

Judicial Performance Evaluation Program
2026 Request for Proposal (RFP) Questions and Answers

Question	Answer
1. Is there a set budget range for the 3-year project?	Proposals will be evaluated based on features and functions and compliance with the RFP requirements.
2. Is there flexibility for the first year to be an instrument update and testing year?	The vendor's implementation plan should reflect recommended timeframes for instrument updates and testing needs.
3. What is the range of case types that circuit and associate judges hear in Illinois?	The Manual on Recordkeeping , Part 1, Section B lists the types of cases heard at the circuit court level by circuit and associate judges in Illinois.
4. Will the evaluation method be required to address performance specific to certain circuit court case types (e.g., civil, probate, juvenile, family) or is the JPE framework applicable across judicial assignments?	The evaluation method is applicable across all case types and judicial assignments.
5. The RFP anticipates survey methods for data collection. Are there additional methodologies that will be permitted and need to be resourced?	A vendor may provide proposed additional data collection methods as part of the response.
6. The RFP indicates attorneys, court personnel and judicial partners shall be surveyed. Are the distribution lists for these group part of the contracted work?	Yes, distribution lists will be made available.
7. What is the contractor role in supporting the judicial feedback process and attending feedback sessions.	Vendor will be responsible for management, coordination, scheduling, and facilitation of meetings and feedback sessions.
8. We have judicial members from Illinois on our non-profit board. What disclosure process will be required.	AOIC cannot respond without knowledge and review of the non-profit board's bylaws.
9. Is AOIC primarily seeking continuity with the existing JPE program, or is the Committee seeking substantive modernization of the evaluation model? a. Specifically, which elements of the current survey, scoring, benchmarking, reporting, and facilitation processes are fixed and what is open to change?	AOIC anticipates that responses will address and include recommendations regarding all areas of the program.
10. Section 8.6 states that the selected vendor may be identified as a "Service Organization" and that the requirements for such can be found in Section 1B of Attachment D, the Standard Vendor Agreement. However, those requirements are not part of Section 1B. Please clarify where we can find the referenced requirements.	The following information will be added to Section 1B of Attachment D upon execution of a Standard Vendor Agreement: Service Organization Report Requirement: Based upon the products and or service(s) to be provided under this Standard Vendor Agreement with the Supreme Court of Illinois, Vendor has been preliminarily identified as a "Service Organization". As such, Vendor agrees to obtain annual Statement of Standards on Attestation Engagements No. 18 (SSAE 18) Service Organization Control (SOC) Reports for the duration of this contract. The reports to be provided should be SOC 1 – Type 2 reports for goods and service(s) relating to the Supreme Court of Illinois's internal control over financial reporting and/or SOC 2 – Type 2 reports for any other products or service(s) contracted hereunder. Vendor agrees to provide these report(s) to the Supreme Court of Illinois within 30 days upon written request. Should any such SOC report not cover the period under audit review and if

	requested by the AOIC, Vendor shall obtain and provide a bridge letter from Vendor's Service Auditor (the firm who prepares a SOC report) to cover the additional time period. All such report(s) referenced herein shall be sent via a secure email transmission. Vendor's SOC reports and bridge letters may be used by the AOIC to address financial and compliance audit requirements from the Illinois Auditor General and their representatives. Confidentiality and Ownership of Data: All information gathered, generated, or compiled during this project and throughout the term of this agreement is considered highly confidential, for exclusive use by the Supreme Court of Illinois, and is not to be reproduced or disseminated. Confidential information includes the documents, workflows, data (system and application), and technical specifications developed, used or migrated during this project. All access (remote and onsite), account credentials, and procedures used or interfacing with the Court's database platform is granted solely for the purpose of this engagement and is not to be shared outside of those directly involved in this project.
11. This section also states that the selected vendor must be willing to obtain and submit annual Service Organization Control (SOC) reports. Please identify the required SOC report type (e.g., SOC 1 or SOC 2; Type I or Type II) and specify when the first report must be submitted.	See Response to Question #10.
12. Section 13 states that certificates of insurance be provided prior to contract execution. Do you want those certificates included in the proposal, provided we can provide them at the time of submission?	Certificates of Insurance will be required upon vendor selection prior to contract execution.
13. Section 13 requires Commercial General Liability, Professional Liability, and Cybersecurity/Data Breach Insurance but does not specify coverage limits. Please provide the minimum required coverage limits for each required policy.	Coverage limits would be based on the contract value.
14. Section 14 states that the proposal must also include Attachment D, Standard Vendor Agreement for Goods and Services. Is the intent to have us return a complete, but unsigned, agreement, or are you looking for an attestation or verification that, if selected, we agree to abide by the terms and conditions of the agreement?	Vendor should provide an agreement or attestation that the terms of the Standard Vendor Agreement will be agreed to and completed.
15. Please define the respondent groups included within the term "judicial partners" and identify the anticipated sources and availability of names and contact information for those respondents.	Judicial partners may include court reporters, technical staff, clerks, administrators, or other personnel who have interacted professionally with the judge. Distribution lists will be made available.
16. Section 3.2 states that a single survey is to be developed for three distinct respondent groups. Given that these groups have different backgrounds and levels of expertise and will likely evaluate the judge through different lenses, can	The proposal should identify a recommended protocol.

the questions differ by stakeholder group, or must all questions be applicable to all respondents?	
17. Will AOIC continue to provide source data identifying selected judges and eligible survey respondents, including available respondent contact information and applicable attorney data, with the contractor responsible for intake, verification, secure maintenance, and administration of those lists?	Distribution lists will be made available.
18. Section 3.4(3) directs contractors to identify low response trends and propose remediation strategies (targeted reminders, communication adjustments, survey design changes) once the survey is live. Given that this is not a new program, would AOIC welcome a proposed development-phase process that includes proactive stakeholder outreach — e.g., soliciting input from prospective respondent groups on their concerns, barriers to participation, and what would increase their willingness to respond— prior to finalizing survey design and distribution? Alternatively, is AOIC's intent to have contractors treat response-rate improvement solely as a mid-cycle/reactive process?	The vendor's implementation plan should include the recommended timeline and activities.
19. Section 4 establishes a three-year contract term, and Section 6.5 requests a proposed implementation timeline. The RFP does not specify a target start date for the first full evaluation cycle or the expected division between program/survey development (including stakeholder input, instrument design, testing, and Committee approval) and ongoing administration. Can AOIC confirm whether proposers may recommend a development phase (such as Year 1) dedicated primarily to survey development, stakeholder input, and testing before full-scale survey administration and data collection begin? Or does AOIC have a specific target date by which the first full cycle of evaluations must be operational?	The vendor's implementation plan should reflect recommended timeframes for instrument updates and testing needs and could include a development phase if the vendor feels that is warranted.
20. For pricing purposes, what annual evaluation volume should proposers assume? Should proposers assume a maximum of approximately 125 judicial evaluations per year, consistent with prior JPE program operations, or does AOIC anticipate a different annual volume under the new contract?	The vendor's implementation plan should reflect recommended evaluation volume and selection activities.
21. Does AOIC or the JPE Committee have an established or preferred benchmarking methodology or comparison framework for individual judicial evaluation reports, or should proposers develop and recommend a benchmarking methodology and comparison groups as part of their technical approach?	The vendor's implementation plan should reflect recommended benchmarking methodology and comparison groups.
22. Section 3.5 requires systematic coding, thematic analysis, and sentiment assessment of qualitative feedback. Does AOIC expect these methods to be applied to all narrative responses for each individual evaluation, as well as to the statewide aggregate analysis, or may proposers recommend an	Vendors may propose an alternative systematic methodology which meets RFPs objectives.

alternative systematic methodology that meets the RFP's objectives?	
23. Should confidential individual evaluation reports continue to include verbatim narrative responses, consistent with the current JPE program, in addition to the narrative feedback summaries required by the RFP?	Yes.
24. Please clarify the respective responsibilities of AOIC and the contractor for identifying potential facilitators, confirming eligibility and continued participation, recruiting or selecting facilitators, maintaining the facilitator pool, and matching or assigning facilitators to evaluated judges.	AOIC is responsible for identifying and recruiting potential facilitators, confirming eligibility, and maintaining the facilitator pool. Vendor is responsible for the remaining facilitator activities.
25. For the requirement to "coordinate confidential meetings between facilitators and judges," does AOIC expect the contractor to schedule individual facilitation meetings, or to make facilitator assignments and monitor completion, while judges and facilitators arrange meeting logistics directly?	Vendor will be responsible for management, coordination, scheduling, and facilitation of meetings and feedback sessions.
26. For the requirement to develop and maintain a secure portal or platform for exchange of data files between AOIC and the contractor, may the contractor use an existing secure file-transfer or collaboration platform that satisfies AOIC security requirements, or does AOIC contemplate a dedicated JPE-specific portal?	Either a dedicated JPE-specific portal or use of an existing secure file-transfer or collaboration platform that satisfy AOIC security requirements would be acceptable.