

**Office of Statewide Pretrial Services
Pretrial Case Management System RFP
Questions and Answers**

As questions regarding the RFP are received they will be posted here. All questions are due by April 15, 2022 and will be posted no later than April 22, 2022.

1. RFP – pages 1-2 – Directions – Sections have a numbering error I, II, III, IV, V, VII, IX, X

The important thing is to have all the sections that are requested and by the titles that are used – numbering can either be as listed here or in sequence 1-8

2. RFP Page 5, top paragraph: The RFP states “up to 350 concurrent users”. Can the OSPS provide the total users for the following categories:
 - a) Full System Users – any user that requires Add, Edit, Delete, Modify permissions, including generating reports.
 - b) Read-Only Users – Only requires the ability to Read/View Data in the system. Cannot run or generate reports.

It is important that the selected vendor is able to scale the CMS to meet the user needs of OSPS. As identified in the RFP, counties (users) will be migrated to the CMS over time, so OSPS expects the user count will increase (i.e., in the first year their might only be 100-150 full system users, in addition to 100-150 read only users, but this will build over time). Our best estimates are that the CMS needs to handle 350 concurrent Full System Users and 350 Read-only Users by the end of the term of this contract.

3. In Attachment F – OSPS Pretrial CMS System Requirements, the values provided in column E do not match the answer key provided in the instructions tab and in the Pretrial RFP PDF. Can the OSPS please provide an updated Attachment F?

This was updated on the website to remove those values.

4. Attachment F, System Description Tab, A3: “*The Implementation plan will also include roll-out of the CMS and training on the use of the CMS to all end users.*” Does the OSPS prefer full vendor-led End User Training, or vendor-led Train the Trainer.

The OSPS wishes to see what the vendor suggests as the best way to train end users on their product, based upon their experience. Video and online user training are very good ideas. In addition, there may be instances where in-person vendor-led training is a better alternative. It is important that the vendor identifies a training plan, including options and any related costs in their proposal.

5. Attachment F, System Description tab, B7 reads: “Allow the agency to define system workflow including business rules.” Can you provide specific examples of workflows that are required?

The following is an example ideal workflow. This is not all encompassing but provides an idea of the type of functionality we would like the CMS to have.

- The CMS would accept secure communication from appropriate jails, indicating a person had been arrested and is in need of a pretrial bond report.
- This would populate a portion of the CMS notifying OSPS staff that an investigation needs to be completed.
- An OSPS Supervisor would assign this investigation to a Pretrial Officer within the system.
- The Pretrial Officer would interview the defendant and then enter all information into the CMS:

- Interview information, including verification information
 - Risk assessment factors that would be scored automatically in the CMS
 - Criminal history information
 - All of this information would populate a Pretrial Bond Report within the CMS
 - The Pretrial Bond Report would be completed within the CMS
 - The Pretrial Bond Report would be emailed (transferred electronically) to the Judge, State's Attorney, Public Defender, etc. via the CMS
 - Record of this would be stored in the CMS
 - The CMS would record information about the initial court appearance
 - The Supervising Pretrial Officer would manage all aspects of the pretrial case within the CMS
 - i.e. case notes, drug tests, referrals to services, court dates, appointments, etc.
 - The CMS would offer two way communication between the Pretrial Officer and defendant
 - This would be recorded in the CMS
 - The CMS would provide electronic (text, email, etc.) court date and appointment reminders
 - The CMS would fully integrate with the Pretrial Data Set provided in the RFP
6. Attachment F, Integration Tab, L4 – *“Provide support for all existing external interfaces.”* Can the OSPS please provide a list of all required interfaces as well as the data to be exchanged, outbound, inbound, bi-directional, and any available specifications for the desired interfaces?

As identified in the RFP, the selected vendor and CMS needs to be able to support integrations and interfaces with other systems. For example, an integration is expected to the Court's online reporting system and may also include integrations with other systems of record. Until OSPS selects a CMS and works with that vendor on the data elements in their CMS, details of the data exchanges from other systems are premature. The expectation is that the selected vendor / CMS will have the resources to timely develop integrations and interfaces to exchange data with other systems.

7. Attachment F, Integration Tab, L10 – *“Ability to migrate/convert data from existing local Probation system (with option to archive closed files) in the new system.”* Can the OSPS please provide the details of the source systems to converted, including the number of systems for conversion, the name of the systems, amount of data, file layouts, etc.?

The selected vendor is expected to have resources and expertise in migrating data from other systems into the central CMS. Existing Probation / Pretrial systems are both commercial and in-house developed. However, the data that would need to be migrated is dependent on the central CMS' / database structure. The details of this work would be something planned with the selected vendor and OSPS during implementation.

8. Attachment F, Supervision Tab, AAA6: *“Electronically receive accounting data from an external agency (e.g., individual Circuit Clerk's Office).”* Will the State provide the number of external accounting systems needed to interface with, preferred file format, and whether the interface is uni-directional or bi-directional?

The details of the data to be exchanged with external agencies is dependent upon the data fields and capabilities of the selected pretrial CMS. OSPS expects to work with the selected vendor to plan and detail the integrations, interfaces, and data exchanges after a vendor is selected and the CMS capabilities are known.

9. Will the state consider a stand-alone or packaged solution with the case management system that can be used for investigations and provide federated queries from disparate databases? Examples include NCIC, Illinois Criminal History Databases, Sex Offender Registries, Motor Vehicle systems, etc.
- a. If so, will the state provide a list of data sources queried by Pretrial Services Officers during investigations?

OSPS is happy to consider value-add options for the CMS.

OSPS will routinely use: NCIC/LEADS, Illinois Department of Motor Vehicles, local circuit court records (i.e. Judici, etc.), other local criminal history information from states outside Illinois, etc.

10. Does OSPS wish to have data separated and viewable only by employees of a specific region, with upper management being the only entity to see the all the data from the entire state?

OSPS wishes to have the ability to create roles in the CMS and assign permissions to different users. For example, the Director and upper management would likely have access to all statewide data. However, front line staff might only have access to more basic information related to defendants (such as their criminal history, history on pretrial supervision, demographics, etc.)

11. What would roll out of CMS look like along with OSPS roll out? Would there be pilot sites for the CMS?

OSPS will begin to roll out operations in July of 2022 with a goal of having all OSPS counties (currently 66) operational by 1.1.23. We anticipate the CMS roll out will not start after the OSPS roll out. OSPS wishes to have the vendor address the best form of implementation in their submission, whether phased or not.

12. Pricing/data conversions/interfaces – Does OSPS want pricing or just to know the CMS has the capability?

Please provide additional explanation so we can better understand this question.

13. Will the State consider a minimum 2-week extension on the RFP due date since it is a one-week turnaround from the questions and answer return and for further analysis by the State for requested documentation from the vendor call?

We will extend the final submission date to 5.6.22. If additional time is needed it will be discussed when the final submission date is closer.

14. Will OSPS use one pretrial risk assessment tool or a variety of tools?

OSPS is currently working with Justice System Partners (JSP) to develop an Illinois-specific pretrial assessment. It is expected to be ready to pilot sometime between July of 2022 and January of 2023. In the interim OSPS will use the VPRAI-R. OSPS also will likely use the ODARA. It is also possible OSPS will use other ancillary tools. (Additional information – other pretrial services programs in Illinois use other tools such as the Ohio risk assessment or the PSA.)

15. What data requirements to be measuring? Would there be requirements of the state/counties? Will we be using Measuring What Matters? Other?

Please see the RFP attachment “Pretrial Data Set”. This data set was created by state and national experts in addition to the AOIC’s Pretrial Practice Data Oversight Board. NIC’s Measuring What Matters was used (in addition to other sources) to form this data set and such measures will likely be used in our data analysis efforts.

16. Regarding Attachment F – Security and Data Integrity Tab – G2 (Line 44) – “Provide constraints to avoid duplicate records (i.e., entering the same defendant, the same investigation, the same restitution transaction, etc.). Prompt user with a warning and allow override capability.”

Question: This requirement seems to imply that restitution transactions should occur within the system. Is it the expectation of OSPS that payments for restitution, fees, fines be made from within the application or will payments be made using the Circuit Clerks CMS and this information is then passed to the Pretrial CMS as part of an integration with the Circuit Clerks systems (see requirements TT7, AAA6)?

OSPS staff will not be collecting money from defendants. Payments will be made through the Circuit Clerk's CMS. The OSPS CMS should have the ability to record payment information (i.e., how much money was the defendant ordered to pay for pretrial supervision, drug testing, electronic monitoring, restitution, fees, etc. and how much was paid on these fees) either from manual entry or ideally from integration with the Clerk's CMS. The ability to have a payment plan within the OSPS CMS as referred to in TT7 is a mandatory requirement.

17. Regarding Attachment F – General Case Work Tab – Q10 – “Provide the capability to assign a caseload by risk level (i.e., low-risk cases are assigned to a casebank system with the ability to group all cases for subsequent review).”

Question: Can you provide additional details about what a casebank system is? Is this a separate system outside of the CMS?

It is not a separate system outside of the CMS. A “casebank” or “banked caseload” is a supervisory practice where like cases are grouped to form a caseload. The most common example of this is taking all clients who score low risk on an assessment and put them on a strictly low-risk caseload.

18. Is it possible to get a recording of the March 29th meeting, any list of questions and answers that were addressed, and copies of any presentations that were shared or distributed, if available?

A recording of the March 29th meeting was not made. A list of questions/answers and the PowerPoint slides from the presentation are available on the RFP website.

19. The current timeline has answers to questions being published on April 22, and proposals due one week later on April 29th. This does not give much time for vendors to modify and update proposal responses and pricing based on the answers. Would it be possible to move the proposal due date out two weeks to May 13th to give sufficient time for all vendors to incorporate the changes that typically come from answers?

We will extend the final submission date to 5.6.22. If additional time is needed it will be discussed when the final submission date is closer.