I. PARTICIPANTS

**CLAC State Representatives**: Brenda Aiken (AK), Sandra Barrios (ID), Shirley Bonfond (WA), Sandra Bryan (NY), Carmel Capati (WI), Andrea Krickova (NV), Robert Lichtenberg (WA), Emy López (CO), Rena Micklewright (NY), Rosa Oakes (UT), and Mary Rose Zingale (TN)

**Liaison**: Emy López (CO)

**NCSC Staff**: Mayra Miranda, Jacquie Ring, Konstantina Vagenas and Sarah Esterbrook

II. EMY LOPEZ: INTRODUCTION

Ms. López welcomed everyone to the Western Regional Conference Call.

III. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANT APPLICATIONS AND CLAC’S 2ND ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Ms. Vagenas’ opening discussion addressed the Technical Assistance Grant opportunity funded by SJI. Currently, Ms. Vagenas is reviewing and accepting applications. Ms. Vagenas goes on to say that the total grant money will be split into increments of $15,000-25,000, and will be awarded to multiple state recipients to further develop, improve, and enhance technical programs. Ms. Vagenas further disclosed that some applications that were received requesting a large sum have been granted a portion of the grant money to help fund their requests. The grant can (1) help develop or enhance Language Access Plans. Also, the grant can assist in (2) conceptualizing and developing court management systems that correlate to cases where Language Access resources are likely to be used. Lastly, the grant can be used to (3) evaluate current IT resources and suggest possible technology enhancements to apply the most relevant applications of Language Access technologies. Other ways the grant can benefit in the fields of technology is to administer guidance, standards, resources, and information on remote interpretation. Remote interpretation, which includes video remote interpretation, is a major interest for SJI to advance new ‘cutting edge’ principles.
Ms. Vagenas moved on to the next topic on the agenda, the CLAC’s 2\textsuperscript{nd} Annual Conference. CLAC’s 2\textsuperscript{nd} Annual Conference will be held in Portland, Oregon this year at the Doubletree by Hilton from April 27\textsuperscript{th} through April 30\textsuperscript{th}. Thus far, the planning committee consists of Brenda Aiken, Carmel Capati, Emy Lopez, Kelly Mills, Carol Mitchell, Mary Rose Zingale, and the NCSC staff. Ms. Vagenas stated that we are still in the planning stages for the event, and she would like to recruit more volunteers to help plan necessary details. Ms. Vagenas said that she is looking for volunteers to suggest creative ideas to better enhance the conference. Ms. Vagenas then offered the invitation to all to join the planning committee and notify her now, by email or a telephone call, with potential interest.

\textbf{IV. \textit{VRI Manual Project}}

Ms. Capati started the discussion by emphasizing that publishing the VRI Manual has been an ongoing project. Ms. Capati announced that Ms. Miranda distributed the current updated draft by email on Friday, November 15, 2013. Ms. Capati stated that she would like to have more feedback before submitting the final draft of the VRI manual by November, 29\textsuperscript{th}. Ms. Capati directed that additional comments and revisions should be emailed to Ms. Miranda. Ms. Miranda will compile all the responses and provide further updates accordingly.

\textbf{V. \textit{National Model Code of Ethics for Interpreters}}

Ms. Zingale addressed that the deadline for submitting comments for the initial draft ended last Friday, November 15, 2013. Ms. Zingale extended the offer to anyone who would like to send additional feedback, to email Ms. Zingale their suggestions. The final draft for the National Model Code of Ethics manual will be submitted December 5\textsuperscript{th}, 2013. It is possible that the final Model Code of Ethics manual will be published at the end of January.

\textbf{VI. \textit{State Updates and Discussion}}

\textbf{New York:} Ms. Micklewright spoke on behalf of New York. Ms. Micklewright started by saying that the Remote Interpreting Program is a big part of what they are focusing on currently. Since January they had over 400 remote interpreting cases and noticed that it is becoming a program that is commonly used, but is still a small percentage of interpretation services that they provide. Ms. Micklewright then reported that New York has received some funding to get wireless headsets with multiple receivers to facilitate interpretation in multiple languages for multiple
parties. This equipment will benefit in situations where multiple interpreters are needed, but cannot be resourced. As well as improve safety standards including the interpreter being able to distance themselves from a dangerous defendant, or two conflicting parties. Ms. Micklewright reported that New York just went through a round of oral testing for per diem interpreters, and the written exams are scheduled to take place in June. Ms. Micklewright is hopeful that more interpreters will be certified to meet the demand and need for court certified interpreters. Ms. Micklewright asked for feedback if any other states have dealt per diem interpreters receiving unemployment benefits even when they are classified as freelance contractors. Ms. Micklewright said to contact her offline if anyone has information and insight on how to deal with this type of situation.

Alaska: Brenda spoke on behalf of Alaska. Brenda noted that the NCSC may be able to provide a legal review of the unemployment benefits situation Ms. Oakes raised. This issue was raised several years ago by John Goerdt and is of growing interest in addressing interpreter payment on the state level. Brenda reported that as a result of the Language Access Summit in Houston, the Alaska Court System has developed educational materials for judicial officers and court staff. Additionally, the court system continues to research ways to provide video remote interpreting given the state’s limited bandwidth and current technology infrastructure.

Idaho: Ms. Barrios spoke on behalf of Idaho. Ms. Barrios opened by saying that last Friday they had their first Language Access Advisory Committee Meeting that consisted of 16 people. They are reviewing their first draft of their Language Access Plan to be implemented statewide. The challenge they are trying to overcome is creating a Plan that encompasses the needs in all districts. Their next meeting will be in March where they hope to finalize their Language Access Plan.

Nevada: Ms. Krlickova spoke on behalf of Nevada. Ms. Krlickova said that their Language Access Plan has been submitted to the High Court and the High Court was receptive to the proposed content. The draft Plan will be presented to the Judicial Council of the State of Nevada (JCSN) for additional input on December 6, 2013. Ms. Krlickova stated that Nevada has just formed a Language Access Committee devoted to managing a broad range of language access issues. Ms. Krlickova noted that the Program has recently updated its Court Interpreter’s webpage by adding a new link that extends the line of communication between interpreters and attorneys and other legal practitioners. Ms. Krlickova said that the Program finished up certification testing for interpreters of spoken languages in Korean, Mandarin,
Spanish and Tagalog. She described an issue which involved a rater who mistakenly sent the test materials to a different agency. Ms. Krlickova went on to say she is a member of the Planning Committee for the 2014 National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT) Conference that will be held in May in Las Vegas. Ms. Krlickova invited participants of this call to give her any suggestions or recommendations pertaining to the conference program. Lastly, Ms. Krlickova stated that the Program started to work on a court documents translation project. At the moment, the Program conducts research into similar completed translation projects by CLAC members in order to apply their success strategies to its own translation project.

Utah: Ms. Oakes spoke on behalf of Utah. Ms. Oakes stated that they had made arrangements for two out-of-state Burmese & Karen interpreters for a Burmese murder trial coming up, which had a $22,000 tab for a three week time span. Ms. Oakes said she can relate to Ms. Aiken in her current situation relative to the high cost of securing qualified interpreters. Ms. Oakes also related to Ms. Krlickova’s situation in that there are issues to work out regarding test raters; Utah had a Bosnian rater who was inexperienced and suggested a second opinion on the test results. The second rater gave very different scores ultimately passing the test candidate. Ms. Oakes reported on the reciprocity issue and that she received good responses to her query on the listserv. Utah brought this issue before their Language Access Committee, wherein they voted not to provide Utah certificates for certified interpreters who will not be relocating to Utah. Ms. Oakes spoke on behalf of Utah. Ms. Oakes stated that they finished up with a Burmese murder trial and had a $22,000 tab for two interpreters during a three week time span, which Ms. Oakes said she can relate to Ms. Akins in her current situation. Ms. Oakes also related to Ms. Krlickova’s situation, but Utah had a Bosnian rater that made mistakes and now there is a new rater that was certified and took their place. Ms. Oakes reported on the reciprocity issue and that she received good responses. Utah brought this issue before their Language Access Committee, which they voted no to providing Utah certificates for interpreters that are certified out of state.

Washington: Ms. Bondon spoke on behalf of Washington. Ms. Bondon reported that Mr. Lichtenberg is the new Language Access Coordinator. Monday, November 18, was his first day on the job. Mr. Lichtenberg comes to the AOC with a strong background in Video Remote Interpreting. AOC is pleased to have him working with the spoken language Interpreter Program.
**Colorado:** Ms. López spoke on behalf of Colorado. Ms. López shared that they are excited about the progress that they have made both in telephone interpreting and video remote interpreting. Ms. López mentioned that Colorado was recognized for having an outstanding phone interpreting system at the Judicial Conference in September. Over this past year, this phone system saved the courts approximately $62,000.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Submitted by:** Sarah Esterbrook (A temporary employee for NCSC)