



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

REGARDING:

ADDENDUM 1

2015 LANGUAGE NEED AND INTERPRETER USE STUDY

RFP # CLASP LNS2015

PROPOSALS DUE:

~~OCTOBER 31, 2013~~ **NOVEMBER 4, 2013** NO LATER THAN 3:00
P.M. PACIFIC TIME

This Addendum 1 hereby modifies the RFP as follow:

- 1. Deletions in the RFP and Attachment 2 Terms and Conditions are shown in strikethrough font (~~strikethrough font~~); insertions are shown in bold underlined font (**bold underlined font**). Paragraph numbers refer to the numbers in the original RFP.**
- 2. The following changes are made to the RFP:**

2.5 Statewide data will be collected using information captured in CIDCS and other independent data systems used by individual trial courts. Data elements not captured in the various systems may be obtained through other methodologies, including but not limited to: interviews and focus groups with court staff from a sample of courts, a statewide survey, or review of court files.¹ ~~Approximately 70%–80% of the courts use CIDCS but courts that use the greatest number of interpreters do not use CIDCS and will require other methods for extracting or gathering the data.~~ **Many courts that use the greatest number of interpreters do not use CIDCS or only enter a limited number of data elements into CIDCS, which will require other methods for extracting or gathering the needed data.** Additionally, CIDCS does not capture data for interpretations occurring in civil proceedings such as general civil, small claims, and unlawful detainers. While court staff or judicial officers may be available to participate in interviews or focus groups, the contractor ~~may~~ **should** not expect or rely on the use of court personnel to actually gather data and/or conduct the study activities.

*[The remainder of this page intentionally left blank
so as to properly display the change to the footnote]*

¹ **Many of the courts that use CIDCS do not enter all interpretive assignments or the variables describing them (language, case type, and session type). Additionally, courts vary in their use of what was intended to be standardized codes and coding practices.** ~~Almost half of the state's service days occur in Los Angeles and Orange county courts, which do not use CIDCS. The 49 courts that use CIDCS do not enter all interpretive assignments or the variables describing them (language, case type, and session type). Additionally, courts vary in their use of what was intended to be standardized codes and coding practices.~~

- 2.7.1.** Perform the following tasks and provide the associated Deliverable pertaining to the development of a methodology to determine spoken language need and interpreter use on a regional and statewide basis in California state courts:

Deliverable #1: Contractor to prepare a written report detailing data collection methods and to meet with CLASP staff to discuss proposed data collection protocols for the following: assessment of spoken language interpreter use in court proceedings, including criminal proceedings, delinquency proceedings, dependency proceedings, and specified family law cases— domestic violence proceedings (including elder abuse), paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought on a regional and statewide basis, and assessment of the use of spoken language interpreters in other civil proceedings (data collection to be conducted in a limited number of sample courts across regions).

Due date: ~~December 31, 2013~~ Within 30 days of the contract start date. [Actual date to be inserted in final contract].

2.10. Progress Reports

The Contractor shall submit monthly progress reports to the Project ~~Lead~~Manager, describing work performed, work status, issues encountered, remedial actions, and statement of activity anticipated subsequent to reporting period for approval prior to payment of invoices.

3. TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

3.1. The following list of key events related to this RFP was developed. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	DATE
RFP issued	October 1, 2013
Deadline for questions	October 21, 2013 9:00 am Pacific Time
Questions and answers posted (<i>estimate only</i>)	October 23, 2013 <u>October 28, 2013</u>
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	October 31, 2013 <u>November 4, 2013</u> 3:00 pm Pacific Time
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 12, 2013— November 18, 2013 <u>November 6, 2013 – November 15, 2013</u>
Anticipated interview dates (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 7, 2013— November 8, 2013 <u>Week of November 18, 2013</u>
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 22, 2013
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 23, 2013 – November 30, 2013
Contract start date (<i>estimate only</i>)	December 1, 2013
Contract end date (<i>estimate only</i>)	April 30, 2015

3. The following change is made to Attachment 2, Terms and Conditions, Exhibit D, Work To Be Performed:

2. Deliverables

- A. The Contractor shall perform the following tasks and provide the associated Deliverable pertaining to the development of a methodology to determine spoken language need and interpreter use on a regional and statewide basis in California state courts:

Deliverable #1: Contractor to prepare a written report detailing data collection methods and to meet with CLASP staff to discuss proposed data collection protocols (and alternatives) for the following: assessment of spoken language interpreter use in mandated proceedings (including felony and misdemeanor criminal proceedings, delinquency proceedings, domestic violence proceedings, and dependency proceedings) on a regional and statewide basis and assessment of the incidental use of spoken language interpreters in non-mandated (civil) proceedings (data collection to be conducted in a limited number of sample courts across regions).

Due date: ~~December 31, 2013 (estimated)~~ Within 30 days of the contract start date. [Actual date to be inserted in final contract].

END OF ADDENDUM 1