

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

RFP Title: AB 1032: Workforce Study on Court Interpreters

RFP Number: CFCC-2024-01-TK

October 3, 2024

1. **QUESTION:** Has the Judicial Council worked with any external evaluators for this kind of study, for example for the 2020 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study in the past? If so, is this contractor eligible for rehire/contract renewal for this workforce study?

ANSWER: The AB 1032 workforce study is anticipated to be a one-time study. The 2020 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study was done in-house by Judicial Council staff, as will the 2025 Study. The 2015 Study and some of the prior five-year studies were done by a consultant. Potential vendors are encouraged to bid on this proposal and future study proposals that require a consultant.

2. **QUESTION:** Could the Judicial Council extend the deadline of the proposal given the responses to questions may be available only a few days prior to submission?

ANSWER: Unfortunately, no. This project is on a relatively quick timeframe and must be completed on schedule. Please use the RFP and answers provided herein to prepare your proposal.

3. **QUESTION:** The RFP mentions that the contractor will have access to some existing data on court interpreters so the contractor can identify where additional data collection may be necessary. How comprehensive is the existing data provided by the Judicial Council? Specifically, is there sufficient coverage of key areas such as:

- a. Interpreter workforce numbers and demographic information (Section 2.6.1, 2.6.2)?
- b. Compensation data for court employees and contractors (Section 2.6.3)?
- c. Current interpreter training and recruitment efforts (Section 2.6.4)?

ANSWER:

- a. The council has data on numbers of contractors and employees, and ages of interpreters.
- b. The council has data on pay rates for court interpreter employees and standard/average rates of pay for interpreter contractors.
- c. The council has data on interpreter training and recruitment efforts managed by the council. Other training may require a survey of courts and/or education providers.

4. **QUESTION:** The RFP indicates that the Judicial Council will collaborate with the contractor in identifying stakeholders for participation in interviews and focus groups, as outlined in Section 2.4 and Section 2.6. Is the Judicial Council planning to assist with participant recruitment for interviews and focus groups or will potential sample lists be shared with the contractor?

ANSWER: For interviews and focus groups, the council has email distribution lists for Language Access Representatives (each of the 58 superior courts must have a Language Access Representative), Interpreter Coordinators, Human Resources Contacts, and individual interpreters who are on the Judicial Council Master List of Certified Court and Registered Interpreters. The council can help with facilitation of volunteers for focus groups and/or interviews, or outreach for completion of surveys. See also answer below to Question 18.

5. **QUESTION:** Can the Council provide a range or estimate for the number of court interpreters employed?

ANSWER: Yes. As of July 2024, there are 715 employees and 1,136 independent contractors.

6. **QUESTION:** What types of research or educational support has the Council previously provided to strengthen the experience of court interpreters?

ANSWER: The council has developed extensive educational resources for both aspiring and current court interpreters. These are available on the Language Access Services web page and for credentialed interpreters, through a dedicated Interpreter Learning Portal. For prospective interpreters, there are extensive resources to help prepare them for the required examinations. The council can provide detailed descriptions of its educational resources. As an example of education resources, please visit: <https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/court-interpreters-resources/certified-court-interpreting>

7. **QUESTION:** Has the Council performed previous workforce development studies in other areas? If so, can the Council provide direction where the public reports of those studies live?

ANSWER: We are not aware of a previous workforce study prepared by the Judicial Council within a public report.

8. **QUESTION:** The RFP requests identify itemized costs, with estimated maximum amounts identified in Section 2.15. Will the Council accept amounts differently scoped to what is identified, amounts larger than what is originally proposed?

ANSWER: The total amount available for this project is \$245,000.00. The proposer may suggest different amounts for tasks; however, the total estimated cost must not exceed \$245,000.00.

9. **QUESTION:** The RFP identifies estimated dates by which certain tasks take place. Will the Council accept tasks scoped differently than what is identified, as in extending time to occur after the proposed date?

ANSWER: The proposer may identify suggested date changes to tasks; however, the study must be completed by the date identified in the RFP. Any proposed date changes to tasks must also be realistic for timely completion of the study.

10. **QUESTION:** Does the Council have a history of compensating research participants? If so, at what rates for what types of engagements?

ANSWER: Stipends are sometimes used for study participants, although Language Access Services has not used stipends for volunteer court or interpreter participants. Any stipends paid by the vendor must come out of the overall project budget.

11. **QUESTION:** Does the Council anticipate any in-person meetings with consultants or throughout the research process? If so, approximately how many?

ANSWER: Currently, we meet virtually frequently through MS Teams or Zoom. Yes, we would meet frequently with the consultant (e.g., at least monthly) for a study of this kind. There is not a need for in-person meetings, unless the vendor happens to be in San Francisco or Sacramento and would like to meet in-person.

12. **QUESTION:** What technology platforms has the Council leveraged previously to survey staff internally?

ANSWER: We currently use SurveyMonkey, Qualtrics, and MS Forms for surveys.

13. **QUESTION:** What platform does the Council leverage for internal data share? (e.g. Microsoft Teams; Google Drive; etc.)

ANSWER: Key data sharing platforms and applications used by the council include Box, Google Drive, OneDrive, and a dedicated agency-wide network storage repository, which features a private intranet network. Applications which facilitate instant data sharing include Microsoft Outlook, Teams, SharePoint, and OneNote. For internal data collection and sharing, we utilize MS Access and Excel, while Adobe Secure Share is employed for disseminating secure PDF documents. Additionally, Tableau and Power BI are used for data visualization and online/web-reporting.

14. **QUESTION:** Is there a preferred software for data visualization, as editable versions are required?

ANSWER: We currently use Excel, Power BI and Tableau for data visualization.

15. **QUESTION:** Does the council currently use Tableau, Power BI, or any specific data visualization software?

ANSWER: See answer above to Question 14.

16. **QUESTION:** What is the total/approximate number of (a) court interpreters registered with CA state courts and (b) court staff?

ANSWER: See answer to Question 5 above for numbers of interpreters. The California court system has approximately 18,000 court employees. This includes judicial officers and other court staff.

17. **QUESTION:** Can you share examples of existing data sources that are available?

ANSWER: Reports issued by Language Access Services are available here:

<https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/about/studies-and-reports>.

The most recent Language Access Metrics Report (Spring 2024) is located here:

<https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2024-04/lap-metrics-report-2024-spring.pdf>

The most helpful reports are likely to be the Metrics Reports and past Language Need and Interpreter Use Studies, especially the most recent 2020 Study. Language Access Services is in the process of preparing the 2025 Study (which is due by July 1, 2025), and data from that study can be shared with the vendor for this project, as appropriate.

18. **QUESTION:** Can you share an approximate number of organizations for stakeholder outreach?

ANSWER: There are a handful of interpreter organizations: California Federation of Interpreters (CFI), Association of Independent Judicial Interpreters of California (AIJIC), and American Alliance of Professional Translators and Interpreters (AAPTI). Other stakeholders may include the State Bar of California, specific state bar member groups (e.g., public defenders and district attorneys), and legal services organizations. The council can assist with identification of stakeholders to include for input.

19. **QUESTION:** Is the data available from the Judicial Council-owned databases clean, or will it require data cleaning?

ANSWER: This depends on the fiscal year. Data regarding court interpreters prior to FY 2023-24 is clean, while data for FY 2023-24 is currently being reviewed and cleaned.

20. **QUESTION:** For how many fiscal years is the data from the Judicial Council available for this project?

ANSWER: We have data on court interpreters for the past several years. However, the data for this study project will primarily focus on the most recent three to five fiscal years, as available. Language Access Services also has data on aspiring interpreters who have recently taken the Bilingual Interpreting Examination (BIE) for certified interpreter status.

21. **QUESTION:** Is there a requirement for any of the data collection efforts (e.g., interviews, focus groups) to be conducted in person, or is it anticipated that these will happen virtually?

ANSWER: Virtual interviews and focus groups are fine. As noted, we routinely use MS Teams and Zoom for virtual communications with council staff, courts and consultants.