

OCA-DGCP-044 NYS Multi-Site Mental Health Screening and Assessment Tool

Questions and Responses

The New York State Unified Court System (UCS) thanks the vendors that submitted the questions below concerning OCA-DGCP-044 NYS Multi-Site Mental Health Screening and Assessment Tool, issued on May 13, 2025.

Below are responses to the questions UCS received in connection with this RFP.

Vendor # 1

Question:

We are interested in the RFP from a potentially unique perspective and were wondering whether our proposal would be of interest to NYS. Our thought is to work with partner organizations to create (or augment existing tools) an assessment that would meet the RFP requirements while concurrently building the assessment tool into our platform so that it could be readily disseminated across the state while tracking effective administration of the assessment. We believe that this novel application of technology would overcome many existing barriers to implementation of a new assessment that exist when training across geographical and socioeconomic domains.

Alternatively, we have experience developing consumer facing interactive tools that could be used to administer the assessment to individuals involved in the justice system. This would materialize in the form of virtual assessors that can administer and score assessments, leading to a highly consistent and accurate assessment tool that would help reduce costs and increase reliability of assessment administration.

In either case, both applications would allow for easy data tracking to help identify trends in assessment data and allocation of training resources.

Our partners would have the relevant experience designing and validating assessment tools. The main point we are interested in is whether the novel application of training and assessment administration would be relevant to the current RFP.

UCS Response:

All eligible applicants who meet the criteria in the Minimum Qualifications in Article IV are encouraged to apply. **No, we do not intend to utilize technology to provide**

training and assessment. The funding is designated for agency staff to work collaboratively with the pilot MHC sites as outlined in the RFP.

Vendor # 2

Question:

Is the awarded contractor allowed to subcontract key components (e.g., technical development, training)?

UCS Response:

Any plans to subcontract awarded funds must be clearly outlined in the proposer's staffing plans, as detailed in Section C of the RFP. All subcontracting arrangements are subject to UCS review and approval.

Question:

Will UCS provide existing data or screening templates to guide tool development?

UCS Response:

UCS will provide existing data or screening templates - such as the Criminal Court Assessment Tool (CCAT), Drug Court Assessment Tool (DCAT), and the New York State (NYS) Screener – to guide the development of this tool.

Question:

Is a proprietary tool permitted if it is licensed for government use?

UCS Response:

A proprietary tool is eligible if it is customizable by UCS, complies with the requirements of Exhibit 6 (Appendix B), and can be integrated into the UCS's existing Universal Case Management System by UCS's in-house technology team. At minimum, UCS must have an exclusive, perpetual, royalty-free, fully-paid, irrevocable, worldwide, transferable license to use, reproduce and distribute, create distributive works of, and commercialize the tool to the fullest extent

permissible and effective under applicable law. The UCS's intention is to develop its own screening tool to be integrated into the existing court system's Universal Case Management System.

Question:

Are New York State-based subcontractors preferred or required?

UCS Response:

New York State-based subcontractors are not preferred or required.

Question:

Can digital components of the tool be developed using off-the-shelf solutions (e.g., REDCap), or must the system be custom-built?

UCS Response:

Off-the-shelf solutions may be used, provided that the final product is the sole property of the New York State Unified Court System and complies with the licensing requirements in Exhibit 6 (Appendix B).

Question:

Is direct experience with UCMS-TSM integration mandatory, or can the awarded contractor collaborate with UCS technical staff to implement this component?

UCS Response:

Direct experience with UCMS-TSM integration is not mandatory or necessary. UCS technical staff will implement this component based off the tool developed by the awarded contractor.

Vendor # 3

Question:

Are you or anyone available for questions to see if we should be working toward submitting for this?

UCS Response:

All questions for OCA-DGCP-044 NYS Multi-Site Mental Health Screening and Assessment Tool were to be submitted in writing by Tuesday, 5/27/2025 at 2:00pm.

However, pursuant to Amendment # 1, UCS has created a follow-up question period. Final questions are due by 6/27/25 at 2:00pm in writing to the designated bid contact articulated in the RFP.

Vendor # 4

Question:

Will the State provide a UX designer for the customization of the app, e.g., 'logo' for the app in the online app stores, design of any customized icons/art within the app, etc.?

UCS Response:

No, this tool will only be accessed by court employees utilizing the court system's Universal Case Management System.

Question:

Will the app be launched using the State's government cloud?

UCS Response:

No, the tool will not be launched using the State's government cloud.

Question:

Is it accurate that since the solution would be part of the legal court system process, individual consent, similar to what is required in the health care sector, would not be legally required?

UCS Response:

No, individual consent is still required.

Question:

Are there any certification requirements that would be needed prior to going into production, e.g., HIPAA, ISO, SOC-2, etc.?

UCS Response:

No, there are no certification requirements needed prior to going into production.

Question:

Is there a data residency requirement? Does the data have to stay within the state of NY?

UCS Response:

Yes, the data will stay within the court system's environment. The data will reside within the court system's Universal Case Management System. We do not expect that the Awarded Contractor will have access to any court user data.

Question:

Who is responsible for the cyber-security for the overall data?

UCS Response:

The court system will be responsible for the cybersecurity of all data housed within its case management system.

Vendor # 5

Question:

The RFP mentions six pilot sites (pages 5 and 8) but Exhibit 2 (page 22) lists only five. Could you confirm the number of sites we should plan for?

UCS Response:

The number of sites will be determined based upon sample size requirements needed to obtain representative data. A minimum of six MHC pilot sites will be included.

Question:

The applicant is required to submit proof of insurance with the application. If we are including a subcontractor, would they also be required to submit proof of insurance with the application?

UCS Response:

Proof of insurance for subcontractors is not required at the time of application, but UCS may request insurance from subcontractors upon award.

Vendor # 6

Question:

Based on past experience piloting new initiatives in NYS problem-solving courts, this effort will require several months of relationship-building and engagement with the sites. Even with our plan to begin outreach and establishing buy-in while the tool is in development, the six-month timeline to develop and implement the new tool is very tight and will likely face delays. Further, the evaluation will require sufficient time to (a) reach an adequate sample size of assessed individuals to support the required statistical analyses (including for subgroups—e.g., those in rural courts, women, those with specific diagnoses) and (b) allow for a 12-month post-assessment follow-up period to track recidivism for all assessed individuals. Given the 2023 statewide mental health court caseloads (2023 is the most recent year for which the applicants have data available), achieving adequate sample sizes will be challenging. Given these concerns, would OCA consider an application with a slightly extended timeline? For instance, given the 2023 caseloads, we anticipate that a four-year project period would enable us to successfully implement the new tool in enough sites to conduct a 12-month post-assessment recidivism analysis with a sufficient sample of assessed individuals. (A 12-month post-program recidivism analysis would require additional time.)

UCS Response:

At this time, OCA will not consider applications with an extended timeline.

Question:

Can OCA provide an enrollment breakdown of 2024 enrollment in each of the state's mental health courts?

UCS Response:

This information is not available at this time.

Question:

What role will OCA play in requesting and securing criminal history and recidivism data from DCJS? Will OCA work with DCJS and the grantee to facilitate and expedite such data requests if needed? Does OCA have recent experience doing so, and might you be able to suggest how long such requests will take DCJS to fulfill?

UCS Response:

OCA has experience working with DCJS; however, we are not able to expedite requests. We will work with the grantee to facilitate recidivism data requests from DCJS if needed but the timeline for fulfilling such requests will be determined by DCJS based on their internal workload.

Question:

Are there other outcomes beyond recidivism that OCA is already tracking?

UCS Response:

OCA is currently tracking discharge and completion status.

Question:

Does OCA have a specific target recidivism period they would like the grantee to examine or is it up to the grantee to decide based on the project timeline?

UCS Response:

The bidder's submission must contain a project timeline that includes the proposed targeted recidivism period as outlined in the RFP as amended. This timeline will be reviewed by UCS and, upon award, may be revised in collaboration with the awarded contractor, if deemed necessary by UCS.

Question:

For MHC programs that take a year or more to complete, the three-year timeline means it is unlikely that there will be any post-program time accumulated for anyone other than those who are terminated early (who will likely have an increased risk of recidivism). At what point does OCA want the recidivism period to start: Once assessment is completed (i.e., track recidivism for a period of time while they are in program) or once the participants have left the program (which could cause timelines to be an issue)?

UCS Response:

The recidivism period should begin once the assessment is completed.

Question:

Is the instrument intended to be administered strictly by clinicians to make diagnoses and develop treatment plans? Or is the instrument intended to be used as a screening tool to flag potential candidates for fuller diagnostic interviews?

UCS Response:

It is intended to be used as a screening tool to flag potential candidates for fuller diagnostic interviews and to identify areas of need to inform the development of a case management plan.

Question:

At what point (e.g., identifying potential candidates for mental health court, intake to mental health court) is the instrument intended to be used?

UCS Response:

The instrument is intended to be used at referral and intake to mental health court.

Vendor # 7

Question:

Given the delivery of a hard copy - is UPS or Fed Ex preferred for court deliveries?

UCS Response:

We do not have a preferred delivery method for applications, but all applications must arrive on the due date no later than 2 p.m.