

MINNESOTA JUDICIAL BRANCH

OFFICE OF LAWYERS PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

LAWYER DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (LDMS)

I. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

- A. Defined. The State of Minnesota Judicial Branch – Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility (OLPR) is using a competitive selection process (referred to herein as the “Request for Proposals” or “RFP”) to select the vendor responsible for the detailed design, development, and implementation of a Case Management Software System that will replace the current OLPR application and that will require minimal maintenance. This is not a bid, but a Request for Proposals that could become the basis for negotiations leading to a contract with a designated vendor to provide system analysis, design, and implementation services described in this document.
- B. Right to Cancel. The OLPR is not obligated to respond to any proposal submitted, nor is it legally bound in any manner whatsoever by the submission of a proposal. The OLPR reserves the right to cancel or withdraw the request for proposals at any time if it is considered to be in its best interest. In the event the request for proposals is cancelled or withdrawn for any reason, the OLPR shall not have any liability to any proposer for any costs or expenses incurred in conjunction with this request for proposals or otherwise. The OLPR also reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, or parts of proposals, to waive any informalities therein, and to extend proposal due dates.

II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

- A. The Minnesota Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility (OLPR) is an agency of the Minnesota Supreme Court established to handle complaints of unprofessional conduct against Minnesota lawyers. It is funded by the annual license fees paid by Minnesota lawyers. OLPR investigates complaints against attorneys. In addition, the OLPR also does a substantial amount of Continuing Legal Education for lawyers in the area of Professional Responsibility and Legal Ethics. The Director is appointed by the Supreme Court. The office has 12 attorneys, including its Director who is appointed by the Court, 5.5 paralegals, one office administrator, 10 support staff, and one law clerk. For more information visit the OLPR website at <http://lprb.mncourts.gov/Pages/Default.aspx>

- B. The OLPR uses an internal system called Attorney Discipline Record System (ADRS) to track complainants, respondents, complaints, and many other items. This system is about 20 years old and the OLPR desires to develop a new application to replace and enhance the current ADRS system functionality and to move toward a more paperless process.
- C. **Background.** The Minnesota Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility (OLPR) uses an internal system called Attorney Discipline Record System (ADRS) to track complaints, complainants, respondents, and many other items related to the disciplinary process. This system is about 20 years old and OLPR would like to develop a new application to replace and enhance the ADRS system functionality.

After a thorough design and analysis project, which included interviews, workflow documentation, and working whiteboard sessions, this specification document for a new Case Management Software System was created. The analysis identified the following pain points with the current system which need to be addressed in a new system:

- Limited search capabilities
- Difficult to track current status of a case
- Lack of real-time reporting
- Difficult to pull statistical details
- Non-intuitive, out of date icons and user interface
- Many items being tracked in Microsoft Access databases because ADRS doesn't provide the functionality, such as:
 - Probation
 - Rule 5.8
 - Paralegal Case List
 - Trust Account Overdrafts
 - Judgment and Collections
 - Conditional Admission
 - Admonition Index
 - Trust Accounts
 - Random Urine Analysis
 - Miscellaneous
- Not able to work efficiently within the system by having multiple windows open at one time
- Calendaring/task tracking done manually in Outlook
- Case related documents not linked in system

Based on the identification of the current pain points, the new system should implement the following main concepts to make the case management processes more effective and efficient:

Home Screen - that will show each user information that is immediately relevant to him or her. The home screen will be flexible and extendable so it can grow with changing business needs and practices in the future. The new Home Screen will include things like:

- Alerts
- Assigned tasks
- Current cases
- Key performance metrics
- Recent documents
- Search
- Action Bar

Information will be driven to the user based on individual use of the system and on their role.

“Paperless First” Design – The system will be built to support a future “electronic legal records” paradigm that is becoming more the norm with each passing day. All case data and documentation will reside in the system by default.

Eliminate Data Silos – currently many users rely on a number of external data silos and tools to effectively manage their workloads. The new system will pull all these external tools into the core system, all case-related data and functionality reside in one place.

Electronic Workflows –All case-related workflows will be managed electronically within the system including all case tracking and related task tracking.

Integrated Documentation – All letters and documentation associated with a case will be linked to the case within the system.

Robust, Modern Search – Users will be able to search broadly for information in the system based on a number of case attributes such as respondent or complainant first name or last name, location, case number, law firm, etc.

Records Management –Rules will manage records retention in the system. Based on these rules and attorney input the system will automatically purge electronic records on a set schedule.

Robust, Real-Time Reporting – Reporting in the new Case Management System will include the following capabilities:

- On Demand Reports

- Scheduled Reports
- Key Performance Metrics
- Dashboards

Customizable – users will be able to set preferences in the system to tailor an experience that suits each user best for items such as email alerts, reporting, dashboards, and home page displays.

The future state of the new system will provide users with a seamless experience providing real time information to case data at all stages of the process.

1. A Day in the Life

To illustrate how the new system would be used, the following “Day in the Life” scenario of OLPR employees using the future system to coordinate a simple Summary Dismissal (SD) case would look something like this:

The receptionist enters new complaints into the system as they arrive. He or she easily scans the original documents into the Case Management System to attach them to the new complaint.

The Duty Attorney receives email notifications as the new complaints are created in the system. He or she reviews the list of new Complaints on the “Complaint Review” screen in the system. The Duty Attorney opens them one at a time, reviews any attached electronic documentation, codes them, and saves the updates which clears them from the Complaints Review queue. As a new Summary Dismissal (SD) case is created email alerts immediately go out to Word Processing to start creating the needed documents.

Word Processing receives the task alert to create the SD document for the case. The document is drafted and a series of notification prompts the Word Processing Supervisor and Duty Attorney to review and edit the document before it is finalized.

The First Assistant Director receives a task notification to sign the new SD document for the case. He goes into the Case Management System, opens the task, opens the document from the task and reviews it. If it looks good he applies his eSignature and saves the document back to the system.

The Mail Clerk receives a task notification to send out the SD document. She prints the document and complaint, creates the mailings, and sends them out. She marks the Mail Items task as complete, and the case is marked as closed in the Case Management System.

The new system will provide OLPR staff with efficient workflows that are managed through the system. Individuals within the office will be focused on value added tasks rather than on administrative tasks that can be managed via the system.

The balance of the ADRS System Requirements and Specifications document provides detailed descriptions of High Level Design Specifications, Operational Scenarios, Case Processing Workflows, User Stories, Preliminary Screen Examples, an Entity Diagram, and a High Level Process Flow which will be the guide in developing a new system which will serve the needs of OLPR today and well into the future. Appendix I.

III. PROJECT GOAL

- A. The OLPR is seeking proposals from vendors to complete detailed design, programming, testing, documentation and implementation of a Case Management System and conversion of all information contained in existing databases. Implementation will include training for users and training for system operation.
- B. Technical requirements should include a web-based application, compatibility with Windows 2012, SQL 2012 and SharePoint 2013.

IV. PROJECT DELIVERABLES

A. Based on the pain points reported when using the current system, other related details and the desired future state for processing, a new application is being envisioned that would include the following primary design concepts:

1. **Home Screen** - When a user logs into the new system they will immediately be greeted by a new personalized “Home Screen” that will show them information that is immediately relevant to them. This is intended to give all users quick access to the data and processes that are most important to them and their role in the overall process. The new Home Screen will include things like:

Alerts – real time informational messages from the system about events that I care about. I can dismiss the alerts or forward them to another user.

Assigned tasks – tasks that have been assigned to me upon which I need to take action. I can view my tasks from here, perform the required action, and close the task.

Current cases – case data that is assigned to me or that I have recently viewed or updated. I can view full case file information from here and make data updates.

Key performance metrics – data points that illustrate team or individual performance metrics. This helps me track day to day how I am doing on my most important performance goals.

Recent documents – quick list of documents that I’ve recently viewed or updated. This allows me quick access to those documents.

Search – users will be able to kick off broad searches directly from the home screen

Action Bar – users will have access to personalized buttons that give them shortcuts to the actions they perform the most often in the system.

Other – other home screen tools will likely be identified over time and can be added to a list of options to customize the Home Screen by role or user. The home screen will be flexible and extendable so it can grow with changing business needs and practices in the future.

Information will be driven to the user based on individual use of the system, and also based on their role. So word processors would potentially see document related history and assignments highlighted on the Home Screen whereas attorneys would see their case list highlighted on the home screen. See the Home Screen wireframe below for more information and examples.

2. **“Paperless First” Design** – The system will be built to support a future “electronic legal records” paradigm that is becoming more the norm with each passing day. All file/case data and documentation will live in ADRS by default. All interaction with case data and documentation will be electronic by

default. Supplemental documentation that comes in paper form will be scanned into ADRS and associated with the case. By default, paper files will not be created for the majority of ADRS cases that come through the system. There will be options in ADRS to print a case file artifacts when it is needed for court appearances or other external events, but this is expected to be the exception not the rule.

3. **Eliminate Data Silos** – currently many users rely on a number of external data silos and tools to effectively manage their ADRS workloads. These data silos include a number of Access databases, Office documents, Outlook calendaring, and a number of printouts and paper tools. The new ADRS would endeavor to pull all these external tools into the core system, so that all ADRS related data and functionality can live in one place. This will help make case management as a whole more transparent, improve reporting capabilities, eliminate dual data entry and other supplemental tasks, and give the organization a “single source of truth” for case management.
4. **Electronic Workflows** – along with eliminating data silos and redundant external tools, the management of all ADRS related workflows will be pulled into the system and managed electronically. This will include the following capabilities:

Tasks – all tasks and to dos will be electronically assigned to users within ADRS. Users will view the tasks in the system, perform the task (normally linked from the task interface) and mark the task as complete in ADRS. The act of marking the task as complete may auto-generate a new task for someone else to perform the next step in the workflow. Paper forms will no longer be required to handle task assignments.

Case Tracking – because all task assignments live electronically in the system, users will be able to check the case in ADRS at any time to see where the process is and who is currently working on tasks for that case. The case and related information will never get “lost” or need to be tracked down.

5. **Integrated Documentation** – All letters and documentation associated with a case will be linked to the case in ADRS. Users will be able to see a list of all linked documentation and open a document from within the electronic case record in ADRS. Users will be able to search for documents based on document content or metadata (like case number, complainant, respondent, etc.).
6. **Robust, Modern Search** – Users will be able to search broadly for information in ADRS based on a number of case attributes such as respondent or complainant first name or last name, location, case number, law firm, etc. Users will be able to drill into and refine search results to focus in on what

they are looking for.

7. **Records Management** – Administrators will be able to set up rules to manage records retention in the system. Attorneys will be prompted by electronic tasks to review and approve files to be disposed or retained. Based on these rules and attorney input the system will automatically purge electronic records on a set schedule. Manual purges of data would not be required.
8. **Robust, Real-Time Reporting** – Reporting in the new ADRS will include the following capabilities:

On Demand Reports – these will display electronically with an option for printing.

Scheduled Reports – these will be scheduled to run (monthly, quarterly, etc.,) and delivered to users via email. The email can include reports attached in PDF or other formats, or with a link to run the report from the system and display it immediately.

Key Performance Metrics – these are data points that illustrate team or individual performance metrics. These metrics will be shown on the Home Screen and other key places in the system.

Dashboards – these are mashup reports in the system that include a number of key performance metrics and reporting data that will paint a picture of some important aspect of the data that is flowing through ADRS.

9. **Customizable** – users will be able to set preferences in the system to tailor an experience that suits them best. This would include things like the following:

Whether or not they receive email notifications along with ADRS system alerts.

The ability to select what tools/widgets are displayed on their Home Screen, and what buttons are displayed on the Home Screen “action bar.”

The ability to sign up for scheduled reporting.

B. Other Deliverables should include:

- Project plan, including milestones, communication plan, issues list, weekly status reports as determined in consultation with project leadership.
- Requirements document establishing the breadth and depth of the project.
- On site, written and in-person training for content contributors.

- Development of service/maintenance agreement and what occurs after the service/maintenance agreement expires.
- C. For further detailed deliverables, refer to “ADRS System Requirements and Specification Document” attached as Appendix I.

V. TRAINING

- A. Create training materials and train on the Case Management System.
- Training for technical staff supporting application
 - Training for business staff to use process
 - Training for content contributors and system Administrator(s).
 - Create a Case Management System overview communication plan.

VI. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS.

- A. **General Requirements** – each response must include the following or it may be excluded from moving through to the next phase of response scoring:
1. **Certificate of Insurance.** Each proposal shall contain acceptable evidence of compliance with the workers' compensation coverage requirements of Minnesota Statute § 176.181, subd. 2. Vendor’s RFP response must include one of the following: (1) a certificate of insurance, or (2) a written order from the Commissioner of Insurance exempting you from insuring your liability for compensation and permitting him to self-insure the liability, or (3) an affidavit certifying that you do not have employees and therefore are exempt pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §§ 176.011, subd. 10; 176.031; and 176.041. *See* Section XVII of the sample State contract in Appendix IV for details on additional insurance requirements that must be provided upon request of the State.
 2. **Affirmative Action Certification.** If the vendor’s proposal exceeds \$100,000.00, the RFP response must include a completed Affirmative Action Statement and Certificate of Compliance, which are attached as Appendix II.
 3. **Non-Collusion Affirmation.** Vendor must complete the Affidavit of Non-Collusion (Appendix III) and include it with its RFP response.
 4. **Contract Terms – acknowledgment of a and b.** The State’s proposed contract templates are set forth in Appendix IV (contract) and Appendix V (subcontractor participation agreement). No work can be started until a contract (and where necessary a subcontractor participation agreement), in the form approved by the State Court Administrator’s Legal Counsel Division, has been signed by all necessary parties in accordance with state

court procurement and contract policies. The templates included in the appendices are sample forms and are not to be interpreted as offers.

- a. By submitting a response to this RFP, Vendor accepts the standard terms and conditions and contract set out in Appendices IV and V, respectively. Much of the language included in the standard terms and conditions and contract reflects requirements of Minnesota law.
- b. Vendors requesting additions or exceptions to the standard terms and conditions or contract terms shall submit them with their response to the RFP. A request must be accompanied by an explanation why the exception is being sought and what specific effect it will have on the Vendor's ability to respond to the RFP or perform the contract. The OLPR reserves the right to address nonmaterial requests for exceptions to the standard terms and conditions and contract language with the highest scoring Vendor during contract negotiation.
- c. The OLPR shall identify any revisions to the standard terms and conditions and contract language in a written addendum issued for this RFP. The addendum will apply to all Vendors submitting a response to this RFP. The OLPR will determine any changes to the standard terms and conditions and/or contract.

5. **Evidence of Financial Stability.** Vendor's RFP must provide evidence of Vendor's financial stability as an indicator of Vendor's ability to provide services irrespective of uneven cash flow. **Financial Stability-Related Trade Secret.** The Minnesota Judicial Branch (MJB) rules of public access permit vendors to submit evidence of financial stability as trade secret information according to the following:

- a. The evidence-of-vendor's-financial-stability must qualify as a trade secret under Minn. Stat. § 325C.01 or as defined in the common law;
- b. The vendor submits the evidence-of-vendor's-financial-stability on a separate document (but as part of their complete submission) and marks the document(s) containing only the evidence-of-vendor's-financial-stability as "confidential;"
- c. The evidence-of-vendor's-financial-stability is not publicly available, already in the possession of the MJB and OLPR, or known to or ascertainable by the MJB and OLPR from third parties.

Except for financial stability information submitted in accordance with this section, do not place any information in your proposal that you do not want revealed to the public. Proposals, once opened, become accessible to the public except for financial stability information submitted in accordance with this section. Please also note that if a Vendor's proposal leads to a contract, the following information will also be accessible to the public: the existence of any resulting contract, the parties to the contract, and the material terms of the contract, including price, projected term and scope of work.

- B. **Project-Related Submission Requirements** - Each response from Vendor must include the following or it may be excluded from moving through to the next phase of response scoring:
1. A cover sheet including Vendor's contact information, email address, business address, and phone numbers. Cover sheet should include signature lines and must be signed by, in the case of an individual, by that individual, and in the case of an individual employed by a firm, by the individual and an individual authorized to bind the firm;
 2. An overview that reflects the Vendor's understanding of the efforts described in this RFP and the project deliverables;
 3. A detailed explanation of how the Vendor proposes to meet the Project objectives and requirements set forth above, including descriptions of the methodology that will be used and examples of the deliverables that will be produced;
 4. A detailed explanation of the terms of the warranty for new development software, including defect management, and enhancement requirements;
 5. Provide a not-to-exceed cost to include identification of the assumptions made and the rationale used to prepare the estimate.;
 6. A description of completed similar projects that demonstrate the Vendor's experience and area of expertise, including Vendor's ability to provide the stated Deliverables;
 7. At least three (3) client references with appropriate contact information that the Vendor has performed work for in the past three (3) years and that can attest to vendor ability to complete work as stated;
 8. A written statement acknowledging either no conflict of interest or identifying any conflicts of interest as it relates to this project;

9. Provide a timeline estimate for the project, including identification of the assumptions made and the rationale used to prepare the time estimate.

C. Pricing, Risk of Loss

1. All prices quoted must be firm and not subject to increase unless otherwise provided for in this RFP. Price reductions must immediately be passed on to the OLPR whenever they become effective. Prices must be quoted in United States currency.
2. Travel, administrative, overhead and other related charges and expenses shall be included in the prices set forth in the proposal.
3. A unit price and a total for the quantity must be stated for each item quoted. In case of an error in the extension or total, the unit price prevails.
4. No more than one unit price may be quoted on any one item unless otherwise provided for in the RFP.
5. DO NOT INCLUDE sales tax in pricing. The State of Minnesota holds Direct Payment Permit 1114 and pays tax directly to the Department of Revenue.
6. The OLPR is relieved of all risks of loss or damage to the equipment during periods of transportation, installation, and during the time the equipment is in possession of the OLPR, unless and until such time as unencumbered title for the goods are vested in the OLPR and the goods are in exclusive possession of the OLPR.

VII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION.

- A. The OLPR will evaluate all complete proposals received by the deadline. Incomplete proposals, late proposals, or proposals sent to any other address will not be considered. In some instances, an interview or demonstration may be part of the evaluation process.
- B. The first part evaluation will be limited strictly to the general submission requirements and project specific requirements as outlined in Section VI, A & B.
- C. The second part evaluation of all proposals shall be based upon deriving the “Best Value” for the OLPR. Best Value means achieving an appropriate balance between price and other factors that are key to a particular procurement. A procurement that obtains a low price but does not include other necessary qualities and features of the desired product or service does not meet the Best Value criterion. Factors upon which the proposals will be judged include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Vendor's industry experience and previous experience in performing similar work;
 2. Thoroughness, quality, specificity, robustness, flexibility of Vendor's approach/methodology;
 3. Cost estimate;
 4. Vendor's product and/or service delivery methodology;
 5. Reliability of product or service;
 6. Closeness of fit with technical requirements;
 7. Financial stability of the organization; and
 8. Vendor's past performance and client references.
- D. The OLPR reserves the right to determine, at its sole and absolute discretion, whether any aspect of a proposal satisfactorily meets the criteria established in this RFP.
- E. The OLPR reserves the right to request additional information from Vendors during any phase of the proposal evaluation process. During the evaluation and selection process, the OLPR may require the presence of Vendor's representatives at a vendor conference. During a vendor conference, a vendor may be asked to provide a demonstration of the product and/or to answer specific questions. Vendors are required to travel at their own expense to for the demonstration of the product and answer questions. Notification of any such requirements will be given as necessary.
- F. The OLPR may elect not to award a contract solely on the basis of this RFP, and will not pay for the information solicited or obtained. The information obtained will be used in determining the alternative that best meets the needs of the OLPR.

VIII. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.

A. Proposal Timeline.

1. Posting Date on the Minnesota Judicial Branch Website [MJB Court Public Website - Public Notice](#) : **Friday, July 31, 2015.**
2. Questions Due: **Friday, August 21, 2015, 4:30 p.m.**
3. Answers Posted: **Friday, September 4, 2015, 4:30 p.m.**
4. Proposal Submission Deadline: **Friday, September 18, 2015, 4:30 p.m.**

5. Vendor conferences will be scheduled if needed.
 6. Subsequent selection as soon thereafter as possible.
- B. **Amendments.** Any amendments to this RFP will be posted on the MJB website.
- C. **Questions.** All questions about this RFP must be submitted in writing via email to the OLPR's sole point of contact identified in this paragraph no later than **Friday, August 21, 2015, 4:30 p.m.** Other court personnel are not allowed to discuss the Request for Proposals with anyone, including responders, before the proposal submission deadline.

MARTIN A. COLE
Director
Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility
1500 Landmark Towers
345 St. Peter Street
St. Paul, MN 55102
lprbrfp@courts.state.mn.us

- D. **Answers to Questions.** Timely submitted questions and answers will be posted on the Judicial MJB website by the end of the day on **Friday, September 4, 2015, 4:30 p.m.** and will be accessible to the public and other proposers.
- E. **Sealed Proposal and Submittal Address.** Your proposal must be submitted in writing by **Friday, September 18, 2015, 4:30 p.m.** in a sealed envelope to:

MARTIN A. COLE
Director
Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility
1500 Landmark Towers
345 St. Peter Street
St. Paul, MN 55102
lprbrfp@courts.state.mn.us

The submission must include both four (4) paper copies and one (1) electronic PDF copy either on disc or flash drive. No facsimile submissions will be accepted. Proposals delivered in person to the OLPR should be presented to the OLPR receptionist and date/time stamped by the receptionist.

- F. **Signatures.** Your proposal must be signed by, in the case of an individual, by that individual, and in the case of an individual employed by a firm, by the individual and an individual authorized to bind the firm. This can be done on vendor informational cover sheet as stated in Project Related Submission Requirements.

- G. **Ink.** Prices and notations must be typed or printed in ink. No erasures are permitted. Mistakes may be crossed out and corrections must be initialed in ink by the person signing the proposal.

- H. **Deadline; Opening; Public Access.** Proposals must be received no later than **Friday, September 18, 2015, 4:30 p.m.** Proposals will be opened the following business day and once opened become accessible to the public (except financial stability information submitted as a trade secret in accordance with the instructions in Section VI(A)(5) of this RFP). With the exception of evidence-of-vendor's-financial-stability trade secret information submitted in accordance with the instructions in Section VI(A)(5) of this RFP, do not place any information in your proposal that you do not want revealed to the public. All documentation shipped with the proposal, including the proposal, will become the property of the State.

- I. **Late Proposals.** Late proposals will not be accepted or considered.

- J. **Selection Timeline.** Vendor selection will be as soon as possible after the proposal submission deadline.