Provision of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams	x		
17.0	Cost Proposal: Project B – Administration of Certification and Registration Exams		x	
18.0	Cost Proposal: Project C – Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams			x
19.0	Submission of Proposals	x	x	x
20.0	AOC Rights	x	x	x
21.0	Contact with the AOC	x	x	x
22.0	Additional Information/Documentation Requirements	x	x	x
23.0	Administrative Rules	x	x	x
24.0	Minimum Contract Terms	x	x	x
25.0	Confidential or Proprietary Information	x	x	x
26.0	Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Goals	x	x	x
27.0	Payee Data Record	x	x	x

3.2 Please refer to Sections 13.0 – 15.0 for outlines of how vendor’s proposals must be organized for each project proposal.

4.0 PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE OF RFP KEY EVENTS AND DATES

4.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events and dates from issuances of the Projects of this RFP through commencement of contracted services. All key events and dates are subject to change at the AOC’s sole discretion.

TABLE 1: PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

<i>Key Event No.</i>	<i>Event Description</i>	<i>Key Dates</i>
1	Issue RFP	9/29/08
2	Deadline for Proposers to Submit Requests for Clarifications or Modification of Solicitation Documents	1 p.m. on 10/14/08
3	AOC Posts Clarification / Modification Response	10/22/08 (estimated)
4	Proposal Due Date and Time	5 p.m. on 11/5/08
5	Evaluation of Proposals	11/5/08 - 11/14/08 (estimated)
6	Notification of Vendors Selected to Make Oral Presentations	11/17/08 (estimated)
7	Oral Interviews and Presentations	12/3/08 (estimated)
8	Notice of Intent to Award Contract(s)	12/8/08 (estimated)
9	Negotiations	12/8/08 - 12/22/08 (estimated)
10	Execution of Contract(s)	12/22/08 (estimated)
11	Notice of Contract Award(s)	12/22/08 (estimated)
12	Commencement of Contracted Services	1/5/09 (estimated)

- 4.2 The RFP, including all attachments, and any addenda that may subsequently be issued, will be available on the following AOC Courtinfo website:

<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>

- 4.3 All key events and dates are subject to change at the AOC's sole discretion.

- 4.3.1 Changes to dates listed for key event nos. 2, and 4 (Deadline for Proposer Requests for Clarifications or Modifications, or Proposal Due Date and Time)

set forth above, will only be made by posting a formal addendum on the AOC's Courtinfo website.

- 4.3.2 The dates listed for key event 3, and 5-12 are estimated dates only and are subject to change at the sole option of the AOC. The AOC will not issue a formal addendum for changes to any of these estimated dates unless the AOC anticipates any such change or changes may impact the irrevocable offer period set forth in this RFP.
- 4.3.3 It shall be the sole responsibility of prospective proposers to monitor the AOC's Courtinfo website to ascertain whether the AOC has issued an Addendum or changed any key events or their estimated dates.
- 4.3.4 Upon selection of the preferred vendor(s), the AOC will post the "Notice of Intent to Award Contract" on the AOC's Courtinfo website only after all proposers submitting proposals have been notified of their selection/non-selection as the preferred provider of the services set forth in the RFP.
- 4.3.5 The AOC will post the "Notice of Award Contract" on the AOC's Courtinfo website after the finalized contract(s) has/have been fully executed.

5.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

- 5.1 Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:
 - 5.1.1 Attachment A, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules set forth in Attachment A, in preparation of their proposals.
 - 5.1.2 Attachment B, Minimum Contract Terms. The contract(s) with the awarded vendor(s) will be signed by the parties on a Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Minimum terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as Attachment B to this RFP.
 - 5.1.3 Attachment C, Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Minimum Contract Terms or Exceptions to Minimum Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Minimum Contract Terms as set forth in Attachment B, or clearly identify exceptions to these Minimum Contract Terms. If exceptions are proposed, then proposer must also submit (i) a red-lined version of Attachment B that clearly tracks all proposed changes (additions, deletions, modified language, or new provisions) to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to provide an explanation or rationale for each individual proposed change. Vendors must submit a completed Attachment C for each Project proposed.

- 5.1.4 Attachment D, Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each vendor prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, vendor's proposal must include a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form. A copy of the Payee Data Record Form is included as Attachment D. Vendors are only required to submit one (1) copy of a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form even if they submit proposals for multiple Projects.
- 5.1.5 Attachment E, DVBE Participation Form. Proposers must demonstrate either (i) DVBE compliance with minimum participation goals, or (ii) written evidence of a "good faith effort" explaining why compliance with DVBE goals cannot be achieved. The DVBE Participation Form is included as Attachment E. Vendors must submit a completed Attachment E for each Project Proposed.
- 5.1.6 Attachment F, Reference Form. Proposers shall use Attachment F, Reference Form, to provide a list of at least three references for whom the proposer has provided similar services in size and scope during the last three years. Vendors must submit a completed Attachment F for each Project Proposed.
- 5.1.7 Attachment G, Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities Essential for Court Interpretation. This Attachment is provided for information purposes and details the knowledge, skills and abilities that are deemed essential for language interpretation in a court environment.
- 5.1.8 Attachment H, Cost Proposal Table – Project A. Proposers must propose all pricing necessary to accomplish the work requirements of the eventual contract for Project A.
- 5.1.9 Attachment I, Cost Proposal Table – Project B. Proposers must propose all pricing necessary to accomplish the work requirements of the eventual contract for Project B.
- 5.1.10 Attachment J, Cost Proposal Table – Project C. Proposers must propose all pricing necessary to accomplish the work requirements of the eventual contract for Project C.

6.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF SERVICES: PROJECT A - PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS

6.1 Purpose of Project A

- 6.1.1 For the provision of the oral proficiency screening exams, the AOC seeks a service provider with expertise in spoken language evaluation. This service

provider will assess the oral proficiency skills of all test candidates in English and multiple foreign languages as the first step in the testing process to become certified or registered court interpreters. The service provider will utilize existing valid instruments either owned or contracted by the service provider. The service provider will manage the administration of oral proficiency screening exams, including the establishment of a performance standard, registration of candidates, the rating of candidate performances, generation of score reports for the candidates and the AOC, administration of an appeals process, and other related services, to determine candidates with the minimum requisite skills needed to proceed in the testing process.

- 6.1.2 The service provider should have experience with establishing defensible cut-scores. Documented evidence should illustrate methodological practices used in the process of setting standards for performance evaluations.
- 6.1.3 The service provider should have a battery of valid test instruments in multiple languages representative of the demographic needs of California, to be used for the purpose of assessing oral language proficiency. (See *2005 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study* at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/courtinterpreters/documents/2005languageed.pdf.) Documented evidence should illustrate the purpose of the exam content and alignment of content to the relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities outlined in Attachment G. Documented evidence should also illustrate that instruments have been developed in accordance with industry-standard practices, and that instruments have been pilot-tested and evaluated for effectiveness. Evidence should be provided for exams in English and all foreign languages proposed for assessment.

6.2 Scope of Services for Project A

- 6.2.1 The services specified in Project A of this RFP are expected to be performed by the selected service provider between January 5, 2009 and December 31, 2009, with two individual one-year option terms to extend the agreement at the AOC's sole discretion, from January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010 and January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011.
- 6.2.2 The service provider will be asked to include the performance of the following tasks in relation to setting a performance standard to be used with the Oral Proficiency Screening Exam scoring rubric:
 - 6.2.2.1 Conduct a standard-setting study based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) determined in the *Study of California's Court Interpreter Certification and Registration Testing* to be essential for the function of court interpretation and recommend a valid cut-score

to be used to identify candidates with a minimum level of language proficiency skills to proceed in the testing process; and

- 6.2.2.2 Provide a validation study of the standard-setting process, including information pertaining to methods used in the establishment of the recommended cut-score to be used with all languages.
- 6.2.3 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to providing public access to information about the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams:
- 6.2.3.1 Provide public web-based access to Oral Proficiency Screening Exam information, including but not limited to: test dates and test sites; information on scheduling and registering for the exams; information on test structure and test development practices; information on the scoring rubric and scoring practices; information pertaining to rater selection and training; instructions regarding the appeals process; and access to pertinent validity studies with regard to the recommended cut-score, general test content areas, test specifications, and the scoring rubric;
 - 6.2.3.2 Ensure public exposure to web-based information through web design that maximizes page ranking; and
 - 6.2.3.3 Staff and maintain a call center and a centralized e-mail response center with Pacific Time zone operation hours to process examination registrations and answer questions regarding the test administration process.
- 6.2.4 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to test administration activities for both the English and foreign language Oral Proficiency Screening Exams:
- 6.2.4.1 Administer Oral Proficiency Screening Exams in English and in all foreign languages for which the service provider has valid exams twice per calendar year. Oral Proficiency Screening Exams in all available languages must measure oral proficiency skills and assess a candidate's ability to comprehend and communicate at the minimum requisite level established by the standard-setting study as outlined in Section 6.2.2. Documentation must be provided to ensure that exam instruments meet psychometric standards and have evidence of content validity, including documentation that instruments assess relevant grammatical structures and conventions, as well as level-appropriate vocabulary. Documentation must also be provided to

illustrate field tests and/or pilot tests and results of these pilot test administrations;

- 6.2.4.2 Obtain and coordinate testing facilities for Oral Proficiency Screening Exam administrations to best accommodate the geographic location of the test candidates and operational needs of the Judicial Council's certification program. Test facilities should be ADA compliant and be equipped with any necessary technological equipment needed for the administration of the exams;
 - 6.2.4.3 Conduct uniform test administrations so that they accommodate candidates in multiple statewide localities. Service provider will ensure verification of candidate identity, confidentiality for all testing candidates, and safeguarding to avoid exam compromise at test sites;
 - 6.2.4.4 Collect and account for all fees assessed to test examinees. Such fees shall be collected and retained by the contractor to be applied to the amounts billable for contract Deliverables;
 - 6.2.4.5 Maintain standard security procedures to assure the integrity and confidentiality of the testing program and its security from unauthorized access. The security plan should provide detail regarding the storage and mailing of test instruments and data. The security plan should also include documented steps to be taken in the event that test security is compromised; and
 - 6.2.4.6 Develop and implement an appeals process to address and track examinee complaints concerning the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams.
- 6.2.5 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to rating the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams:
- 6.2.5.1 Identify, screen, train, and secure the services of qualified language professionals to evaluate and record the results of the Oral Proficiency Screening exams. The service provider will secure the services of raters both inside and outside of California who meet identified minimum qualifications;
 - 6.2.5.2 Establish and publicize methods by which raters are identified, recruited, screened, and evaluated;
 - 6.2.5.3 Provide initial rater training, as well as refresher training sessions, covering rating and scoring processes, use of the scoring rubric,

- reporting methods, and a review of the AOC established Rater Code of Ethics;
- 6.2.5.4 Provide ongoing monitoring of the rating process, including reporting on, and addressing any concerns pertaining to inter-rater reliability and norming;
 - 6.2.5.5 Ensure that each Oral Proficiency Screening Exam is rated by qualified language professional(s) and an established method is employed to resolve rater conflicts, discrepancies in ratings, and/or appeals based on ratings; and
 - 6.2.5.6 Ensure that Raters for Oral 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 or Oral Proficiency Screening Exam developer shall have a vested financial interest in the outcome of the applicant's performance.
- 6.2.6 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to reporting and tracking activities for the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams:
- 6.2.6.1 Provide score reports to candidates and the AOC within three weeks of test administration indicating pass/fail status and proficiency level achieved;
 - 6.2.6.2 Capture and report statistical and demographic data to the AOC by language, following each administration of the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams. Data should include pass/fail rates by language and geographic region. Data should also include item analysis on test content questions, analysis of rater reliability, and analysis of candidate demographic characteristics in relation to passage rates;
 - 6.2.6.3 Provide a progress report following each administration, which includes a narrative summary of Work, fee collection, activities planned, rater training sessions, challenges encountered and how addressed, and trends in appeals; and
 - 6.2.6.4 Provide candidate tracking reports to the AOC following each administration of the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams. Tracking reports should indicate the number of times a candidate has taken the English and/or Foreign Language Exam, specifically identifying first-time and subsequent attempts, with results from each attempt.

- 6.2.7 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to quality assurance practices:
- 6.2.7.1 Establish a quality assurance method for checking a pre-determined sample of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams;
 - 6.2.7.2 Monitor and report on standardized test administration practices, proctor performance, and rater reliability; and
 - 6.2.7.3 Make a minimum of two test site visitations per calendar year, including one visitation to a test site in Los Angeles, and report on the testing conditions at each site.
- 6.2.8 In providing the services set forth in Sections 6.2 – 6.2.7 of Project A: Provision of the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams, the service provider will be required to provide the Deliverables outlined in the following table:

TABLE 2: PROJECT A DELIVERABLES

Deliverable No.	Project A: Oral Proficiency Screening Exam Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct standard-setting study and recommend valid cut-score to be used for all languages • Provide validation study and publicize methodology used for establishing cut-score 	6.2.2, 6.2.2.1, 6.2.2.2
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide public web-based access to Oral Proficiency Screening Exam information • Ensure maximized page ranking for web site • Staff and maintain call center and centralized e-mail response center 	6.2.3, 6.2.3.1, 6.2.3.2, 6.2.3.3
A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify, train, and secure the services of qualified raters • Establish and publicize rater identification, recruitment, screening, and evaluation methods • Provide initial rater training • Provide ongoing monitoring of raters • Establish method for resolving discrepancies in ratings • Ensure that raters are free of any conflicts of interest or influence that may affect Exam results 	6.2.5, 6.2.5.1, 6.2.5.2, 6.2.5.3, 6.2.5.4, 6.2.5.5, 6.2.5.6

Deliverable No.	Project A: Oral Proficiency Screening Exam Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer the first cycle of English and foreign language Oral Proficiency Screening Exams • Obtain and coordinate testing facilities to best accommodate the geographic location of test candidates • Conduct uniform test administrations to accommodate candidates in multiple statewide locations • Collect and account for all fees assessed to test candidates • Maintain standard security procedures of the testing program • Develop and implement an appeals process 	6.2.4, 6.2.4.1, 6.2.4.2, 6.2.4.3, 6.2.4.4, 6.2.4.5, 6.2.4.6
A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely score reports to candidates and AOC • Capture and report statistical and demographic data to the AOC by language, following each administration of the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams 	6.2.6, 6.2.6.1, 6.2.6.2,
A6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide statistical data to AOC, including pass/fail rates by language and geographic region, and analysis of test content and rater reliability • Provide progress report, including narrative summary of work, tracking record of candidates, rater training sessions, and trends in appeals • Provide candidate tracking reports to the AOC, indicating the number of times a candidate has taken the Exams with results from each attempt • Establish a quality assurance method for checking a pre-determined sample of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams • Monitor and report on standardized test administration practices, proctor performance, and rater reliability • Make and report on a minimum of two test site visitations, including one visitation to a test site in Los Angeles 	6.2.6, 6.2.6.2, 6.2.6.3, 6.2.6.4, 6.2.7, 6.2.7.1, 6.2.7.2, 6.2.7.3

Deliverable No.	Project A: Oral Proficiency Screening Exam Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer the second cycle of English and foreign language Oral Proficiency Screening Exams • Obtain and coordinate testing facilities to best accommodate the geographic location of test candidates • Conduct uniform test administrations to accommodate candidates in multiple statewide locations • Collect and account for all fees assessed to test candidates • Maintain standard security procedures of the testing program • Develop and implement an appeals process 	6.2.4, 6.2.4.1, 6.2.4.2, 6.2.4.3, 6.2.4.4, 6.2.4.5, 6.2.4.6
A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely score reports to candidates and AOC • Capture and report statistical and demographic data to the AOC by language, following each administration of the Oral Proficiency Screening Exams 	6.2.6, 6.2.6.1, 6.2.6.2,
A9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide statistical data to AOC, including pass/fail rates by language and geographic region, and analysis of test content and rater reliability • Provide progress report, including narrative summary of work, tracking record of candidates, rater training sessions, and trends in appeals • Provide candidate tracking reports to the AOC, indicating the number of times a candidate has taken the Exams with results from each attempt • Establish a quality assurance method for checking a pre-determined sample of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams • Monitor and report on standardized test administration practices, proctor performance, and rater reliability • Make and report on a minimum of two test site visitations, including one visitation to a test site in Los Angeles 	6.2.6, 6.2.6.2, 6.2.6.3, 6.2.6.4, 6.2.7, 6.2.7.1, 6.2.7.2, 6.2.7.3

Deliverable No.	Project A: Oral Proficiency Screening Exam Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
A10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement appeals process • Resolution of all candidate appeals 	6.2.4, 6.2.4.6

7.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF SERVICES: PROJECT B - ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS

7.1 Purpose of Project B

7.1.1 For the administration of the current California Certified Court Interpreter Written Examinations, California Registered Court Interpreter Written Examinations, and California Certified Court Interpreter Oral Examinations used in the certification and registration of state court interpreters, the AOC seeks a service provider with expertise in spoken language credentialing and/or certification programs. This service provider will administer the written and oral exams, including but not limited to the following activities: registration of candidates, rating of candidate exams, reporting of scores to candidates and the AOC, management of a standard appeals process, and other related services to determine candidates with the minimum requisite skills needed for certification or registration status.

7.2 Scope of Services for Project B

7.2.1 The services specified in Project B of this RFP are expected to be performed by the selected service provider between January 5, 2009 and March 31, 2010, with two individual one-year option terms to extend the agreement at the AOC’s sole discretion, from April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011 and April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012.

7.2.2 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to providing public access to test information:

7.2.2.1 Provide web-based access to certification and registration test information, including but not limited to: test dates and test sites; information on registering for the exams; information on test structure and scoring practices; information pertaining to rater selection and training; instructions regarding the appeals process, and test preparatory materials;

7.2.2.2 Ensure public exposure to web-based information through web design that maximizes page ranking; and

7.2.2.3 Staff and maintain a call center and a centralized e-mail response center with Pacific Time zone operation hours to process examination

registrations and answer questions regarding the test administration process.

- 7.2.3 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to test administration activities for both the interpreter written and oral certification and registration exams:
 - 7.2.3.1 Obtain and coordinate testing facilities for written and oral testing sites and administration dates to best accommodate the geographic location of the test candidates and operational needs of the Judicial Council's certification program.. Test facilities should be ADA compliant and be equipped with any necessary technological equipment needed for the administration of the exams;
 - 7.2.3.2 Conduct uniform test administrations so that they accommodate candidates in multiple statewide localities. Service provider will ensure verification of candidate identity, confidentiality for all testing candidates, and safeguarding to avoid test compromise at the test sites;
 - 7.2.3.3 Collect and account for all fees assessed to test examinees. Such fees shall be collected and retained by the contractor to be applied to the amounts billable for contract Deliverables;
 - 7.2.3.4 Maintain standard security procedures to assure the integrity and confidentiality of the testing program and its security from unauthorized access. The security plan should provide detail regarding the storage and mailing of test instruments and data. The security plan should also include documented steps to be taken in the event that test security is compromised; and
 - 7.2.3.5 Develop and implement an appeals process to address examinee complaints concerning the test.
- 7.2.4 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to test administration activities for the interpreter written exams:
 - 7.2.4.1 Administer the California Certified Court Interpreter Written Examinations as previously developed for and currently used by the State in test cycles to be determined for Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese twice per calendar year distributed through the fall and spring seasons;
 - 7.2.4.2 Administer the California Registered Court Interpreter Written Examinations as previously developed for and currently used by the

- State. These written examinations for English proficiency must be administered twice per calendar year in the fall and spring seasons;
- 7.2.4.3 Distribute all necessary testing materials on test dates, including test booklets, machine scoring answering sheets, test administration instructions, and demographic surveys provided by the AOC ; and
 - 7.2.4.4 Score the written test battery and report the results to both the candidates and the Judicial Council/AOC within an agreed-upon time span following the test administration date.
- 7.2.5 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to interpreter oral test administration activities:
- 7.2.5.1 Identify, train, and secure the services of a cadre of academics and interpreter raters to evaluate and report the results of the oral examinations. The service provider will secure the services of raters both inside and outside of California who meet the State's requisite minimum qualifications, which include achievement of a post-graduate degree with a focus in an applicable area of study and/or ten years of interpreting and/or language-related experience and reputation in the field;
 - 7.2.5.2 Establish and publicize methods by which raters are identified, recruited, screened, and evaluated;
 - 7.2.5.3 Provide initial rater training, as well as periodic, timely refresher training sessions, covering rating and scoring processes, reporting methods, and a review of the Rater Code of Ethics;
 - 7.2.5.4 Provide ongoing monitoring of the rating process, including identifying, reporting on, and addressing any concerns pertaining to inter-rater reliability and norming;
 - 7.2.5.5 Ensure that oral exams are rated by qualified raters as outlined in Section 7.2.5.1 and an established method is employed to resolve rater conflicts, discrepancies in ratings, and/or appeals based on ratings;
 - 7.2.5.6 Ensure that Rater Panels for all oral 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 members of the Rater Panel or test development panel shall be involved in interpreter training or have a vested financial interest in the outcome of the applicant's performance;

- 7.2.5.7 Administer the California Certified Court Interpreter Oral Examinations as previously developed for and currently used by the State in determined test cycles for Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese twice per calendar year distributed through the fall and spring seasons.
- 7.2.6 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to reporting activities:
 - 7.2.6.1 Provide timely score reports to candidates and the AOC indicating pass/fail status and a performance evaluation;
 - 7.2.6.2 Capture and report on a quarterly basis statistical data by language, which includes pre-test, demographic data for candidates; pass/failure rates; item analysis; and inter-rater reliability;
 - 7.2.6.3 Provide a progress report on a quarterly basis, which includes a narrative summary of Work, fee collection, activities planned, challenges encountered and how addressed, trends in test data and test items, and trends in appeals; and
 - 7.2.6.4 Provide candidate tracking reports to the AOC following each administration of the oral exams, identifying eligibility requirements for all candidates.
- 7.2.7 The service provider will be asked to perform the following tasks in relation to quality assurance practices:
 - 7.2.7.1 Establish a quality assurance method for checking a pre-determined sample of written and oral exams;
 - 7.2.7.2 Monitor and report on standardized test administration practices, proctor performance, and rater reliability; and
 - 7.2.7.3 Make a minimum of two visitations per calendar year to the test sites for both the written and oral exam administrations, including one visitation to a test site in Los Angeles, and report on the testing conditions at each site.
- 7.2.8 In providing the services set forth in Sections 7.2 – 7.2.7 of Project B: Administration of the Certification and Registration Examinations, the service provider will be required to provide the Deliverables outlined in the following table:

TABLE 3: PROJECT B DELIVERABLES

Deliverable No.	Project B: Administration of Certification and Registration Examinations Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide web-based access to written and oral certification and registration exam information • Ensure maximized page ranking for web site • Staff and maintain call center and centralized e-mail response center 	7.2.2, 7.2.2.1, 7.2.2.2, 7.2.2.3
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify, train, and secure the services of qualified raters • Establish and publicize rater identification, recruitment, screening, and evaluation methods • Provide initial rater training • Provide ongoing monitoring of raters • Establish method for resolving discrepancies in ratings • Ensure that raters are free of any conflicts of interest or influence that may affect Examination results 	7.2.5, 7.2.5.1, 7.2.5.2, 7.2.5.3, 7.2.5.4, 7.2.5.5, 7.2.5.6
B3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer the first cycle of Written Exams (Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, English, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese) • Obtain and coordinate testing facilities to best accommodate the geographic location of the test candidates • Conduct uniform test administrations to accommodate candidates in multiple statewide locations • Collect and account for all fees assessed to test examinees • Maintain standard security procedures of the testing program • Distribute all necessary testing materials on test dates • Score the written test battery and report results to both the candidates 	7.2.3, 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, 7.2.3.3, 7.2.3.4, 7.2.4, 7.2.4.1, 7.2.4.2, 7.2.4.3, 7.2.4.4

Deliverable No.	Project B: Administration of Certification and Registration Examinations Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
	and the Judicial Council/AOC within an agreed-upon time	
B4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely score reports to candidates and the AOC for administered Written Exam for Certified and Registered Languages • Provide score reports indicating pass/fail status and a performance evaluation 	7.2.6, 7.2.6.1
B5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer the first cycle of Oral Exams (Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese) • Obtain and coordinate testing facilities to best accommodate the geographic location of the test candidates • Conduct uniform test administrations to accommodate candidates in multiple statewide locations • Collect and account for all fees assessed to test examinees • Maintain standard security procedures of the testing program • Develop and implement an appeals process 	7.2.3, 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, 7.2.3.3, 7.2.3.4, 7.2.3.5, 7.2.5, 7.2.5.7
B6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely score reports to candidates and AOC for administered Oral Exams for Certified Languages • Provide score reports indicating pass/fail status and a performance evaluation 	7.2.6, 7.2.6.1
B7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide statistical and demographic data to AOC on the first cycle of administered Written and Oral Exams, including statistical data by language, pass/failure rates, item analysis, and inter-rater reliability • Provide progress report, including narrative summary of work, fee 	7.2.6, 7.2.6.2, 7.2.6.3, 7.2.6.4, 7.2.7, 7.2.7.1, 7.2.7.2, 7.2.7.3

Deliverable No.	Project B: Administration of Certification and Registration Examinations Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
	<p>collection, activities planned, and trends in appeals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide candidate tracking reports, identifying eligibility requirements for candidates • Establish a quality assurance method for checking a pre-determined sample of written and oral exams • Monitor and report on standardized test administration practices, proctor performance, and rater reliability • Make and report on a minimum of two site visitations, including one test site visitation in Los Angeles 	
B8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer second cycle of Written Exams (Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, English, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese) • Obtain and coordinate testing facilities to best accommodate the geographic location of the test candidates • Conduct uniform test administrations to accommodate candidates in multiple statewide locations • Collect and account for all fees assessed to test examinees • Maintain standard security procedures of the testing program • Distribute all necessary testing materials on test dates • Score the written test battery and report results to both the candidates and the Judicial Council/AOC within an agreed-upon time 	7.2.3, 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, 7.2.3.3, 7.2.3.4, 7.2.4, 7.2.4.1, 7.2.4.2, 7.2.4.3, 7.2.4.4
B9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely score reports to candidates and AOC for administered Written Exam for Certified and Registered Languages • Provide score reports indicating 	7.2.6, 7.2.6.1

Deliverable No.	Project B: Administration of Certification and Registration Examinations Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
	pass/fail status and a performance evaluation	
B10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer second cycle of Oral Exams (Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese) • Obtain and coordinate testing facilities to best accommodate the geographic location of the test candidates • Conduct uniform test administrations to accommodate candidates in multiple statewide locations • Collect and account for all fees assessed to test examinees • Maintain standard security procedures of the testing program • Develop and implement an appeals process 	7.2.3, 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, 7.2.3.3, 7.2.3.4, 7.2.3.5, 7.2.5, 7.2.5.7
B11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely score reports to candidates and AOC for administered Oral Exam for Certified Languages • Provide score reports indicating pass/fail status and a performance evaluation 	7.2.6, 7.2.6.1
B12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide statistical and demographic data to AOC on second cycle of administered Written and Oral Exams, including statistical data by language, pass/failure rates, item analysis, and inter-rater reliability • Provide progress report, including narrative summary of work, fee collection, activities planned, and trends in appeals • Provide candidate tracking reports, identifying eligibility requirements for candidates • Establish a quality assurance method for checking a pre-determined sample 	7.2.6, 7.2.6.2, 7.2.6.3, 7.2.6.4, 7.2.7, 7.2.7.1, 7.2.7.2, 7.2.7.3

Deliverable No.	Project B: Administration of Certification and Registration Examinations Task/Deliverable Description	RFP Section Reference
	of written and oral exams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and report on standardized test administration practices, proctor performance, and rater reliability • Make and report on a minimum of two site visitations, including one test site visitation in Los Angeles 	
B13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement an appeals process • Final resolution of all candidate appeals 	7.2.3, 7.2.3.5

8.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF SERVICES: PROJECT C - ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS

8.1 Purpose of Project C

8.1.1 The purpose of the Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams is to assess the practical equivalency between the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification (Consortium) exams and California’s Court Interpreters Program exams (CCIP), and to determine the extent to which the Consortium’s exams measure the knowledge, skills, and abilities essential for court interpretation in California, as outlined in Attachment G.

8.1.1.1 To that end, the AOC seeks the services of a consultant with expertise in test assessment and analysis to conduct a comparative study of the testing programs of the Consortium and the CCIP;

8.1.1.2 The study will compare the development, content, standards, and scoring practices of the written and oral instruments of these two testing programs;

8.1.1.3 The outcome of this RFP will be an assessment of the current examinations (written and oral) developed and used by the Consortium to certify or qualify court interpreters of various Consortium states. Working with the set of knowledge, skills, and abilities (32 KSAs) adopted by the Judicial Council, as well as the scoring rubrics established for the CCIP, the consultant’s assessment will inform the AOC as to the functional equivalences between the CCIP and Consortium exams, including what KSAs are measured and to what level, as well as exam cut scores and pass levels; and

- 8.1.1.4 The AOC seeks to learn how California could align the Consortium tests and test scores with its own standards were the state to adopt the Consortium exams for its own use. Findings from this study will inform future decisions regarding the utilization of Consortium exams to qualify California court interpreters and/or reciprocity.

8.2 Scope of Services for Project C

- 8.2.1 Services specified in Project C of this RFP are expected to be performed by the consultant between January 5, 2009 and February 28, 2010. The consultant will be asked to perform the following work for both the written and oral components of the exam:
 - 8.2.2 The consultant will be asked to conduct an assessment of the Consortium's test development.
 - 8.2.2.1 Description of the test development processes, including test writing, item selection, pilot testing, and psychometric evaluations.
 - 8.2.2.2 Analysis of documentation regarding processes used to translate and/or adapt foreign language components.
 - 8.2.2.3 Analysis of processes used for adapting donated non-Consortium tests to meet Consortium guidelines.
 - 8.2.2.4 Description of the qualifications, training, and recruitment processes for exam writers and developers.
- 8.2.3 The consultant will be asked to conduct an assessment of the Consortium's test content.
 - 8.2.3.1 Identification of the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) measured by the exams.
 - 8.2.3.2 Analysis of the structure and content of tests and determination if the tests are equivalent across languages as well as across multiple versions within languages.
 - 8.2.3.3 Identification of any differences (in test content or complexity) seen across languages and/or versions.
 - 8.2.3.4 Psychometric evaluation of blueprint/template of test content and standards.

- 8.2.3.5 Comparative analysis of test industry standards with the Consortium's documented test purpose, test development procedures, and technical analysis.
- 8.2.4 The consultant will be asked to conduct an assessment of the Consortium's rating and scoring procedures.
 - 8.2.4.1 Description of basis for and process of selecting objective scoring units.
 - 8.2.4.2 Description of the exam rating and scoring practices, including guidelines, standards, and rubrics for scoring.
 - 8.2.4.3 Analysis of methodology used to establish cut-scores.
 - 8.2.4.4 Analysis of documentation regarding rating procedures, including a review of weighted items and the relevance of items in relation to test purpose and test specifications.
 - 8.2.4.5 Analysis of documentation regarding equating strategies used for scoring alternate test versions for the same language as well as tests across multiple language groups.
 - 8.2.4.6 Description of the qualifications and minimum training requirements for raters.
 - 8.2.4.7 Description of standards and guidelines for rater norming, retraining, and evaluation.
- 8.2.5 The consultant will be asked to conduct an assessment of the Consortium's test administration practices.
 - 8.2.5.1 Review of the process for registering, pre-qualifying, and taking each part of the test for becoming qualified, credentialed, and/or certified.
 - 8.2.5.2 Analysis of statistical review processes, piloting processes, and reporting options.
 - 8.2.5.3 Description of process for protecting exams from overexposure.
 - 8.2.5.4 Analysis of regulations required by Consortium in order for participating states to use exams.
 - 8.2.5.5 Analysis of guidelines and/or best practices recommended by the Consortium for test administration, including appeals processes, retake policies, and cycles of administration.

- 8.2.5.6 Analysis of guidelines and/or best practices recommended by the Consortium for other aspects of interpreter qualification (orientation, test preparation, training).
- 8.2.5.7 Analysis of how individual states qualify passing candidates, based on their test scores.
- 8.2.6 The consultant will be asked to conduct a comparative analysis of CCIP's exams and the Consortium's exams.
 - 8.2.6.1 Comparison of content and standards of the exams of the Consortium and CCIP, mapping results of analyses of the CCIP exams produced through the *Study 2007* to the Consortium's exams.
 - 8.2.6.2 Determination of extent to which Consortium tests assess California's 26 measurable KSAs.
 - 8.2.6.3 Recommendations regarding standard setting to ensure functional equivalence between Consortium exams and the current California court interpreter certification exams.
 - 8.2.6.4 Review and comment on two reports prepared by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) assessing the equivalency of the Federal Court Interpreter Certification Examination (FCICE) to other assessment measures, including the NCSC Consortium's oral exam: (a) *Comparison of Examinee Performance Between the FCICE and Related Assessment Measures*, Hewitt and Romberger, January 2004, and (c) *Comparison of Examinee Performance on the FCICE Oral Examination and the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Oral Examination* (Hewitt and Romberger, September 2004). This action will be contingent on permission from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the Consortium to share the information contained in these reports with the project vendor.
- 8.2.7 The consultant will be asked to present a final report and recommendations regarding California's potential use of Consortium exams.
 - 8.2.7.1 A comprehensive report including separate sections for each of the five component reports above; each component section to include methodology, findings, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.
 - 8.2.7.2 An executive summary of the report described in Section 8.2.7.1 that excludes any material that might be considered confidential, as

determined by the Consortium and the California Administrative Office of the Courts.

8.2.7.3 Both the comprehensive report and the executive summary should be prepared with professional quality and appearance, and should be professionally copy-edited before submission. Final copies of each should be submitted electronically. In addition, 15 hard copies of the comprehensive report and 200 hard copies of the executive summary should be submitted.

8.2.8 In providing the services set forth in Sections 8.2 – 8.2.7 of Project C: Analysis of the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams, the consultant will be required to participate in the meetings named in Table 4 and to provide the Deliverables outlined in Table 5:

TABLE 4: PROJECT C REQUIRED MEETINGS
(Dates and locations subject to revision)

Meeting No.	Purpose and Audience	Location	Timing
1	Meet key AOC staff as well as AOC and Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) leadership and Consortium representatives to discuss purpose of contract, expectations, and desired outcomes.	San Francisco	January 2009
2	Conference with Consortium staff for data collection.	Teleconference	February 2009
3	Briefing with Court Interpreters Advisory Panel and key AOC staff to get feedback on project plan.	Burbank	February 2009
4	Progress meeting with key AOC staff and Consortium representatives.	Teleconference	June 2009
5	Present draft results and recommendations to key AOC staff, CIAP leadership, and Consortium representatives.	Teleconference	September 2009
6	Present final report and recommendations results to CIAP and Consortium representatives.	Burbank	January 2010

Meeting No.	Purpose and Audience	Location	Timing
7	Present final report and recommendations to Judicial Council.	San Francisco	February 2010

TABLE 5: PROJECT C DELIVERABLES

<i>Task/Deliverable No.</i>	<i>Project C: Peer Analysis Study Task/Deliverable Description</i>	<i>Estimated Due Date</i>
C1	First draft of assessment of Consortium's test development	4/30/09
C2	First draft of assessment of Consortium's test content	5/31/09
C3	First draft of assessment of Consortium's rating and scoring procedures	6/30/09
C4	First draft of assessment of Consortium's test administration practices	7/31/09
C5	First draft of comparative analysis of CCIP's exams and the Consortium's exams	8/31/09
C6	Second draft of assessment of Consortium's test development	10/31/09
C7	Second draft of assessment of Consortium's test content	10/31/09
C8	Second draft of assessment of Consortium's rating and scoring procedures	10/31/09
C9	Second draft of assessment of Consortium's test administration practices	10/31/09
C10	Second draft of comparative analysis of CCIP's exams and the Consortium's exams	10/31/09
C11	Draft of final comprehensive report and of executive summary	11/30/09
C12	Final copyedited comprehensive report and executive summary	12/15/09
C13	Delivery and AOC acceptance of final comprehensive report and executive summary	1/5/10

- 8.3 The service provider selected for Project C will be required to set up and administer a program that identifies all project personnel that will gain access to test content in providing the services required by Project C. Such program will require all project personnel with access to Consortium test content to sign an agreement, approved by the AOC, that said personnel would not seek to take a Consortium exam in order to become credentialed in court interpreting for a minimum of five years from the date of final expiration of any such contract for Project C services between the vendor and the AOC.

9.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROJECT A – PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS

Proposals for Project A will be evaluated by the AOC using the criteria set forth in this Section. A summary of the weighted evaluation criteria is set forth as Table 6, below:

TABLE 6: WEIGHTED EVALUATION CRITERIA – PROJECT A

Content Number	Description	100 Total Possible Points
9.1	Quality of Work Plan Submitted	66 Possible Points
9.1.1	General quality of work plan	12
9.1.1.1 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.1.2 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.1.3 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.2	Oral proficiency screening exam instruments and administration	16
9.1.2.1 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.2.2 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.2.3 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.2.4 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.3	Standard-setting study	11
9.1.3.1 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.3.2 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.3.3 (1-3 pts.)		
9.1.4	Rater selection, training, evaluation, and appeals	15
9.1.4.1 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.4.2 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.4.3 (1-4 pts.)		
9.1.4.4 (1-3 pts.)		
9.1.5	Test information, data collection, analysis, and reporting	6
9.1.5.1 (1-3 pts.)		
9.1.5.2 (1-3 pts.)		
9.1.6	Security	6
9.2	Credentials and Experience	14 Possible Points
9.2.1 (1-4 pts.)	Credentials of staff	4
9.2.2	Professional experience with similar assignments	7
9.2.2.1 (1-4 pts.)		
9.2.2.2 (1-3 pts.)		
9.2.3 (1-3 pts.)	References	3
9.3	Ability to Meet Timing Requirements	10 Possible Points
9.3.1 (1-4 pts.)	Provides a reasonable timeline	4
9.3.2 (1-3 pts.)	Provides exam schedule that meets operational needs	3
9.3.3 (1-3 pts.)	Accommodation of geographic locations	3

Content Number	Description	100 Total Possible Points
9.4	Reasonableness of Cost/Fee Proposal	10 Possible Points
9.4.1 (1-4 pts.)	Costs are reasonable	4
9.4.2 (1-3 pts.)	Demonstrates fiscal controls	3
9.4.3 (1-3 pts.)	Budget and justifications are clear	3

9.1 Quality of work plan submitted

9.1.1 General quality of work plan

- 9.1.1.1 Work plan is complete, well organized, and easy to follow;
- 9.1.1.2 Work plan clearly describes valid and detailed methodologies for accomplishing the required project Deliverables specified in Sections 6.2 – 6.2.8 of Project A of this RFP; and
- 9.1.1.3 Work plan clearly identifies the key staff on the project, organization of team, and the roles of each member.

9.1.2 Oral Proficiency Screening Exam Instruments and Administration

- 9.1.2.1 Proposal clearly describes the oral proficiency screening exams to be used, including the number of existing instruments and available languages, the development process of exams, and the purpose, content, and validity of instruments;
- 9.1.2.2 Proposal clearly describes the knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed by existing instruments in all available languages;
- 9.1.2.3 Proposal clearly describes administration of exams, including registration of candidates, operational administration, and scoring mechanisms; and
- 9.1.2.4 Proposal clearly describes scoring rubric used to rate oral proficiency screening exams, including development methodology and documentation of validity.

9.1.3 Standard-setting study

- 9.1.3.1 Proposal clearly defines methodology to be used in standard-setting study;
- 9.1.3.2 Proposal clearly outlines operational steps to be conducted in establishing valid cut-score for minimum requisite oral proficiency skills needed to continue in the testing process; and
- 9.1.3.3 Proposal clearly describes statistical procedures used to document validity of standard-setting procedures.

9.1.4 Rater selection, training, evaluation, and appeals

- 9.1.4.1 Proposal clearly describes the means through which potential raters are identified, recruited, screened, and evaluated both during and following training processes;
- 9.1.4.2 Proposal demonstrates plan for meeting industry standards for recruiting, screening and training raters;
- 9.1.4.3 Proposal clearly describes provisions for performing ongoing quality control of the rating process and verification of the raters' continued accuracy; and
- 9.1.4.4 Proposal provides a plan for dispute resolution of examinee complaints, including an applicant appeals process.

9.1.5 Test information, data collection, analysis, and reporting

- 9.1.5.1 Proposal describes methods to provide access to test information through internet, a centralized call center, and an e-mail response center. Information should include, but not be limited to: test dates, registration processes, and rater selection and appeals process; and
- 9.1.5.2 Proposal describes procedures for statistical data collection, analysis, and timely reporting, including but not limited to exam scores, test dates and sites, candidate tracking information, problems and challenges.

9.1.6 Security

- 9.1.6.1 Proposal provides a comprehensive plan for security procedures to ensure integrity and confidentiality of the testing program and its security from unauthorized access; and
- 9.1.6.2 Proposal provides a contingency plan for documenting steps to be taken in the event that test security is compromised.

9.2 Credentials of staff to be assigned to project, experience on similar assignments, and feedback from references

- 9.2.1 Credentials of staff. Resumes of project staff indicate education, training, and other professional credentials that demonstrate ability and qualifications to undertake the project in the following areas:
 - 9.2.1.1 Expertise in standard-setting for performance exams;
 - 9.2.1.2 Expertise in test administration of oral proficiency screening exams;
 - 9.2.1.3 Expertise in rater training and evaluation;
 - 9.2.1.4 Expertise in data collection, analysis, and reporting;
 - 9.2.1.5 Expertise in web development and maintenance; and
 - 9.2.1.6 Expertise in fiscal control and management.

9.2.2 Professional experience with similar assignments

9.2.2.1 Proposal articulates professional experience in the establishment of valid cut-scores and the administration of oral proficiency screening exams or transferable experience; and

9.2.2.2 Proposal articulates professional experience with test administration of a comparable scope.

9.2.3 References

9.2.3.1 References support service provider's ability to provide required project Deliverables as specified in Sections 6.2 -6.2.8 of Project A of this RFP based on past experience or similar contracts.

9.3 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project

9.3.1 Provides a reasonable timeline to permit completion of contract project Deliverables specified in Sections 6.2 – 6.2.8 of Project A of this RFP and allow for contingencies;

9.3.2 Provides exam schedule that meets operational needs of the Judicial Council's certification program as outlined in Sections 6.2 – 6.2.8; and

9.3.3 Describes clear plan for administering oral proficiency screening exams in a manner that best accommodates the geographic locations of the test candidates.

9.4 Reasonableness of cost/fee proposal

9.4.1 Costs for Project A of this RFP are reasonable and allow for contingencies;

9.4.2 Demonstrates fiscal controls necessary for collection and management of exam fees; and

9.4.3 Budget and justifications are clear, well defined, and include line itemization and formulas for each project Deliverable specified in Sections 6.2 – 6.2.8 of Project A of this RFP.

10.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROJECT B - ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS

Proposals for Project B will be evaluated by the AOC using the criteria set forth in this Section. A summary of the weighted evaluation criteria is set forth as Table 7, below.

TABLE 7: WEIGHTED EVALUATION CRITERIA – PROJECT B

Content Number	Description	100 Total Possible Points
10.1	Quality of Work Plan Submitted	55 Possible Points
10.1.1	General quality of work plan	15
10.1.1.1 (1-5 pts.)		
10.1.1.2 (1-5 pts.)		
10.1.1.3 (1-5 pts.)		
10.1.2	Rater selection, training, evaluation, and appeals	18
10.1.2.1 (1-5 pts.)		
10.1.2.2 (1-5 pts.)		
10.1.2.3 (1-4 pts.)		
10.1.2.4 (1-4 pts.)		
10.1.3	Test information, data collection, analysis, and reporting	12
10.1.3.1 (1-4 pts.)		
10.1.3.2 (1-4 pts.)		
10.1.3.3 (1-4 pts.)		
10.1.4	Security	10
10.1.4.1 (1-5 pts.)		
10.1.4.2 (1-5 pts.)		
10.2	Credentials and Experience	16 Possible Points
10.2.1 (1-4 pts.)	Credentials of staff	4
10.2.2	Professional experience with similar assignments	8
10.2.2.1 (1-4 pts.)		
10.2.2.2 (1-4 pts.)		
10.2.3 (1-4 pts.)	References	4
10.3	Ability to Meet Timing Requirements	16 Possible Points
10.3.1 (1-4 pts.)	Provides a reasonable timeline	4
10.3.2 (1-4 pts.)	Provides exam schedule that meets operational needs	4
10.3.3 (1-4 pts.)	Accommodation of geographic locations	4
10.3.4 (1-4 pts.)	Describes sufficient staff size	4
10.4	Reasonableness of Cost/Fee Proposal	13 Possible Points
10.4.1 (1-5 pts.)	Costs are reasonable	5
10.4.2 (1-4 pts.)	Demonstrates fiscal controls	4
10.4.3 (1-4 pts.)	Budget and justifications are clear	4

10.1 Quality of work plan submitted

10.1.1 General quality of work plan

10.1.1.1 Work plan is completed, well organized, and easy to follow;

10.1.1.2 Work plan clearly describes valid and detailed methodologies for accomplishing the required project Deliverables specified in Sections 7.2 – 7.2.8 of Project B of this RFP; and

10.1.1.3 Work plan clearly identifies the key staff on the project, organization of team, and the roles of each member.

10.1.2 Rater selection, training, evaluation, and appeals

10.1.2.1 Proposal clearly describes the means through which potential raters are identified, recruited, screened, and evaluated both during and following training processes;

10.1.2.2 Proposal demonstrates plan for meeting industry standards for recruiting, screening and training raters;

10.1.2.3 Proposal clearly describes provisions for performing ongoing quality control of the rating process and verification of the raters' continued accuracy; and

10.1.2.4 Proposal provides a plan for dispute resolution of examinee complaints, including an applicant appeals process.

10.1.3 Test information, data collection, analysis, and reporting

10.1.3.1 Proposal describes methods to provide web-based access to test information, including but not limited to: test dates, test preparatory materials, registration processes, and rater selection and appeals process;

10.1.3.2 Proposal describes methods to ensure public access to information through web design that maximizes page ranking, centralized call center, and e-mail response center; and

10.1.3.3 Proposal describes procedures for statistical data collection, analysis, and reporting, including but not limited to exam scores, test dates and sites, candidate tracking information, problems and challenges.

10.1.4 Security

10.1.4.1 Proposal provides a comprehensive plan for security procedures to ensure integrity and confidentiality of the testing program and its security from unauthorized access; and

10.1.4.2 Proposal provides a contingency plan for documenting steps to be taken in the event that test security is compromised.

10.2 Credentials of staff to be assigned to project, experience on similar assignments, and feedback from references

10.2.1 Credentials of staff. Resumes of project staff indicate education, training, and other professional credentials that demonstrate ability and qualification to undertake the project in the following areas:

- 10.2.1.1 Expertise in test administration of written exams;
- 10.2.1.2 Expertise in test administration of oral exams;
- 10.2.1.3 Expertise in rater training and evaluation;
- 10.2.1.4 Expertise in data collection, analysis, and reporting;
- 10.2.1.5 Expertise in web development and maintenance;
- 10.2.1.6 Expertise in fiscal control and management; and
- 10.2.1.7 Expertise in customer service, including management of customer call centers and appeals.

10.2.2 Professional experience with similar assignments

- 10.2.2.1 Proposal articulates professional experience in the administration of written and oral exams or transferable experience; and
- 10.2.2.2 Proposal articulates professional experience with test administration of a comparable scope.

10.2.3 References

- 10.2.3.1 References support service provider's ability to provide required project Deliverables as specified in Sections 7.2 – 7.2.8 of Project B of this RFP based on past experience or similar contracts.

10.3 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project

- 10.3.1 Provides a reasonable timeline to permit completion of contract project Deliverables specified in Sections 7.2 – 7.2.8 of Project B of this RFP and allow for contingencies;
- 10.3.2 Provides exam schedule that meets operational needs of the Judicial Council's certification program as outlined in Sections 7.2 – 7.2.8;
- 10.3.3 Describes clear plan for administering written and oral exams in a manner that best accommodates the geographic locations of the test candidates; and
- 10.3.4 Describes a sufficient size staff to meet the operational needs of administration of the written and oral certification and registration exams.

10.4 Reasonableness of cost/fee proposal

- 10.4.1 Costs are reasonable and allow for contingencies;
- 10.4.2 Demonstrates fiscal controls necessary for collection and management of exam fees; and

10.4.3 Budget and justifications are clear, well defined, and include line itemization and formulas for each project Deliverable specified in Sections 7.2 – 7.2.8 of Project B of this RFP.

11.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA: PROJECT C – ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS

Proposals for Project C will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria set forth in this Section. A summary of the weighted evaluation criteria is set forth as Table 8, below.

TABLE 8: WEIGHTED EVALUATION CRITERIA – PROJECT C

Content Number	Description	100 Total Possible Points
11.1	Quality of Work Plan Submitted	40 Possible Points
11.1.1	General quality of work plan	30
11.1.1.1 (1-10 pts.)		
11.1.1.2 (1-10 pts.)		
11.1.1.3 (1-10 pts.)		
11.1.2 (1-10 pts.)	Security	10
11.2	Credentials and Experience	36 Possible Points
11.2.1 (1-10 pts.)	Credentials of staff	10
11.2.2	Professional experience with similar assignments	18
11.2.2.1 (1-9 pts.)		
11.2.2.2 (1-9 pts.)		
11.2.3 (1-8 pts.)	References	8
11.3	Ability to Meet Timing Requirements	8 Possible Points
11.3.1 (1-8 pts.)	Provides a reasonable timeline	8
11.4	Reasonableness of Cost	16 Possible Points
11.4.1 (1-8 pts.)	Costs are reasonable	8
11.4.2 (1-8 pts.)	Budget and justifications are clear and well-defined	8

11.1 Quality of work plan submitted

11.1.1 General quality of work plan

- 11.1.1.1 Work plan is complete, well organized, and easy to follow;
- 11.1.1.2 Work plan clearly describes valid and detailed methodologies for accomplishing the required project Deliverables specified in Sections 8.2 – 8.2.8 of Project C of this RFP; and

11.1.1.3 Work plan clearly identifies the key staff on the project, organization of team, and the roles of each member.

11.1.2 Security

11.1.1.4 Proposal provides a comprehensive plan for security procedures to ensure confidentiality of the testing materials and their protection from unauthorized access or use.

11.2 Credentials of staff to be assigned to projects, experience on similar assignments, and feedback from references

11.2.1 Credentials of staff. Resumes of project staff indicate education, training, and other professional credentials that demonstrate ability and qualification to undertake the project in the following areas:

- 11.2.1.1 Expertise in analysis and evaluation of written exams;
- 11.2.1.2 Expertise in analysis and evaluation of oral performance exams;
- 11.2.1.3 Expertise in standard-setting for licensing tests; and
- 11.2.1.4 Expertise in data collection, research, analysis, and reporting.

11.2.2 Professional experience with similar assignments

- 11.2.2.1 Proposal articulates professional experience in the analysis and evaluation of court interpreting exams or transferable experience; and
- 11.2.2.2 Proposal articulates professional experience with test analysis and evaluation of a comparable scope.

11.2.3 References

11.2.3.1 References support service provider's ability to provide required project Deliverables as specified in Sections 8.2 - 8.2.8.

11.3 Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project

11.3.1 Provides a reasonable timeline to permit completion of contract project Deliverables specified in Sections 8.2 – 8.2.8 of Project C of this RFP and allow for contingencies.

11.4 Reasonableness of cost/fee proposal

11.4.1 Costs are reasonable and allow for contingencies; and

11.4.2 Budget and justifications are clear, well defined, and include line itemization and formulas for each project Deliverable specified in Sections 8.2 - 8.2.8 of Project C of this RFP.

12.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

- 12.1 The AOC will conduct a comprehensive, fair, and impartial evaluation of proposals received in response to this RFP. All proposals received from vendors will be reviewed and evaluated by a committee of qualified personnel (“Evaluation Committee”). The name, units, or experience of any individual members of the Evaluation Committee will not be made available to any vendor. The evaluation of proposals and selection of preferred providers will occur as set forth in this Section.
- 12.2 Written Proposal Review. Preliminary evaluations for Projects A, B, and C will be based on written proposals as outlined in the Specifics of a Responsive Proposal for Project A (13.1-13.4.1); Project B (14.1 – 14.4.1); and Project C (15.1 – 15.4.1). The Evaluation Committee will assign preliminary weighted scores to each outlined area for Project A (9.1 – 9.4.3); Project B (10.1 – 10.4.3); and Project C (11.1 – 11.4.2). A proposal may be eliminated if it does not contain all proposal elements outlined in these sections.
- 12.3 Finalist Selection.
- 12.3.1 The Evaluation Committee will compile the preliminary scores for each vendor’s written proposal based on the weighted evaluation criteria. The vendors with the highest ranking scores for each of the individual projects will be identified and may be invited to participate in interviews, if interviews are deemed necessary by the Evaluation Committee.
- 12.3.2 Vendors not selected or invited to interview will not be eligible for further consideration for Projects A, B, or C of this RFP.
- 12.3.3 In the event the Evaluation Committee determines that interviews are not necessary, the AOC will proceed with selection of the preferred provider(s) as specified in Section 12.5, below.
- 12.4 Finalist Interviews
- 12.4.1 After completion of the evaluation of written proposals, and if deemed necessary by the Evaluation Committee, selected proposers may be given the opportunity to participate in the interactive interviews regarding their proposal. Proposers selected to participate in an interview will be notified in writing of the date, place, time and format of the interview. Proposers will be responsible for all costs related to the interview, which, at the AOC’s sole discretion, may be in-person at the AOC’s offices in San Francisco and/or by teleconference. If a proposer is

selected to participate in an interview and fails to participate in such interview, the proposer may be disqualified from further consideration.

12.4.2 Interviews, if held, are designed to provide the AOC with clarification of submitted proposals only, and shall not be construed as a solicitation, invitation, or opportunity for vendors to alter, modify, or amend their previously submitted proposals. Any alterations, modifications, or amendments so offered to a proposal during this clarification process shall not be considered by the AOC; but will, however, be viewed as negatively impacting the proposal evaluation.

12.4.3 Key staff for the individual projects should be present for the interview. Sales representatives not working as key staff on the projects should not participate in the interviews.

12.4.4 Upon completion of interviews, if conducted, the Evaluation Committee will finalize the scoring of proposals.

12.5 Selection of Preferred Provider(s)

12.5.1 Upon completion of proposal evaluation, and the interview process, if held, the Evaluation Committee will finalize evaluation scoring. The Evaluation Committee will then make their selection recommendation to the AOC's Contracting Officer responsible for this solicitation.

12.5.2 After review and confirmation of the Evaluation Committee's recommendation(s), the AOC's Contracting Officer will provide written notification to all vendors who submitted proposals advising whether they were selected or not selected to be the preferred provider. The Contracting Officer will subsequently post a Notice of Intent to Award on the AOC's Courtinfo website advising the public the name of the vendor selected as the preferred provider.

12.5.3 The AOC reserves the right to commence negotiations with multiple vendors or one vendor for multiple projects in the interest of reaching a deal in a timely fashion with the greatest benefit to the AOC for each Project.

13.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL: PROJECT A - PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS

13.1 Administrative Specifics

13.1.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of Project A of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.

13.2 Technical Specifics

- 13.2.1 The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal for Project A: Provision of Oral Proficiency Screening Exams.
- 13.2.2 Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address, web site address, and federal tax identification number. Note that if a sole proprietorship using its social security number is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.
- 13.2.3 Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
- 13.2.4 Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project.
- 13.2.5 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.
- 13.2.6 Overall plan for Project A with time estimates for completion of all work required.
- 13.2.7 Detailed summary of project plan to include:
 - 13.2.7.1 Proposed process for conducting standard-setting study and recommending valid cut-score to be used with oral proficiency screening exams in all languages;
 - 13.2.7.2 Description of all languages for which valid instruments to assess oral proficiency exist;
 - 13.2.7.3 Proposed process for statewide administration of oral proficiency screening exams in English and foreign languages;
 - 13.2.7.4 Proposed process for identification, training, and monitoring of raters and the rating process for oral proficiency screening exams;
 - 13.2.7.5 Proposed method for ensuring that rater panels of oral proficiency screening exams are 1) administratively independent in their evaluation of individual applicants, and 2) are free of any conflicts of interest or influence from any external source on decisions affecting Examination results, and 3) that no members of rater panels shall have a vested financial interest in the outcome of the applicant's performance;
 - 13.2.7.6 Proposed data collection methods and reporting mechanisms for exam results and candidate tracking;
 - 13.2.7.7 Proposed process for handling customer inquiries, complaints, and appeals.

- 13.2.7.8 Proposed outline of web page and methods for ensuring public access to information;
- 13.2.7.9 Proposed project and team organization, identifying key personnel and their credentials; and
- 13.2.7.10 Proposed selection and use of subcontractors, if any; and
- 13.2.7.11 List of existing professional time commitments on other subject-related contracts occurring within the expected period of performance of the services.

13.3 Cost Specifics

- 13.3.1 Responsive proposals must provide the service provider's cost/fee proposal showing total cost/fees for providing these services, as outlined in Section 16.0.

13.4 Additional Specifics

- 13.4.1 Responsive proposals must include the appropriate completed RFP attachments, as specified in Section 3.0 of this RFP.

14.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL: PROJECT B - ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS

14.1 Administrative Specifics

- 14.1.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of Project B of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.

14.2 Technical Specifics

- 14.2.1 The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal for Project B: Administration of Certification and Registration Exams.
- 14.2.2 Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address, website address, and federal tax identification number. Note that if a sole proprietorship using its social security number is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.
- 14.2.3 Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.
- 14.2.4 Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project.

14.2.5 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.

14.2.6 Overall plan for Project B with time estimates for completion of all work required.

14.2.7 Detailed summary of project plan to include:

14.2.7.1 Proposed process for statewide administration of written and oral examinations to be used for certification and registration of state court interpreters;

14.2.7.2 Proposed process for identification, training, and monitoring of raters and the rating process for oral examinations;

14.2.7.3 Proposed method for ensuring that rater panels of all oral exams are 1) administratively independent in their evaluation of individual applicants, and 2) are free of any conflicts of interest or influence from any external source on decisions affecting Examination results, and 3) that no members of rater panels shall have a vested financial interest in the outcome of the applicant's performance;

14.2.7.4 Proposed data collection methods and reporting mechanisms for exam results, demographic information, and candidate tracking;

14.2.7.5 Proposed process for handling customer inquiries, complaints, and appeals.

14.2.7.6 Proposed outline of web page and methods for ensuring public access to information;

14.2.7.7 Proposed project and team organization, identifying key personnel and their credentials;

14.2.7.8 Proposed selection and use of subcontractors, if any; and

14.2.7.9 List of existing professional time commitments on other subject-related contracts occurring within the expected period of performance of the services.

14.3 Cost Specifics

14.3.1 Responsive proposals must provide the service provider's cost/fee proposal showing total cost/fees for providing these services, as outlined in Section 17.0.

14.4 Additional Specifics

14.4.1 Responsive proposals must include the appropriate completed RFP attachments, as specified in Section 3.0 of this RFP.

15.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL: PROJECT C - ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS

15.1 Administrative Specifics

15.1.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of Project C of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.

15.2 Technical Specifics

15.2.1 The following information shall be included as the technical portion of the proposal for Project C: Analysis of Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification Exams.

15.2.2 Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address, website address, and federal tax identification number. Note that if a sole proprietorship using its social security number is awarded a contract, the social security number will be required prior to finalizing a contract.

15.2.3 Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.

15.2.4 Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project.

15.2.5 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.

15.2.6 Overall plan for Project C with time estimates for completion of all work required.

15.2.7 Detailed summary of project plan to include:

- 15.2.7.1 Proposed strategies and methods that will be employed to achieve the project objectives and produce the project deliverables;
- 15.2.7.2 Proposed data collection methods for each deliverable;
- 15.2.7.3 Proposed project and team organization, identifying key personnel and their credentials;
- 15.2.7.4 Proposed selection and use of subcontractors, if any; and

15.2.7.5 List of existing professional time commitments on other subject-related contracts occurring within the expected period of performance of the services.

15.3 Cost Specifics

15.3.1 Responsive proposals should provide the service provider's cost/fee proposal showing total cost/fees for providing these services, as outlined in Section 18.0.

15.4 Additional Specifics

15.4.1 Responsive proposals must include the appropriate completed RFP attachments, as specified in Section 3.0 of this RFP.

16.0 COST PROPOSAL: PROJECT A – PROVISION OF ORAL PROFICIENCY SCREENING EXAMS

16.1 The service provider's cost/fee proposal showing total cost/fees for providing services of Project A of this RFP shall be inclusive of personnel, materials, computer support, travel, lodging, per diem, and overhead rates. The service provider should provide a per capita estimate of the total costs of Project A. Per capita costs may be estimated at batch levels based on varying numbers of test takers.

16.2 As a separate document attached to the service provider's cost/fee proposal, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of providing the project Deliverables specified in Section 6.2.8 of this RFP. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled "Budget Justification." Additionally, complete the Cost Proposal Table (Attachment H) for Project A.

16.3 The service provider's costs/fees will be reimbursed by one of the following methods, to be determined before contract execution:

16.3.1 The AOC's method of payment to the selected service provider will be by firm fixed fee for project Deliverables specified in Section 6.2.8 of this RFP.

16.3.2 The service provider may be entitled to collect test application fees from exam candidates for oral proficiency exams in English and all foreign languages tested.

16.3.3 A combination of methods described in Sections 16.3.1 and 16.3.2. If this method is used, all test application fees for a specific deliverable will need to be applied before invoices for completion of that deliverable are submitted to the AOC.

16.4 The following table illustrates historical candidate counts for the written exam for registered and certified interpreters, which until the present has been the first step in the testing process that the oral proficiency screening exams will replace. This historical

count may be used to estimate the number of candidates who will take oral proficiency screening exams in both English and a foreign language.³

Historical Candidate Counts	
Year	Number of Candidates
FY 2003 – 2004	1239
FY 2004 – 2005	1492
FY 2005 – 2006	1248
FY 2006 – 2007	1117
FY 2007 – 2008	1777

16.5 The proposer’s cost/fee proposal for Project A shall include a completed and signed DVBE Participation Form.

17.0 COST PROPOSAL: PROJECT B – ADMINISTRATION OF CERTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION EXAMS

17.1 The service provider’s cost/fee proposal showing total cost/fees for providing these services shall be inclusive of personnel, materials, computer support, travel, lodging, per diem, and overhead rates. The service provider should provide a per capita estimate of the total costs of Project B. Per capita costs may be estimated at batch levels based on varying numbers of test takers.

17.2 As a separate document attached to the service provider’s cost/fee proposal, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of providing the project Deliverables specified in Section 7.2.8 of this RFP. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled “Budget Justification.” Additionally, complete the Cost Proposal Table (Attachment I) for Project B.

17.3 The service provider’s costs/fees will be reimbursed by a combination of the following methods:

17.3.1 The AOC’s method of payment to the selected service provider will be by firm fixed fee for project Deliverables specified in Section 7.2.8 of this RFP.

17.3.2 The service provider will be entitled to collect test application fees from exam candidates for certification and registration exams in all languages tested.

17.3.3 All test application fees for a specific deliverable will need to be applied prior to invoices for completion of that deliverable being submitted to the AOC.

³ Candidates of languages for which a foreign language instrument does not exist will be required to take and pass an oral proficiency screening exam in English.

- 17.4 The following table summarizes estimated candidate exam counts and estimated test application fees to be collected by the service provider for written and oral exams based on data from November 2006 - November 2007.

Exam Type	Test Application Fee	Number of Candidates	Total Fees Collected
Certification Exam (written and oral)	\$250.00 ⁴	2652	\$663,000.00
Registration Exam (English-only written)	\$100.00	152	\$15,200.00
Estimated Total Amount for Candidate Test Application Fees ⁵			\$678,200.00

- 17.5 The introduction of oral proficiency screening exams, as outlined in Project A of this RFP, may somewhat reduce candidate certification and registration exam counts, since this process will screen out candidates who do not possess the oral bilingual skills necessary to proceed to the written testing process.
- 17.6 The reduction in the number of candidates related to the oral proficiency screening exam may be counterbalanced by two factors which have caused a significant rise in the number of test candidates in the most recent testing cycle: 1) an increase in the AOC's interpreter recruitment efforts; and 2) the State Personnel Board's recent decision to suspend its own interpreter testing program for administrative law and medical hearing interpreters and to refer its candidates to the AOC's testing program for qualification.
- 17.7 The proposer's cost/fee proposal for Project B shall include a completed and signed DVBE Participation Form.

18.0 COST PROPOSAL: PROJECT C – ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION EXAMS

- 18.1 The service provider's cost/fee proposal showing total cost/fees for providing these services shall be inclusive of personnel, materials, computer support, travel, lodging, per diem, and overhead rates. The AOC's method of payment to the selected service provider will be by fees billed for approved Deliverables specified in Section 8.2.8 of this RFP.
- 18.2 As a separate document, submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of services. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled "Budget Justification." Hourly or daily rates must be provided for each position or person who will be involved in the project. Anticipated travel costs should be clearly itemized and

⁴ The fee for the oral exam is waived for those candidates who pass the most recent administration of the written exam. Subsequent attempts cost \$250.00.

⁵ Total does not include cancellation fees. A \$100.00 processing fee is deducted from all refunds issued due to late cancellations.

should reflect the meeting schedule outlined in Table 1 of Section 8.2.8 of this RFP. Additionally, complete the Cost Proposal Table (Attachment J) for Project C.

- 18.3 The proposer's cost/fee proposal for Project C shall include a completed and signed DVBE Participation Form.

19.0 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

- 19.1 Service providers should provide separate proposals for each Project outlined in this RFP.
- 19.2 Provide an original and five (5) hardcopies of each proposal signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, telephone number, and e-mail address of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 19.3 Provide one (1) electronic copy of each entire proposal in MS Word compatible format (**unprotected**) by submitting it on either a CD-ROM or DVD along with the required original and hardcopies of the proposal.
- 19.4 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed in the Submission of Proposals section of the coversheet to this RFP.
- 19.5 Proposals must be received by the individual listed in the Submission of Proposals section of the coversheet to this RFP no later than the Proposal Due Date & Time as set forth on the coversheet to this RFP.
- 19.6 All proposals must be delivered via U.S. Mail, common carrier, overnight delivery service (with proof of delivery), or hand delivery. A receipt should be requested for hand delivered material. Proposals received prior to the Proposal Due Date & Time that are marked properly will be securely kept, unopened until the Proposal Due Date & Time. Proposals received after the Proposal Due Date & Time will not be considered.
- 19.7 The service provider is solely responsible for ensuring that the full and complete proposal is received by the AOC in accordance with the solicitation requirements prior to the Proposal Due Date & Time and at the place specified. The AOC shall not be responsible for any delays in mail or by common carriers or by delivery errors or delays or missed delivery.
- 19.8 Any proposal containing information that proposer considers confidential and/or proprietary must comply with the requirements set forth in Section 25.0., Confidential and Proprietary Information.
- 19.9 Submittal of proposals by facsimile or email transmission is not acceptable, and any proposal so transmitted will be rejected as non-responsive.

- 19.10 A vendor's submitted proposal shall constitute an irrevocable offer for **120 days** following the Proposal Due Date & Time as set forth on the coversheet to this RFP.

20.0 AOC RIGHTS

- 20.1 The AOC may reject any or all proposals and may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a bid. The AOC's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or excuse a vendor from full compliance with solicitation document specifications. The AOC reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, to award the contract in whole or in part and/or negotiate any or all items with individual vendors if it is deemed in the AOC's best interest. Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to make no selection if proposals are deemed to be outside the fiscal constraint or against the best interest of the State of California.
- 20.2 In addition to the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, the AOC also reserves the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for any proposer's cost of preparing the proposal, including providing additional documentation or participating in interviews, if required.
- 20.3 The AOC reserves the right at any time during the solicitation process set forth herein to require proposer to provide evidence of financial stability, including audited or reviewed profit and loss statements and balance sheets, in accordance with reporting requirements of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) or Office of Benefits Administration and Enforcement (OBAE), for the three (3) previous years. Proposer's failure to provide such requested information within the timeframe specified may result in proposer's proposal being disqualified for further consideration.

21.0 CONTACT WITH THE AOC

- 21.1 Prospective service providers are specifically directed NOT to contact any AOC personnel or its consultants for meetings, conferences, or discussions that are specifically related to this RFP at any time prior to any award and execution of a contract. Unauthorized contact with any AOC personnel or its consultants may be cause for rejection of the vendor's proposal.
- 21.2 All communications with the AOC regarding this RFP, including submittal of questions pertaining to these solicitation documents, shall be made through the AOC's Solicitation Mailbox (solicitations@jud.ca.gov). **All email submissions sent to the Solicitations Mailbox MUST contain the RFP number and other appropriate identifying information in the email subject line.** Failure to include the RFP number as well as other sufficient identifying information in the email subject line may result in the AOC taking no action on a vendor's email submission. All questions, requests for clarification

or modification must be submitted by the date and time specified on the cover page of this RFP.

- 21.3 Responses to questions, as well as any further clarifications or modifications to this RFP, will be posted by the AOC at the following website: www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp. It is each bidder's responsibility to access this information once it is posted; no notification of the posting will be provided.

22.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

- 22.1 It may be necessary to interview prospective service providers to clarify aspects of their submittal. If conducted, interviews may be conducted by phone or by in-person presentations, at the AOC's discretion. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.
- 22.2 It may also be necessary for the AOC to request additional documentation or information in order to clarify aspects of a proposal or a vendor's ability to perform the required services. Should the AOC request such documentation or information, proposer shall provide the requested documentation or information no later than the date specified by such request.
- 22.3 Failure of a proposer to participate in an interview, or provide requested documentation or information by the AOC's specified date may result in the vendor's proposal being disqualified for further evaluation.

23.0 ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

- 23.1 Incorporated in this RFP, and attached as Attachment A, is a document entitled "Administrative Rules Governing Requests for Proposals. Prospective service providers shall comply with these rules in the preparation of their proposals.

24.0 MINIMUM CONTRACT TERMS

- 24.1 The contract with the awarded service provider will be signed by the parties on a Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as Attachment B, Minimum Contract Terms.
- 24.2 As part of a prospective service provider's proposal submission, the proposer must sign and submit Attachment C, Vendor's Acceptance of RFP's Minimum Contract Terms or Exceptions to Minimum Contract Terms and indicate either acceptance of Minimum Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment B, or clearly identify exceptions to these Minimum Contract Terms. If exceptions are proposed, then proposer must also submit (i) a red-lined version of Attachment B, that clearly tracks all proposed

changes (additions, deletions, modified language, or new provisions) to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to provide an explanation or rationale for each individual change proposed to the Minimum Contract Terms.

25.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

- 25.1 One copy of each submitted proposal to the AOC in response for this RFP will be retained for official files and will become a public record.
- 25.2 The AOC policy is to follow the intent of the California Public Records Act (PRA). If a vendor's proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under the PRA, the material will be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a vendor is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then it should not include such information in its proposal.
- 25.3 If any information submitted in a vendor's proposal is confidential or proprietary, the vendor must provide that information on pages separate from non-confidential information and clearly label the pages containing confidential information "CONFIDENTIAL."
- 25.4 In addition to labeling each confidential page that meets the exemption requirements of the PRA, the vendor must include the following statement on a separate page, indicating all page numbers that contain confidential or proprietary information:
- The information contained on pages _____ meets the exemption requirements of the California Public Records Act and shall not be duplicated or used in whole or in part for any other purpose than to evaluate the proposal; provided that if a contract is awarded as a result of this proposal, the AOC shall have the right to duplicate, use, or disclose this information to the extent provided in the contract. This restriction does not limit the right of the AOC to use the information contained herein if obtained from another source.*
- 25.5 Proposals containing general restrictive markings that indicate the entire proposal is confidential and/or proprietary (e.g., "Confidential and Proprietary", "For internal use only", "Use or disclosure of any data contained herein is subject to the restrictions set forth...", "Confidential Information", etc.) and that does not meet the specific exemption requirements of the PRA may be deemed by the AOC to be non-responsive and **will not** be reviewed by the Evaluation Team until proposer has removed such general restrictive page markings.

25.6 PROPOSALS WILL BE MAINTAINED IN CONFIDENCE BY THE AOC UNTIL ISSUANCE OF A NOTICE OF CONTRACT AWARD. UPON ISSUANCE OF A NOTICE OF CONTRACT AWARD, ALL PROPOSALS, INCLUDING PROPOSAL INFORMATION LABELED AS CONFIDENTIAL BY A VENDOR, WILL BECOME PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD AND SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT INFORMATION IS PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW.

26.0 DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS

26.1 The State of California Executive Branch requires contract participation goals of a minimum of three percent (3%) for disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBEs). The AOC, as a policy, follows the intent of the Executive Branch program. Therefore, your proposal should demonstrate DVBE compliance; otherwise, if it is impossible for your company to comply, please explain why, and demonstrate written evidence of a “good faith effort” to achieve participation. For further information regarding DVBE resources, please contact the Office of Small Business and DVBE Certification, at 916-375-4940 or access DVBE information on the Executive Branch’s Office of Small Business and DVBE Internet web site at: <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/default.htm>.

26.2 Prospective consultants/service providers must complete the DVBE Participation Form, included as Attachment E to this RFP, and include the signed form with the proposer’s Cost/Fee Proposal for each Project proposed.

27.0 PAYEE DATA RECORD

27.1 The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each vendor it may make payments to, prior to entering into a contract with that vendor.

27.2 As part of a prospective service provider’s proposal submission, the proposer must sign and submit a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form, set forth as Attachment D.

End of Base RFP