

Strategies for Increasing the Interpreter Pool Using AOC Resources

Institute for Court Management
Court Executive Development Program
2008-2009 Phase III Project
May 2009

Amy M. Wood
Caseflow Management Unit Manager
Administrative Office of the Courts
Phoenix, Arizona

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the interview participants who were so willing to share their time, thoughts and strategies. Without their assistance, this paper would not have been possible or useful.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Janet Scheiderer who provided me with confidence and support throughout my time at the Arizona Supreme Court, and specifically throughout this program. My gratitude extends to Judge Victoria Marks who introduced me to the world of courts by hiring me into the Hawaii court system and went on to provide a wonderful example of what great judges do.

Special thanks also go to my editors. Wanda Romberger, my advisor, who provided resources and insight into the world of interpreting as well as practical edits and organizational advice for the paper. Thanks also to Brian Gruman, my significant other, and Ernest Wood, my father without whom the paper would not read as well or be as approachable to the general reader.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS 3

TABLE OF FIGURES 4

ABSTRACT 4

INTRODUCTION 7

OVERVIEW OF TARGET STATES 28

METHODS 30

 Phase 1: Administrative Offices of the Courts (AOC) Survey 30

 Phase 2: Trial Court Survey 33

 Phase 3: Preliminary Compilation of Information 35

FINDINGS 38

 Phase 1: Administrative Offices of the Courts 38

 California 38

 Colorado 40

 Nevada 41

 Overall 42

 Phase 2: Trial Courts 43

 California 43

 Colorado 44

 Nevada 45

 Overall Results 45

 Rural and Urban Results 46

 Categorical Findings 47

CONCLUSIONS 55

RECOMMENDATIONS 62

BIBLIOGRAPHY 66

APPENDIX A: STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR’S OFFICE SURVEY (SURVEY 1) 73

APPENDIX B: TRIAL COURT SURVEYS (SURVEY 2A)-CALIFORNIA 79

APPENDIX C: TRIAL COURT SURVEYS (SURVEY 2B)-COLORADO 85

APPENDIX D: TRIAL COURT SURVEYS (SURVEY 2C)-NEVADA 91

APPENDIX E: DATA FROM AOC SURVEYS 97

APPENDIX F: DATA FROM NEVADA TRIAL COURT SURVEYS 104

APPENDIX G: DATA FROM COLORADO TRIAL COURT SURVEYS 110

APPENDIX H: DATA FROM CALIFORNIA TRIAL COURT SURVEYS 114

APPENDIX I: COMMENTS FROM INTERVIEW RESPONSES 120

TABLE OF FIGURES

Table 1 Overview of Number of ASL Interpreters Licensed by ACDHH as of June 3, 2008 10
 Table 2 Comparison of Arizona to three target states in terms of geography, population and focus languages..... 28
 Table 3 Categories and definitions for coding respondent comments..... 36
 Table 4 Results of rural and urban courts responses to knowledge of AOC efforts..... 47
 Table 5 Categorization of comments 48

ABSTRACT

Courts in Arizona, like many states, face increasing challenges in finding and deploying skilled court interpreters. Arizona has 15 general jurisdiction and over 160 limited jurisdiction courts, each of which requires the services of interpreters. Across the state, Spanish is the language needed most frequently, followed by American Sign Language. The need goes far beyond these two languages, however. The general jurisdiction court in the most populous county required services for 89 languages during the 2007-2008 fiscal year. Beginning in 2009, the Administrative Office of the courts (AOC) deployed an interpreter registry which enables interpreters to enter their information over the Internet and court staff to search the registry for potential interpreters as one measure to assist in this challenge. As the AOC works to establish other elements of a statewide program, information regarding the most effective ways to leverage AOC resources to assist trial courts was sought.

This project investigated what three carefully selected AOC’s (California, Colorado and Nevada), with similar demographics and established interpreter programs, have done both to increase the interpreter pools and make better use of existing interpreters. All three of these states have a high proportion of Hispanic population and large geographic areas which include remote rural courts.

Two layers of interviews were conducted beginning with a survey that was anchored by 17 Likert style questions to query lead staff about both past and on-going efforts to: 1) increase the pool of interpreters and 2) to improve the utilization of the existing interpreter pool. Following analysis of the initial AOC interview, and with the help of each AOC, trial courts were targeted for a follow-up complimentary survey. Twelve in depth interviews were conducted including both AOC and trial court surveys.

Analysis of Likert scale questions and 120 comments was conducted.

Fifteen conclusions and recommendations that flow from this research and their implications, both nationally, and for Arizona, include:

1. AOCs have a significant and useful role to play in court interpreter programs which cannot be fulfilled by trial courts.
2. Given their system-wide responsibilities, AOCs are well-positioned to facilitate and execute communication between trial courts concerning interpreting issues.
3. While urban courts are most likely to know about AOC efforts to increase interpreter resources, rural courts are more likely to benefit from AOC initiatives.
4. Websites maintained by AOCs can have a positive role in informing interpreters and potential interpreters.
5. Human resource departments are in a unique position to gather information about potential but as yet unavailable interpreters.
6. AOCs are in a strong position to leverage media and other resources for outreach campaigns that have the potential to benefit trial courts within the state.
7. Statewide registries and interpreters lists are useful, but may not meet diverse trial court needs. AOCs should continue to refine these tools.

8. Current training and certification models and processes to address rural courts' needs may be ineffective. Creative methods for delivering training to rural areas must be explored.
9. More continuing education to prepare, improve and retain qualified interpreters is needed.
10. Internship and mentoring programs are valuable methods of providing access to potential and new interpreters to the courts with relatively little risk.
11. Already existing trial court resources including judge and court staff community connections can help identify potential interpreters.
12. Rural jurisdictions which border other states or countries, such as Mexico, could benefit from efforts to share resources across borders.
13. More coordination with other agencies, particularly with regard to interpreters of lesser used languages, is needed.
14. AOCs should take the lead in investigating remote video interpreting.
15. Research regarding the ramifications of not having an interpreter to assist Limited English Proficient speakers throughout the court process is lacking.

Over the last two decades a great deal of the focus in the interpreter arena has been on qualification and certification of interpreters. Although work in that area is still critical, it is important to begin examining issues surrounding the pool of interpreters. This study helps point to areas in which AOC's should focus efforts, and areas in which further investigation and study is needed to increase the pool of interpreters and make better use of existing interpreters.

INTRODUCTION

The state of Arizona is experiencing rapid population growth, as well as an increased breadth of diversity in its citizens. This has led to an increased need for interpreters in the Arizona court system. In 2006, the Census Bureau estimated the population of Arizona to be over 6.1 million. This compares to an estimated 5.1 million in the 2000 census. There are two main urban counties (Maricopa and Pima) in which the majority of cases for the state as a whole are processed and where the majority of Arizona's population resides. The state of Arizona covers a large geographic area, and, despite the rapid growth, is relatively unpopulated.

Arizona has 15 general jurisdiction and over 160 limited jurisdiction courts, each of which has a mechanism for contacting interpreters when their services are needed. In some courts there is an individual responsible for a single court's interpreter scheduling. In other courts there is a regional person who is responsible for scheduling across multiple courthouses and jurisdictions. In either case, these individuals have been called "interpreter coordinators" for the purposes of this paper. A web based survey of interpreter coordinators in Arizona conducted in 2006 indicated that the majority of interpreter language needs are for Spanish speaking individuals, with American Sign Language (ASL) as the second most needed language in both rural and urban areas. A sampling of other languages for which interpreters were needed throughout the state included: Apache, Arabic, Cantonese, Croatian, Farsi, French, German, Indigenous Mexican Languages, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Mandarin, Navajo, Polish, Serbian, Somali, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese. The most populous county in Arizona, Maricopa County, required interpreting service for 89 languages during the 2007-2008 fiscal year¹.

¹ Reported verbally at the Maricopa County Strategic Agenda Meeting in October of 2008.

Many of Arizona's larger courts employ full time Spanish interpreters. In most of Arizona's courts, interpreters for languages other than Spanish are contractors with the court as opposed to court employees. It is common in the more rural areas for court staff to have dual duties such as bailiff and court interpreter. These bilingual staff are asked to interact with Spanish speaking individuals and/or to act as interpreters without any specific title or qualifications of interpreter. It is likely that these staff persons are put in the position of interpreting without having the specific education regarding how to function as a court interpreter. This lack of instruction can lead to problems when interpreting in the courtroom. For example, trained court interpreters have a knowledge and understanding of their ethical responsibilities. This includes an obligation to remain neutral even when the non-English speaking party asks for advice about his or her case in a foreign language. Interpreters are also obligated to inform the court if the content of material to be interpreted is beyond their level of comprehension in either of the languages between which they are required to interpret. Obligations such as these may not be instinctual, especially to a bilingual staff-person asked to interpret without the benefit of training.

The majority of Arizona's courts do not keep specific statistics regarding use of interpreters by language and/or number of continuances granted due to the lack of an interpreter. Anecdotally, however, a number of jurisdictions report an increasing need for a broader base of languages and numerous instances in which continuances have been granted or proceedings dismissed due to a lack of an available interpreter in the appropriate language. Continuances can lead to problems for courts. For example, cases in which repeated appearances are held without accomplishing forward movement clog court calendars, taking time away from other cases. This increases the overall expense of the case. The cumulative effect over time is an increasing

backlog of cases for the courts and slower, more expensive processing of all cases. These impacts can jeopardize the rights of parties to swift justice.

Currently, Arizona does not have a statewide certification program for interpreters, nor are qualifications regulated by law. The one exception in this area pertains only to American Sign Language (ASL). In October of 2007 statutory revisions went into effect² which require courts to use qualified interpreters for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in legal proceedings, and require anyone interpreting in this capacity to be licensed by the Arizona Commission on Deaf and Hard of Hearing (ACDHH). Those who interpret without licenses are guilty of a class two misdemeanor. This has required an adjustment in the court community, and, from anecdotal reports, has led to difficulty covering hearings throughout the state. Legal licenses are only granted to those who, through education, experience and examination are proven to be qualified to interpret in a legal setting. Legal interpreters are required to submit documentation of certification by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) or the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) as well as certification of the number of hours of paid interpreting as part of their application for licensure (Arizona Administrative Code - Agency, Board & Commission Rules: Chapter 26 Commission For The Deaf And The Hard Of Hearing, R9-26-504). There are four levels of legal licenses granted. Level A is provided to those individuals who are capable of providing interpreting services in a court or police setting. Level B interpreters are to interpret only in administrative adjudicatory proceedings. Level C interpreters can interpret in a legal setting only when paired with a Level A or B interpreter. Interpreters at Level A and B must have passed the National Interpreter Certification test (NIC), administered by the RID, at the master or advanced level. Level C interpreters must have passed the NIC at the certified level or

² A.R.S. §§12-242 and 36-1972

higher. Level D interpreters are Deaf or Hard of Hearing interpreters who do not hold certification from RID.

ACDHH has licensed 294 individuals (Listing of Licensed Interpreters, 2008, in its entirety), however, only 25 were licensed within the legal area and only 21 of these were at the A level. This means that there are 21 individuals who can legally interpret ASL in courtrooms across the state of Arizona. This is compared to 164 individuals who have general licenses and may interpret in other venues. The general license requires a NIC certification as well. Provisional licenses are granted to those who do not have certifications and/or have not spent enough time interpreting in the field. The comparison of available ASL interpreters is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1 Overview of Number of ASL Interpreters Licensed by ACDHH as of June 3, 2008

	Legal	General	Provisional
No Level	NA	164	NA
Level A	21	NA	0
Level B	1	NA	97
Level C	0	NA	5
Level D	3	NA	3
TOTALS	25	164	105

Arizona’s political climate adds to the intricacy of interpreter issues. There have been attempts to make Arizona an “English only” state going as far back as 1988. Initial attempts were overturned by the Arizona Supreme Court due to conflicts with first amendment rights and

access to government. In 2006, however, the Arizona voters passed a new proposition (103) which had been drafted to avoid the legal trappings of earlier versions. One of the provisions of this measure is that all official business be conducted in English. The measure passed with 74% of the voters agreeing with its intent which made English the official language of Arizona. Proponents of the proposition cite the waste of tax dollars being expended on translating documents into foreign languages as one of the reasons for the proposition (Arizona Makes English Official, 2006, p. 1).

Arizona law is fairly broad in addressing interpreter use in courts. Outside of those required for ASL, statute provides the ability for the court to appoint interpreters³ at the court's discretion. Interpreting services have historically been a court-by-court issue with each court in the state "fending for themselves" in terms of recruiting, qualifying and scheduling interpreters. This has led to a great deal of innovation in some courts, and neglect in others. There is duplication of efforts when looking across the entire state. Examples of duplication include translating forms into Spanish and creating assessment and training tools. Some counties have established mechanisms for qualifying, scheduling, sharing or pooling interpreters across the county while other counties have widely divergent systems from court to court.

As with other regions in the nation, the costs associated with interpreter services continue to grow. Costs associated with Spanish-speaking interpreter services in Yavapai County Superior Court increased 83% between Fiscal Year 2000/01 and Fiscal Year 2003/04 (Schaefer, 2004, p. 11). Although statistics are not currently available, it is likely that other areas of Arizona are showing similar increases in costs. One city, noting increased costs, cut the interpreter line item from a court's budget completely (Wilczewski, 2007, p. 1).

³ A.R.S. §12-241

The Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)⁴ has played a limited role in interpreter issues when compared to many other states. In 2002 an interpreter committee was established to look at interpreter issues, and made the following major recommendations (Committee to Study Interpreter Issues in Arizona Courts, 2002, pp. 5-6):

- Create a Certification Process for Court Interpreters in Arizona
- Require Interpreter Training (as part of certification process)
- Develop Legislation and Court Rules to Govern Language Interpreter Use
- Establish a Judicial Interpreters Commission

These recommendations were not pursued at the time due to a lack of funding.

Interpreter issues, from a state perspective, were put on hold.

In 2006, the Arizona AOC again began to turn its attention to issues surrounding the use of interpreters. This was done initially through meetings with an informal work group made up of those who are responsible for coordinating the work of interpreters in courts throughout the state. These meetings were essential to opening lines of communication between the AOC and the people closest to the issues in Arizona's courts. Initial meetings focused on validating issues that were reported earlier and continued to be problematic and identifying new issues. Time was also spent brainstorming possible solutions. An early solution which was put into place, to assist with increased communication, was a Listserv for interpreter issues supported by the AOC. Information can be sent to the Listserv which will reach all of those who have subscribed to the service. Since its inception the Listserv has been used by many across the state to locate interpreters needed in specific languages through other court contacts. During the first nine

⁴ "AOC" is used throughout this paper to represent the state administrative office of the courts although different states refer to this office in different ways.

months of the 2008 calendar year alone, the Listserv assisted in finding interpreters for over 21 lesser used languages and dialects⁵.

Three informal work groups were established to focus on three topics: Registry, Education, and Skills Assessment. The progress made by each work group is discussed briefly below.

Registry. The establishment of a registry of those interested in interpreting is seen as a mechanism for identifying and sharing resources throughout the state. It also holds hope for broadening the pool of those available to interpret. The registry, scheduled to be released in March of 2009, will be available to the public. Interpreters will enter information in much the same way as one would when filling out a job application. Court staff will be able to search the database made up of these entries and follow normal screening and/or hiring practices generally used by the court in obtaining an interpreter. It is expected that those currently working for the courts as contractors or part-time interpreters will be the first to enter information into the registry, and perhaps, this will increase the number of jobs they receive.

Additional work is anticipated to be carried out in support of the registry. For example, a website has been developed and will be maintained on the Arizona Judicial Branch web page. The site includes information about court interpreting, including expectations, resources, and potential paths which can be taken to become a court interpreter. Brochures will be developed which can be made available to those who have expressed interest in interpreting. A second version of the brochure will be created to specifically market the registry to those who already have interpreting experience.

⁵ This information was compiled by the author of this paper by counting languages reflected in e-mails which had been generated by the Listserv.

Education. Increasing the availability of training for interpreters and providing education to court staff and judges about the role of interpreters in the courts are the focus of the education work group. One of the first endeavors of the work group was to modify the bench card developed by the Ohio Judiciary for using Deaf and Hard of Hearing interpreters to fit Arizona's needs. This was a logical place to start because the release of Arizona's version of the bench card was able to closely follow the statutory changes which require the use of qualified ASL interpreters. The first objective for the 2009 calendar year will be the development of bench cards for utilizing spoken language interpreters. The bench card will provide helpful tips for judges to use on the bench such as suggested questions to ask interpreters to determine if they are qualified to interpret and to insure that interpreters understand their role.

Skills Assessment. Currently, the skills assessment work group is identifying the types of assessment programs and tools that are in use across Arizona. The hope is that these can be made available for use by courts that have not already developed their own tools.

As these work groups have been developing useful resources to be shared across the state, a group of Arizona judges have been seeking federal funding for a potential interpreter certification program. Arizona's program would offer certification as an educational credential and would not initially require use of certified interpreters nor would there be a disciplinary process regarding certification.

Across the nation, ensuring the quality of court interpreters has rightfully been a primary goal of those involved in interpreter programs. In contrast, there has been very little focus placed on mechanisms for increasing the interpreter pool. This paper describes strategies used by courts and other entities struggling to balance available interpreter resources with their needs. Results of a survey of both state AOC and local trial courts in three states illustrate what those courts are

doing to increase their pool of interpreters and better utilize interpreters that have already been identified. This paper also examines the different perspectives and roles played by administrative offices of the courts in each state versus that of trial courts when approaching this issue.

Court interpreting is a subject which the general public rarely considers. From an abstract perspective, it seems to those who are uneducated in the interplay between language and courts, that anyone who speaks two languages should be able to interpret. It is easy to oversimplify the intricacies of language and underestimate the importance of nuances involved in communicating effectively. Technical terminology, legal terminology, even common idioms and popular slang all add complexity to language in the courtroom. Consider interpreting the testimony of a gang member as a witness using extensive slang and then, during the same trial, interpreting testimony from a DNA expert. Although most people would understand the substance of testimony provided by both witnesses in their native language, few would understand each word and nuance well enough to begin to interpret these concepts into another language. Likewise, these linguistic challenges support the need for interpreters even for those who may understand and speak some English. Buying gas, taking the bus or ordering food in a restaurant certainly do not require the same level of linguistic skills as participating effectively in a court proceeding. Interpreters may be required to interpret in a consecutive or simultaneous mode. In consecutive interpreting, once an individual has spoken a few sentences, he/she stops and waits while the interpreter interprets what has been said into another language. This is in contrast to the simultaneous approach in which interpreters speak at the same time as the speaker interpreting with a slight delay behind the speaker. The simultaneous mode has greater

complexity as the interpreter must hear what the speaker is saying, process the information and then accurately interpret the first concept into another language while listening to the next.

Once one begins to look at the issues surrounding interpreting between languages in a court setting, the implications can become astounding to consider, but of clear importance. Information can easily become misconstrued. Courtroom interpreting, by its very nature, creates obstacles to uncovering errors. In most cases, the only person in the courtroom who understands both languages being spoken is the interpreter. The record kept by the court is in English. When a court reporter is used, there is no record of the non-English language being interpreted. When recording devices such as FTR⁶ are used, there is a record of both languages which could later be reviewed should interpretation be called into question. Although interpreters are ethically bound to report any error they have knowingly made to the Court, it is the well-meaning person with limited knowledge who can unknowingly make the error. This was true in the Ramirez case in which a 20-year-old Mexican national was accused of murder. The interpreter used by the police had only two years of college education in Spanish. Her lack of understanding of the language led to misinformation during the Miranda process (Framer, 2000, p. 4). One of the most cited cases regarding the impact of interpreting is the Negrón case. Negrón, was convicted of 2nd degree murder and sentenced to 20 years to life through a trial process in which ten witnesses offered testimony in English which was not interpreted on Negrón's behalf. Overturned in 1970, the Negrón case is considered a landmark decision requiring interpreters in Federal Court (U.S. ex rel. Negrón v. New York, 1970). There are a number of summaries available describing instances in which issues related to interpretation have been the basis for appeal. [(Benmaman, 2000, pp. 1-13), (Griffin & Cole, 2007, pp. 17-20)]. Most appellate decisions have held that both the decision to appoint an interpreter and the determination of who is qualified as an interpreter

⁶ For the Record (FTR) is an example of a digital recording device used in many courts.

are within the trial court's discretion. The focus of most appellate decisions has been abuse of trial court discretion or plain error (Benmaman, 2000, p. 2).

Law enforcement agencies encounter issues when making arrests and interacting with communities in which many limited-English proficient (LEP) individuals reside. A striking example is that in which a hostage-taker is a LEP person. In this situation, lives may well depend on the ability of negotiators to communicate effectively with hostage takers. Negotiators are advised to think carefully about whether to communicate in English or the hostage-taker's primary language. They acknowledge that forcing a person to communicate in an unfamiliar language greatly reduces the opportunity for displays of emotion and keeps the subject's focus and mental attention on communicating which increases fatigue. It also sends the subliminal message that law enforcement is in control (DiVasto, 1996, Para. 11). Consider the implications when these observations are applied to LEP persons in the courtroom. If a litigant who is not proficient in English attempts to independently understand the proceedings, he or she will be at a distinct disadvantage for the same reasons the hostage-taker is. Certainly interpreters should be afforded to individuals in the court environment which strives for equal treatment and representation among all participants.

Over the last 20 years, a great deal of focus has been placed on improving the quality of court interpreting. Efforts have been underway at local, state and federal levels. Most states have joined the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification⁷ and have launched local efforts. Certification programs and ethics training have been cornerstones of these efforts. One of the dilemmas that courts experience when they design certification programs is that a relatively small percentage of interpreters pass certification tests. This is a concern from two

⁷The Consortium is a partnership between participating state courts led by the National Center for State Courts which focuses on drawing economies by sharing resources in areas such as testing and certification.

perspectives. The first is the quality of interpreters who are currently interpreting. The need for accurate court interpreting is great. Many jurisdictions may already be settling for less qualified people to provide interpreting services without understanding that the interpreters may not have the necessary sophistication to accurately interpret in a court setting.

Secondly, providing increasing numbers of interpreter services with potentially fewer resources is a challenge to administrators. Romberger (2007, p. 22) conducted a study which showed that training court interpreters prior to administering the oral exam is one mechanism for increasing pass rates. This study also found that scores for simultaneous interpreting were better predictors for overall performance than other portions of the test.

Once certified, interpreters still need to keep themselves abreast of changing languages and legal climate. Languages are dynamic with new slang, sayings and even words developing over time. Interpreters must be sensitive to these changes in both of the languages they work in. Likewise the legal processes vary based on changes in legislation, rules and best practices. Thirteen states have included a requirement for continuing education after certification for interpreters in recognition of the need to keep current with both skills and language (Griffin & Cole, 2007, p. 11). Although the picture has greatly improved in some geographic regions, there is still a great deal of work to be done to continue to improve the quality of court interpreting.

There is another concern beginning to gain attention. How do you create a pool from which to select qualified interpreters? Most jurisdictions struggle to cover proceedings that require interpreters. Those states that have strong certification programs and require courts to use certified interpreters still have difficulty filling the needs of the courts (Doege, 2005, para. 2). Courts are often faced with striking a balance between quality and efficiency. Does one dismiss a case because an interpreter cannot be found? Should a defendant be held in jail until

an interpreter can be found in his/her language even when the search requires several months? Such are the dilemmas courts are experiencing. It is, in some ways, understandable why there is a temptation to utilize family members of litigants or others who are not specifically trained as interpreters in these situations. Unfortunately, the cost of lowering standards is likely to be a lack of access to justice.

Interpreting in a court setting requires a combination of skills, including fluency in both languages being used, and knowledge of court terminology, memory, and ethics. It is unreasonable for courts to take on the task of teaching languages or overseeing a process related to language learning. Learning a language requires many years regardless of whether the method is primarily immersion or training. However, there is general agreement that court terminology and ethics can be trained in a reasonably short period of time. First, people with language skills must be identified in order for training to be beneficial. Only a portion of these individuals will be able to adequately take on the role of interpreter. This makes it important to identify as many potential interpreters as possible.

Adding to the complexity of the problem is that the court interpreting field, as it currently exists in most places, is not very appealing. As Romberger and Hewitt (2006, p.78) point out, most interpreter positions involve regular challenges with ethical dilemmas, and supervisors who do not have specific knowledge or understanding of the task of interpreting. Because court managers often do not understand the skill sets required for quality interpreting, these skill sets are often undervalued, which may lead to low pay scales being set in many places. Additionally, for those interpreters working in languages that are only sporadically needed, interpreting cannot be a full-time job and offers no benefits. Contracted interpreters can have a lack of a sense of

“belonging” to an organization which can lead to additional problems with morale (Schaefer, 2004, p. 24).

A survey was conducted of Ohio’s interpreters which found that 45% of the court interpreters in Ohio had another full-time job and interpreted either occasionally or regularly in the courts (Romero, Foy, Langford, & Saltzman, 2006, p. 21). In a study specifically focused on the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in Arizona, researchers found 45% of the ASL interpreters across all areas of interpreting (not court specific) surveyed have seriously considered quitting (Institute for Social Science Research at Arizona State University, 2007). Most of these respondents worked over 31 hours each week in the role of interpreter. In the same study, researchers found that 49% of those who use ASL interpreting services had experienced difficulty locating an interpreter within the year prior to the survey.

Immigration impacts the issues surrounding interpreting from a practical standpoint. Over the last 15 years, the United States has experienced a 246% increase in the number of limited -English speaking individuals (Griffin & Cole, 2007, p. 4). The 2000 United States census identified at least 380 languages which are spoken in the United States. The expectation is that this number will rise in the 2010 census. States that have seen an increase in immigrant migration experience many difficulties trying to find interpreters in these new languages (Suveiu, 2004, p. 102). For instance, in one year over 3,000 Hmong immigrants resettled in Wisconsin, over ten times the anticipated rate from previous years. One city in Wisconsin has a population which is now 12% natives of Somalia (Abrahamson, 2005, p. 6). Needs such as these have led the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification (Consortium) to develop tests for languages which were traditionally seen as “lesser used” such as Hmong, Laotian, or Serbian.

As each geographic region becomes more diverse, it becomes increasingly difficult to meet the needs of the many people who speak a large variety of languages. During the 2003-2004 fiscal year Ohio recorded at least 18,465 interpretations involving over 57 languages (Romero, Foy, Langford, & Saltzman, 2006, p. 8). The centralized office for interpreting in Massachusetts received approximately 2,500 requests per month during the 2000 calendar year for 43 languages, for which the schedules of 115 interpreters needed to be matched (Steelman & Hewitt, 2001). Figures such as these may be valuable in predicting needs in each region if they are tracked over time.

The logistics involved in coordinating interpreting services are substantial. Balancing the resources available with the need is difficult in most jurisdictions. In the lesser used languages, it is difficult to keep an interpreter employed full-time on court business. Even in more common languages, such as Spanish, the balance requires creative scheduling and thinking. Consider a jump from an average of 38 hours per week in one year to 47 hours per week in the next year across four staff interpreters (Schaefer, 2004, p. 11). How many new interpreters should be hired to cover the proceedings, and where will the funding come from for these interpreters? An additional complication is that travel time must be accounted for in providing interpreting services to multiple locations. Coordinators of these programs strive to make the best use of resources while still providing time for skill building for their interpreters. To shed light on this, consider some of the factors outlined below.

Traditionally, courts have focused on criminal cases due to the potential for loss of liberty. In many states this is required by statute. One can easily argue, however, that there are many non-criminal proceedings in which the risk is as high if not higher for the individual involved. Consider losing a child in a custody battle or losing a home due to foreclosure or

forcible detainer proceedings. These are clearly non-criminal examples in which a Limited-English Proficiency (LEP) person would be disadvantaged by not understanding the language in which the court conducts its business. Recent focus has been placed on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Executive Order 13166, issued in 2000 by President Clinton, specifically addresses the improvement of access to services for persons with LEP. As a result of that order, the Department of Justice (DOJ) published guidelines for those who receive monies from the DOJ, including the courts (Commonly Asked Questions and Answers Regarding Executive Order 13166, 2008, p. 1). No distinction is made in the guidelines between different case types. This may be the driving force behind a growing trend to alter the approach courts are taking, expanding the number and type of proceedings for which interpreters are provided (Romberger, *Interpreters in Civil Cases*, 2007, p. 69).

In addition to the factors which are increasing the incidents in which interpreters are required, interpreters, already in short supply, are expected to be reduced in numbers unless something changes soon. The shortage of interpreters impacts organizations and fields outside of the court system. A number of post-war activities in the 1960's drew people to the general field of interpreting. Creation of the United Nations and the European Union provided enough of a spotlight on the general field of interpreting to inspire people to pursue careers in this area. Unfortunately many of these people are now at retirement age and the flow of people into programs for interpreting has not been maintained (Kingston, 2008, para. 5). This is the plight being faced by high profile positions in the United Nations; the predicament for court interpreting may be exponentially worse. The director of the interpreting program at Leeds in England points out that the command of the English language is not as strong in younger generations and speculates that this is related to youth spending less time reading than the youth

in previous generations. She also points to education systems that no longer require the study of foreign languages in England. Additionally, the linguistic register of United States English is more difficult to interpret because it relies more heavily on colloquialisms (Kingston, 2008, para. 21).

As described in one article, the problem of interpreter shortages is a tiered one. First of all funding is needed, and then the ability to draw people who may have the skills, and then an organization must have the ability to evaluate those skills (DiPietro & Aiken, 2002).

Recognition of the difficulty in finding a pool of people from which to draw is growing. It is expected that to meet the needs of the future, courts will need to conduct an expansive recruitment initiative for people who have bilingual skills (Griffin & Cole, 2007, p. 10). This first step lays the groundwork for determining which people have an aptitude for interpreting and, perhaps, providing skills training to those individuals.

Another approach for meeting the demand for interpreting services is to look towards technology as a means to stretch the resources that are available. For many years, courts, as well as other entities have looked to phone services as a mechanism to address needs. Although this can be a solution in limited instances, Hewitt (1999, p. 3) points out some of the limitations. Because of the general use of most telephonic interpreting services, the most highly qualified interpreters are not used for the majority of the telephonic interpreting. The telephonic mode of communication does not permit visual cues which can be important in setting tone and context for discussions in many languages. Consecutive interpreting is the only mode which will work in telephonic interpreting. The consecutive approach limits, by its very nature, the length of an utterance to less than approximately 50 words. For these reasons, telephonic interpreting works best in short proceedings as opposed to lengthy trials

Telephone service providers experience the same problem of identifying interpreters in the lesser used languages. Although this alternative is used by many courts when they are not able to otherwise meet the interpreting needs, Hewitt goes on to relay that some of the same problems that occur in person also can be experienced over the telephone: poor interpreting skills, unprofessional conduct by the interpreter and inappropriate conduct by other courtroom participants. Hewitt, through a State Justice Institute (SJI) grant, conducted a study utilizing Language Line Services⁸ to provide court certified interpreters on short notice. This study went on for six months and included 1,100 calls. One of Hewitt's conclusions in 1999 was that in order for commercial services to be interested in court interpreting as a specific targeted market, usage would need to increase. If court interpreting is not a target market, vendors such as these do not have the necessary motivation to require court-specific knowledge and sophisticated vocabulary in the interpreters they employ. With limited-English speaking populations growing rapidly across the United States over the last 10 years, it is possible that this should be re-evaluated.

It is clear that when trying to launch technology as a solution, it is important to lay the ground-work with participants and create "buy-in" for the solution. Between January and August 2002, a regional consortium was created between the four corner states of New Mexico, Colorado, Utah and Arizona to utilize telephonic court interpreting. During the eight months of the project, only four courts in two of the states used the service. In fact, the system was only used five times according to the final report issued on the project (Schaefer, 2004, p. 51).

In February 2000, a survey of Consortium members found that 62% used telephonic interpreting services, 45% of these were through private agencies, 19% through free-lance

⁸ Language Line is a commercial vendor providing telephonic interpreting services.

interpreter programs, and another 16% through state interpreter programs (Griffin & Cole, 2007, p. 11).

Another promising technology that is being explored is the delivery of interpreting services through voice-over-Internet Protocol (IP) technology. In 2006 the Health Care Interpreter Network (HCIN) launched one of the first voice- and video-over IP call centers in the world. The center, located in San Jose, California, supports 300 to 400 hospital staff by routing 1,200 language need calls each month. Interpreters respond from the various hospitals, providing the opportunity to pool interpreter talent. When an interpreter for a specific language is not available through the hospital network, the system automatically routes the call to an audio-only commercial interpretation service. Interestingly, the system also allows emergency calls to jump to the top of the queue. The center is the result of collaboration between a number of California healthcare organizations and Cisco and Qwest, who provide the technology required to make this system work. The center has also resulted in reduced call-per-minute charges that hospitals had previously been experiencing. (2006, Health Care Interpreter Network Taps Cisco Technology, p. 1). Part of the reason that this center could be so successful is the increased technical networking structure that is in place throughout all of the associated hospitals. Centralized state court systems with well-developed technical networks may be able to investigate a similar solution.

Internationally, several countries recognized that a lack of qualified interpreters was creating obstacles for those seeking asylum. Beginning in October of 2005, countries such as the Netherlands and Slovakia worked together to identify interpreters and establish encrypted telephone lines and then videoconferencing equipment. Each country was provided equipment

that was compatible with the Tandberg 2000⁹. Some unique pressures exist for interpreters who serve individuals seeking asylum. The asylum-seeker may be facing imprisonment or death if they are not granted asylum. The countries involved in this project created a “Rapid Capacity Team” for interpreters to address these particular pressures. Countries that had an availability of interpreters were named “donor” countries, and those most likely to need services from other places were named “beneficiary” countries in order to help differentiate roles. If proven successful, it is expected that this program will grow into a Europe-wide interpreter pool program (Interpreters' Pool Project, 2007, pp. 1-6).

Courts alone may not have the workload to keep interpreters employed full-time. It may be important to pool with other offices and agencies that have similar needs (Romberger & Hewitt, *Wanted: Career Paths for Court Interpreters*, 2006, p. 80). Alaska has developed a Language Interpreter Center which is a collaborative multi-agency effort to build a pool of interpreters for use by both public and private entities in the state. Thus far the effort has received a great deal of positive feedback from the healthcare, education and court systems of Alaska (DiPietro & Aiken, 2002, para. 15).

There appears to be a clear trend towards centralizing coordination of interpreter resources. The ability to look broadly across the needs of several entities has the potential for making better use of interpreters’ time as well as increasing the likelihood of finding qualified individuals. In the context of court systems, these centralized functions are generally best carried out by Administrative Offices of the Courts (AOCs). It is interesting to note that, although they are in the best position to pool information across a state, and likely have the best ability to leverage other resources to create and maintain a centralized coordination point, AOCs are also

⁹ The Tandberg 2000 is one example of a videoconferencing device originally designed for small offices to hold meetings with one-another.

the least likely to actually utilize interpreter services because they have less contact with the general public than trial courts. In these types of situations it is important to gain an understanding from the perspective of service delivery and receipt of service. A study was conducted specifically to examine the effectiveness of the Massachusetts Interpreter Division of the “Administrative Office of the Trial Courts”. This division is responsible for serving 124 separate trial court locations throughout the state. In the review of this successful program, a number of pertinent factors came to light which would apply anywhere. Full and accurate information regarding the demand for interpreters is necessary, as is an effective manager to develop a vision and help the office attain it. Administrative support and quality information systems were cited as critical needs. It was also recognized that one of the core functions of a centralized operation is the development and expansion of a large pool of candidates for court interpreting (Steelman & Hewitt, 2001, p. 5).

OVERVIEW OF TARGET STATES

Three states that serve populations similar to Arizona were explored to determine what methods have been most effective in increasing their interpreter pools. The table below, sorted by percent of Hispanic population, shows a comparison of characteristics of Arizona to California, Colorado and Nevada.

Table 2 Comparison of Arizona to three target states in terms of geography, population and focus languages.

	Square Miles ¹⁰	Population ¹⁰	People/Square Mile ¹⁰	% Hispanic ¹⁰ Population	% Deaf and Hard of Hearing Populations ¹¹
California	155,959.34	36,457,549	217.2	35.9%	5.3%
Arizona	113,634.57	6,166,318	45.2	29.2%	6.2%
Nevada	109,825.99	2,495,529	18.2	24.4%	5.9%
Colorado	103,717.53	4,753,377	41.5	19.7%	5.4%

It is important to understand the overall climate of each state considered in this study including population, geography, organizational and political factors. Arizona is currently not a member of the Consortium and is not a unified state court system. Although the AOC in Arizona is beginning to launch some activities in the area of interpreting, it does not have a comprehensive statewide program at this point in time. All three target states are members of the Consortium, and all three have a centralized statewide program for interpreter services at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Both California and Colorado are unified court systems from both an administrative and fiscal perspective, Nevada is non-unified. All three

¹⁰ 2006 US Census estimate from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html>

¹¹ From Gallaudet University Frequently Asked Questions: <http://library.gallaudet.edu/deaf-faq-stats-states.shtml>

comparison states have at least one full-time dedicated staff-person focused on the interpreter program and all three have an advisory board or committee which examines issues related to foreign language interpreting.

California has 58 trial courts and over 400 court locations throughout the state. During the 2003 fiscal year, just under \$60 million were spent on interpreter services to support these courts (Legislative Analyst's Office, 2004, Figure 2). Costs were expected to reach close to \$70 million by 2005. California's AOC does not have any direct control over foreign language court interpreters. California currently offers certification in 13 languages: Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and American Sign Language.

Colorado has been certifying interpreters since 1999 and currently offers oral certification exams in the following languages: Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish, Russian, and Vietnamese (Current Schedule, 2008, in its entirety). Colorado's AOC has responsibility for discipline, payment, scheduling and hiring and firing of staff interpreters.

The Administrative Office of the Courts in Nevada is responsible for certifying court interpreters utilizing both oral and written exams. The AOC offers skill-building documents to help people prepare for the exams. Nevada's AOC has responsibility for certification, discipline and continuing education of court interpreters. Nevada currently offers certification through the Consortium in the following languages: Arabic, Cantonese, Haitian Creole, Hmong, Korean, Laotian, Mandarin, Polish, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

METHODS

The three states, California, Colorado, and Nevada, were selected based on their relative similarity to Arizona in terms of population per square mile and proportion of Hispanic population. The proportion of the population which was Deaf and Hard of Hearing was also examined; however, there did not appear to be great disparity between any of the states across the nation regarding this population. All three states have an interpreter program which is managed from the AOC in that state.

The collection of information for this research was conducted in three phases. The first phase focused on the Administrative Office of the Courts. The second phase investigated perspectives of local trial courts supported by each AOC. The third phase was strictly an analysis phase which brought the information from the two surveys together into a form from which further analysis could be conducted, allowing for conclusions to be drawn. Each phase is described in the sections below.

Phase 1: Administrative Offices of the Courts (AOC) Survey

An initial survey was developed for discussions with the Administrative Offices of the Courts in each of the three states. It was custom-developed and not modeled after any known existing survey or interview instrument. The majority of the questions asked were done in a Likert¹² item style with five levels of response from very ineffective to very effective. The survey was designed to determine the services offered through the program relative to increasing the pool of interpreters and increasing the efficiency of using existing interpreters. Questions also addressed which methods were proving most useful. The survey was developed so that it

¹² A “Likert” scale is a psychometric measure in which the respondent indicates his or her opinion on with questions or statements posed using a scale on a continuum most often reflecting the level of agreement.

could be utilized as a mail out survey or as a data collection tool via personal interviews. Each interview contained a minimum of 17 Likert scale questions. Depending on responses, there was a possibility of six additional Likert scale questions. These additional questions were asked when the interviewee identified a tool used by that AOC which had not been identified in the standard questions in the survey. There were also three open-ended questions.

The questions in the survey were separated into four distinct sections. The first section elicited information to provide an overview of the program in that state. The second section focused on efforts which have been made to increase the pool of potential interpreters. The third section focused on efficiencies in utilization of the existing pool of interpreters. The fourth section included open-ended questions to solicit more information about which tools were considered most useful.

The first section was done in a tiered question format with the first question being whether or not a particular method had been used by this AOC. If the answer was “yes”, then a question was asked to gauge the interviewee’s opinion regarding how much effort had been expended on a particular strategy. The second and third sections asked an initial question about whether a particular strategy had been employed, and if it had, followed up with a Likert style question regarding the effectiveness of the strategy, allowing the respondent to rate the effort as very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective or very ineffective.

Each of the first three sections provided the interviewee opportunities to respond with other strategies which had not been identified in the interview questions. If an additional item was identified, the interviewee was asked to rate it on the same Likert scale used for the standard questions in that section. The fourth section provided open-ended questions designed to flesh

out the information provided in previous sections in a more qualitative manner. Surveys were pre-tested with individuals who were unfamiliar with the purpose of the study and minor adjustments were made to increase the clarity of the questions.

The final AOC survey used can be found in [Appendix A](#).

A decision was made to conduct these surveys over the phone rather than mailing or e-mailing them. This study is exploratory in nature and phone interaction provided richer information with more opportunity for clarification than a survey in the mail. Additionally, the phone interaction helped ensure timely responses necessary for preparatory work for the second phase.

Preliminary contact was made through e-mail with the AOC staff responsible for interpreting programs in each state. This introduced the idea of the survey and enabled a time to be set to go through the survey by phone. All surveys were conducted by the same researcher.

The last question of each survey asked for contact information for four trial courts (two urban and two rural) that were served by the AOC. This question was introduced over the phone and then e-mailed to the AOC coordinators so that they would have time to fill out the contact information for rural and urban courts supported by their programs. Responses to the e-mail for contact information took between one and ten days with prompting required by the researcher in only one case.

Each AOC survey took between 22 and 60 minutes to complete. Additional responses, expanding upon the questions asked, were encouraged due to the exploratory nature of the study. The interviewer wrote down oral responses provided over the phone by checking appropriate boxes and documenting additional comments. In one state, survey responses provided by a newer employee with a specific focus on recruitment were reviewed and expanded upon by a

more senior staff-person with a broader perspective. This was done at the request of the interview participants. In each of the other two states, a single responder answered all of the questions.

Following each survey, the Likert scale responses were entered into a spreadsheet. Additional comments were typed into a document in the order in which they had been provided. All data were entered by the same individual who conducted the interviews.

Once all AOC level surveys were completed and data were entered, a simple comparison was conducted on the Likert type questions to determine similarities and differences between the states. This was done by comparing the values for each question which had been entered into a spreadsheet based on a scale of one to five following each survey. Additionally, the written comments were reviewed for areas of similarity as well as for useful ideas or programs that might benefit other AOC's. Information obtained from the AOC surveys was used to design trial court surveys.

Phase 2: Trial Court Survey

As mentioned earlier in this paper, AOCs are in the best position to run centralized programs for a state court system, but are least likely to utilize the services they provide. For this reason, a second survey was designed for each court based on the information obtained in the first phase. Each trial court survey was developed following the interview with the state's AOC. Questions were developed to expand on the topics in which the AOC indicated there were efforts or activity. Surveys were pre-tested with individuals who were unfamiliar with the purpose of the study and minor adjustments were made to make the questions more comprehensive.

In general, the survey followed a format similar to that of the AOC surveys. The first section asked three questions of each court to provide a basic overview and general

characterization of the court. These questions addressed the proportion of contractors versus staff interpreters used and the number of courtrooms supported.

The second section of each survey focused on methods used to increase the pool of interpreters. The last section focused on methods to better utilize the existing pool of interpreters. Follow-up questions were asked about which methods were considered most useful to the court and which methods were considered most useful to interpreters.

Initial questions in sections two and three were asked to determine if the interviewee was aware of the efforts undertaken by the AOC in a particular area. If the interviewee was aware of the efforts, a Likert scale follow-up question was asked to garner the opinion of the interviewee about the effectiveness of these efforts. The respondent could indicate that the tool was very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective or very ineffective. AOC's may have different perspectives from trial courts regarding the effectiveness of initiatives to increase the pool of interpreters.

Examples of the survey used in each states' trial courts can be found in Appendices [B](#), [C](#) and [D](#).

Trial court surveys commenced approximately one month following the AOC surveys. Initial contact was made with each participant either through e-mail or by phone to set up a specific date and time for the discussion. Most discussions occurred at the appointed time, but some were rescheduled in order to accommodate the interviewee or interviewer schedule changes. All surveys were conducted over the phone by the same interviewer. The surveys were all conducted in 17 to 29 minutes. Three successful interviews were conducted in each state. Attempts to contact the fourth contact in each state were made, but abandoned due to lack of response and time constraints of this project.

As with the AOC surveys, following each trial court survey, the surveyor entered data from the Likert scale responses into a spreadsheet. Additional comments were typed into a document in the same order they had been given. All information was entered by the same individual who conducted the interview.

A total of nine interviews were conducted, three from each state. After all interviews were completed a simple analysis was done on the Likert-style question responses from each state. The additional verbal responses which had been committed to writing were broken down by individual ideas, comments or thoughts. A review of the verbal responses was carried out and categories established for analysis.

Phase 3: Preliminary Compilation of Information

The Likert scale data was reviewed in the spreadsheet for patterns of interest. It was noted when all respondents from a particular group agreed or when none agreed. In order to address the overall question of whether trial courts were aware of AOC efforts, answers to these questions were split between rural and urban courts and laid out as affirmative or negative responses. A Chi square¹³ was used to test whether differences were significant or not.

Following the completion of all of the surveys, particular attention was paid to the comments made during all 12 interviews (AOC and Trial Courts combined). A table summarizing these comments can be found in [Appendix I](#). The comments became the most valuable part of this study. The comments were reviewed and separated into segments which represented discreet thoughts or statements. These were entered into a spreadsheet. Each comment was then categorized based on criteria displayed in Table 3. Many of the comments

¹³ A “Chi square” is a statistical test utilized to determine whether numbers are significantly different from one another or not. This difference can help determine whether results are due to chance or due to a systematic difference represented in the data.

made by interviewees were not directly solicited by the survey questions. These responses were very valuable with regard to understanding the program and provided many useful ideas from which other jurisdictions might benefit. As such, categories were established based on the data obtained rather than on the initial questions. In general, the categories were designed to include data about similar topics mentioned by various interview participants.

Table 3 Categories and definitions for coding respondent comments

Category	Definition-Comments Made Regarding
AOC	The state administrative office of the courts including ideas for improvement, role, and staff.
Certification	The process, issues, testing and plans with regard to certification of court interpreters
Costs	The concerns, issues and ideas regarding the costs of interpreting services.
Education	Education programs, internship programs, efforts and opportunities for targeting interpreters. Education programs for staff and judges about the role of the interpreter..
Language	Ideas or difficulties regarding a specific language.
Other	Could not be categorized within the other categories.
Outreach	Publicity and outreach ideas, activities and difficulties.
Registry	Combined list of possible interpreter resources.
Scheduling	Concerns, issues and ideas about the scheduling of interpreters on court calendars.
Statewide Discussions	Discussions and venues for discussions held at a broad statewide level including formal advisory groups and informal groups.
Telephonic	Use of telephonic interpreting services.
Website	Content and use of a website to provide information regarding court interpreting.

Information which was deemed to be specific to a location such as the number of hours required to drive from one place to another or the number of interpreted events were removed from the analysis. Some of the comments could have been categorized in more than one area, in these situations, the researcher broke the comments down into two entries where possible. When

the comment could not be broken down without losing the meaning, it was left intact and assigned to the most relevant category.

FINDINGS

Phase 1: Administrative Offices of the Courts

California

The California AOC reported efforts in the areas of educating new and existing interpreters, educating judges and staff, and certifying interpreters. The majority of its efforts are related to the processes surrounding certification, but they have recently hired a person to focus on recruitment.

California has utilized both general and foreign language periodical advertising. It have also begun to educate the community about the need for interpreters through radio, television and booths at public events. This is in the early stages, but they believe targeting communities with a high proportion of foreign-language speakers will be effective over time.

The AOC in California is making a dedicated effort to focus on recruitment. One of the innovations reported in this area was the development and use of a “toolkit” which was sent out to 1,000 organizations in the state. Organizations were targeted which would be likely to include people with knowledge of foreign languages. The toolkit included a printed folder with a brochure, frequently asked questions sheet, and a poster that could be hung, advertising interpreting as a career. Part of this toolkit included stories that had been translated into English that depicted individuals with various cultural backgrounds who had become interpreters. The toolkit was developed with the assistance of a public relations firm. California learned a great deal from this exercise. For instance, by sending the toolkit out to so many organizations, the ability to follow up with the organizations was limited. If California does this again, staff will

reduce the number to between 100 and 200 organizations in order to accommodate the possibility of follow-up with the organizations after some time has passed.

Another innovation reported was the coordination with human resources departments to identify potential interpreters. This included simple things such as changing applications to include the question “are you bilingual?” and educating human resource departments about interpreting so that human resource specialists would, in turn, would be able to talk more about it during any other recruitment activities they might do.

A third innovation reported was the utilization of web advertising. This included reaching out to courts, human resource departments and other organizations and asking them to link their web pages to the AOC’s interpreter web page. Web advertising was purchased on sites which targeted ethnic communities.

In order to more effectively utilize identified interpreters, California has done telephonic interpreting using both local resources and commercial services. The local resources are viewed as the more promising method of these two. They have not utilized video interpreting or interpreting utilizing voice over IP technology.

California has split the state into regions to assist in identifying interpreters when they are needed for courts in that region. Cross-assignment of interpreters is utilized at a regional level in order to better meet the needs of the courts served. California, at times, also groups cases together on calendars based on languages as a “best practice” to better utilize interpreter resources.

The AOC reported that the most useful tool for the courts they support is the master list which helps people to find interpreters. The most useful tool for interpreters in the state is the

ability to cluster cases based on the language spoken. This helps the interpreters use time efficiently, and helps the court calendar move smoothly

Colorado

The Colorado AOC has expended efforts in educating new and existing interpreters, judges, and court staff. It has also worked on certification and coordinating court calendars for interpreter availability. Minimal efforts have been spent increasing the pool of people interested in interpreting. The main focus of Colorado at the time of the interview was to standardize practices across the state in order to attract more qualified interpreters to their courts. This was estimated to be taking about 30% of available staff-time for the year.

Colorado has not done any focused advertising for interpreters. It has, however begun educating the community about the need for interpreters and reaching out to colleges and universities. Part of these efforts included the development of an orientation program which interested members of the public can attend.

Colorado also has a statewide registry of those qualified to interpret and has developed a website for interpreters.

Districts within the state have been established, each of which has a managing interpreter. These people are responsible for coordinating schedules, training and other activities surrounding interpreting. A lot of the AOC's work is done by getting information out to the districts. Colorado has begun to develop a continuing education program for interpreters which has been embraced by the community.

The AOC sees the promotion of certified interpreters as the most useful effort undertaken for both the courts and interpreters in the state. This has helped the courts be more satisfied with

the services they receive and has enabled interpreters to market themselves. The website maintained by the AOC has also been an effective resource.

Nevada

Nevada has invested a great deal of effort in certification and educating new and existing interpreters. Educating staff and judges is a relatively new focus being developed over the last year. Some efforts have also begun in the area of increasing the pool of people interested in interpreting. Nevada has done general advertising and advertising on radio stations that broadcast in Spanish. Nevada also has an interpreter roster which is published on their website. They have begun to reach out to some other government agencies regarding the coordination of interpreter use.

Nevada has done some telephonic interpreting both in-state and commercially, but has found the telephonic method to be rather ineffective in accomplishing the task necessary for interpreters. Video interpreters have not been utilized, but investigations are underway for video and other remote alternatives. The AOC does not work to cluster cases across regions or in any way manage interpreter resources to a schedule. It is possible that some trial courts do cluster cases based on interpreter needs.

Nevada is working through an advisory committee to amend their guidelines related to interpreting. Additionally, the possibility of adding spoken linguistic oral proficiency interviews to the certification process is being examined.

In Nevada, an e-mail list is maintained in order to inform the pool of interpreters about continuing education opportunities. Another innovation has been a project undertaken whereby the AOC interpreter coordinator travels to the rural areas of the states to visit courts face-to-face in order to explain and discuss issues surrounding interpreters.

The visits to rural courts were seen as the most beneficial to the courts because this exercise helped people understand the credentials of a court certified interpreter and the differences between bilingual individuals and interpreters. The exercise had the added benefit of identifying new potential interpreters. Court staff and judges gained a new understanding about the relationship of interpreters to the courts. This led to the identification of additional potential interpreters that were known to staff and judges, but who had not interpreted in the court setting previously.

Overall

Each of the Administrative Offices of the Courts contacted expressed clear concerns regarding finding qualified interpreters. Recruitment, however, has not been a well developed or primary goal in most of these offices historically. Rather, these offices are just beginning to move toward expending efforts in this area. All three offices indicated they had ongoing work in the area of educating new and existing interpreters, educating judges and staff about how to work with interpreters, testing, qualifying, or certifying interpreters, and maintaining some kind of a statewide repository of qualified interpreters. None of the offices currently offer video interpreting using in-state or commercial services. None has utilized voice over IP for interpreting services.

All three states interviewed had AOC-maintained websites which provided information about court interpreting in that state. Some of these sites include steps to become an interpreter, some include testing and certification schedules, and one includes advertising the benefits of being a court interpreter.

Two of the states interviewed are evaluating a mechanism for improving the quality of interpreting by employing linguistic oral proficiency interviews (OPI). These interviews test the

listening and speaking ability of those being tested in a standardized way using levels of linguistic complexity in the language in which they are being tested. This was expected to be a discussion point at the Consortium's annual meeting.

The data extracted from the responses to the Administrative Offices of the Courts surveys can be found in [Appendix E](#).

Phase 2: Trial Courts

California

Two rural and one urban court were interviewed in this state. The urban court in California was unique in that this was the only court interviewed that indicated that finding interpreters to cover hearings was not a challenge. The vast diversity of the city surrounding the court provides a pool of great depth from which to draw. Even indigenous languages of Mexico, a specific area of concern from other courts interviewed, did not pose a challenge to this court.

None of the courts interviewed in California found telephonic interpreting to be effective. Only one of the three courts interviewed found the registry a helpful tool. Although the listing does provide access to both certified and non-certified interpreters, rural courts reported that the usefulness was limited due to the lack of listed interpreters in their area.

All three of the courts were aware of the registry provided by the AOC in this state. The two courts that relied on the registry found it to be either very or somewhat effective. Two of the courts interviewed were aware of advertising efforts as well as efforts to reach out to the community about the need for interpreters which were being carried out by the AOC. These courts did not feel that they could effectively evaluate how useful these efforts had been in finding new interpreters.

Data associated with the California Trial Court Surveys can be found in [Appendix H](#).

Colorado

The AOC in this state identified two of the most effective things that the AOC was doing as the support of a website which includes information about how to become an interpreter and the maintenance of a registration list. The three trial courts interviewed substantiated these as extremely useful tools provided at the state level. As one interviewee explained, those seeking information about interpreting are referred to the AOC website along with the offer for them to call back if they seek additional information. This court employee only hears back from about five percent of those who call with additional questions. The site answers most of what people would need or want to know. All three of the trial courts interviewed rated the usefulness of the website maintained by the AOC as very effective. Interviewees commented about the ability to provide the website to prospective interpreters as a resource.

The AOC interpreter coordinator in this state is also an interpreter. This has built credibility with the court community in that state as it was specifically noted as a positive aspect of the undertakings of the AOC by two of the trial courts interviewed.

These courts also felt that the orientation was either somewhat or very effective. Two of the three courts utilized the registry. One of these found it somewhat effective while the other found it somewhat ineffective. This may be in part due to the difference between rural and urban courts. The urban court in this sample did not find the registry useful because most of the resources needed by this court were local to that court. The rural court found the registry useful because they had limited resources in the area and often needed to identify interpreters using the registry.

The roster of non-certified interpreters maintained online for use by the network of managing interpreters was perceived as very useful. This is likely a step towards addressing needs that are not fully met in the statewide registry of certified interpreters.

Only one of the three trial courts (the urban court) grouped cases based on the need for an interpreter and this court found it to be somewhat effective.

Data associated with the Colorado Trial Court Surveys can be found in [Appendix G](#).

Nevada

The trial courts interviewed in Nevada relied heavily on contract interpreters. The trial court that utilizes staff interpreters the most uses them 66% of the time, whereas the one using staff interpreters the least relied solely on contractors.

Two courts interviewed utilized commercial telephonic interpreting services. Both courts found them to be neither effective nor ineffective. One of these courts used in-state telephonic interpreting and found it to be very ineffective. In the comments surrounding these questions it was clear that telephonic interpreting was only utilized as a last resort when no interpreter could be found and only in very short proceedings such as an arraignment. None of these courts coordinated interpreter services with other non-court entities.

None of the courts queried were aware of the visits to other courts which had been undertaken by the AOC. This is likely partially due to the small sample size and the fact that two of the three trial courts interviewed were urban courts.

Data associated with the Nevada Trial Court Surveys can be found in [Appendix F](#).

Overall Results

A total of nine trial courts were interviewed. Four of these were urban courts, the remaining five were rural. The number of courtrooms supported by the courts ranged from one to 500. The median number of courtrooms was 14 and the mode was 12 courtrooms making the court with 500 courtrooms a significant outlier, therefore an average number was not calculated.

Two of the questions on the survey were related to telephonic interpreting. One question specifically asked about use of commercial interpreting service. Interpreters from this service do not necessarily have court-specific knowledge nor have they necessarily met certification requirements for that state. Another question asked about use of “in-state” interpreters telephonically. This would be a situation of using an interpreter in the state, but in a remote location who met the qualifications required by the state and understood court procedures and terminology. Out of 18 responses on the two questions relating to telephonic interpreting, only two individuals indicated that this method was somewhat effective. Both of these referred to in-state interpreting rather than commercial. All other responses either rated this as neither effective nor ineffective or considered it an ineffective method for interpreting.

The overall question of whether trial courts were in agreement with AOCs about which of the AOC’s efforts were most effective could not be adequately addressed by the data. In too many instances, the trial courts were unaware of the specific effort undertaken that the AOC had indicated was the most effective.

Rural and Urban Results

Anecdotal differences between the rural and urban courts interviewed were noted in a number of the comments which were made, and were also supported by the Likert scale data. There were three questions asked of each trial court regarding their knowledge of the AOC’s efforts regarding increasing the pool of interpreters. Only six of the 15 (40%) responses from rural courts were affirmative, while ten of the 12 (83%) responses from urban courts were affirmative. Table 3 shows an organized depiction of these results.

Table 4 Results of rural and urban courts responses to knowledge of AOC efforts

	Affirmative Responses (knew about AOC efforts)	Negative Responses (did not know about AOC efforts)	Total
Rural	6	9	15
Urban	10	2	12
Totals	16	11	27

A Chi square test on the data revealed this as a significant difference with a probability of less than .05 that this could have occurred by chance.

This result is striking in that rural courts are also the most likely to benefit from efforts made by the AOC. As one urban court discussed during the interview, the efforts by the AOC do not assist them because they are self-sufficient. In fact, some efforts made by the AOC actually divert resources from the urban court to the rural courts adding complexity to the scheduling in the urban court. This is likely a common perspective for large urban courts.

Categorical Findings

The comments made by each of the interview participants were the most useful information gathered from this study. A number of good ideas and practices that can provide suggestions to other trial court locations and AOC’s were uncovered. There were 120 comments categorized from the 12 interviews conducted. The general analysis of the comments based on categorization is shown in Table 5 on the following page.

Table 5 Categorization of comments

Category	Number of Comments
AOC	3
Certification	9
Costs	4
Education	16
Language	3
Outreach	43
Registry	12
Scheduling	9
Statewide Discussions	2
Telephonic Interpreting	9
Website	4
Other	6
Total	120

AOC

Most trial courts were reluctant to provide suggestions for what the AOC in their state could be doing better. Most indicated that the AOCs were doing a good job given the limited resources they had. When pushed to provide suggestions, the most frequent responses related to moving forward with technology, particularly tools for video interpreting.

Video interpreting was seen as a promising goal for the future by most of the courts interviewed. Several courts responded that this would be a great area for AOC’s to put efforts into. This technology was seen as having the potential to far exceed telephonic interpreting and a tool which could help overcome logistical challenges associated with using a limited number of interpreters to cover hearings across states encompassing large areas of land. Courts interviewed acknowledged that in addition to technical challenges, court rules, and in some cases statute, would need to change in order to allow this to occur.

Another idea was to increase reciprocity with neighboring states in terms of utilizing interpreters. Rural jurisdictions which are close to the borders of other states could benefit substantially from a sharing model which permits them, within any certification requirements in their state, to utilize interpreters from another state which may be closer to their courthouse than interpreters within their own state. A striking example came from one rural court which reported that the closest in-state large urban city was a three and a half hour drive from their location, but that a city located across state lines was only a 30 minute drive. This court has contracted with out-of-state ASL interpreters when needed, but points out that a reciprocity agreement between the states would benefit them a great deal.

Interestingly, although not explicitly described as a function of the AOCs in each state, it was clear through conversations with the trial courts that one of the most valued activities was interacting with others involved in scheduling and coordinating interpreter resources. In each state, the state court office has provided for some forum to allow this to occur and nearly every trial court survey participant (seven of the nine) mentioned this as valuable in at least one of their answers.

Other suggestions included increasing advertising efforts, and securing some kind of agreement for shared use of interpreting resources.

Certification

The three states interviewed have had certification programs in place for some time. Trial courts, to some degree, take the existence of the programs for granted. The focus of many of the comments had to do with the limitations of the certification programs. Several courts talked about rural interpreters who could not afford to travel to the urban center where classes or tests for certification were offered. Consider an individual who may only be called once or twice

a month to interpret being burdened with the expense of three or more days lodging as well as travel and meals away from home. This is a difficult problem to solve. Providing training or certification to one individual in a rural court is cost-prohibitive.

Costs

Several discussion points came up throughout the interviews regarding the cost of interpreters. As cited earlier, one court relayed a problem of courts competing with one another based on the amount they would pay for an interpreter. This problem was resolved by the court administrators in that area standardizing a fee schedule. Other courts talk about the cost associated with using certified interpreters and indicate that they would not be able to continue to operate if they were required to use a certified interpreter each time. The discussions in this area clearly point to the practical nature of projecting what interpreting services will be needed in the course of the year, budgeting for them, and then finding them when needed.

Registry

Although each of the states surveyed had some kind of a centralized registry, many (6) trial courts indicated that they also kept a local list in their court separate from the centralized registry.

Outreach

Not surprisingly the majority of the comments revolved around concepts relating to outreach. As the majority of the questions asked by the interviewer were related to increasing the pool of interpreters, it was expected that there would be more responses relating to outreach.

One of the issues noted with several forms of outreach was the time necessary to follow-up. For instance, one court gathered names of people interested in interpreting at a career fair,

but did not have time to call the individuals to follow-up later and cultivate these contacts. An AOC sent out toolkits to 1000 organizations, but did not have the ability to follow-up with them to make sure the toolkits were used and to get feedback from the agencies which could have been useful to future efforts. The general consensus among those working on these efforts appears to be that dedicated time to follow-up would make initial efforts more fruitful. Outreach is seen as something that will have a long-term return on investment.

Lack of time was an oft-cited reason that little outreach had been done at the trial court level. A number of people interviewed had ideas of how to make things better, but had not found the time to implement them. One interviewee had worked with a professor at a local college who was also a federally certified interpreter. He felt that there was the potential to develop students under this professor into being interpreters, but had not had the time to develop this idea into something more tangible with the professor.

There were also examples of success stories from trial courts. In one instance a court had worked with a Mexican law school to have students from the school provide pro bono assistance to self-represented litigants through an internship at the court. Although this example speaks to the use of bilingual individuals in a non-interpreter role, the connection made with the law school of a foreign country is one that could be developed into a broader tool.

Another trial court utilized judges with divergent backgrounds to help reach out to local ethnic communities in order to try to help identify potential interpreters. Similarly, a different trial court engaged existing interpreters in helping spread, by word of mouth, the need for additional interpreters in different areas. This court reported finding four new interpreters through this method.

Education

Education is a broad area of concern among the courts with regard to interpreters. Several rural courts discussed struggles associated with getting new interpreters qualified because of the distance they would need to travel to attend the orientation program which is necessary in that state. A compelling story from one trial court discussed an individual who has been interpreting for that court for a number of years on a sporadic basis (an estimated average of 0 to 2 hearings each month was provided) who would have to travel over 200 miles to attend training and pay for his own lodging. Even with the AOC agreeing to waive the associated registration fees, the training was cost prohibitive for this individual on whom the court relies.

One trial court commented on the time required to keep interpreters sharp in their skills. It appears that the first wave of educational efforts in each of these states were focused on new interpreters and that there is more and more thought being put into continuing education opportunities.

Scheduling

Most of the courts queried were asked about scheduling practices. There were two very strong philosophical views expressed with regard to calendaring cases based on languages spoken by the defendant. One school of thought supported this notion and saw benefit to making the best use of interpreter time as well as moving court calendars efficiently using this method. Courts subscribing to this school of thought reported prompting judges, already granting a continuance, to schedule for a day when an interpreter would already be at the courthouse, or scheduling all hearings for Spanish speaking individuals on a particular day of the week.

The opposite perspective pointed to issues of equality in terms of those who spoke different languages being treated differently because schedules were being made based on their spoken language. One court cited the example of a response to their recent administration of the

Access and Fairness survey (CourTools Measure Number One)¹⁴. One respondent complained that defendants using interpreter services received preferential treatment. Whether seen as an advantage or disadvantage, clustering cases by language runs the risk of being perceived as treating people differently.

Statewide Discussions

Throughout the interviews trial courts referenced meetings, e-mail lists and other mechanisms for communicating with other people in their state facing similar dilemmas with interpreter resources. Although this was not a specific area explored initially, it is clearly a very important part of what AOCs can do. Trial courts talk about the benefit of having consistent rules, disciplinary action and ethics which are generally the result of statewide discussions. Perhaps more importantly, they speak of knowing others in similar situations who they can reach out to for help in identifying interpreters, making difficult decisions regarding contractors, and collaborating in general.

Telephonic Interpreting

The survey results substantiate many of the issues referenced in the literature regarding telephonic interpreting. Most looked upon telephonic interpreting as a last resort and would only use this in situations where proceedings were relatively short and simple. In places where a system for telephonic interpreting between other staff interpreters within the state was available, respondents were slightly more likely to utilize the service. Respondents had more confidence in the knowledge of interpreters which had gone through the state's own orientation program, understood courtroom procedures and/or had met certification requirements within the state.

¹⁴ CourTools is a set of ten performance measures used to evaluate the effectiveness of courts. The access and fairness survey is traditionally given to individuals as they are leaving the courthouse in order to determine their opinions about the court.

Interpreters provided by commercial vendors might or might not meet criteria established by the state and therefore were a less trusted source of services.

One court talked about the specific situation of migratory workers who speak indigenous Spanish languages. In general, these defendants tend to be unschooled and this factor makes interpreting that much more difficult. To try to do this by telephone without the added benefit of non-verbal communication cues is ineffective.

Language

From the interviews there were two consistent language specific challenges mentioned. Indigenous languages of Mexico impact courts in all three states surveyed as do challenges of obtaining qualified ASL interpreters.

Website

All three states had trial courts which commented on the value of the website maintained by the AOC. Trial courts referenced the vast amount of information that could be found there. They have confidence in the website as a resource that directs and aids potential interpreters in getting their initial information. One court identified this as the most effective tool that the AOC provides. Others clearly see value and utilize the site frequently. Information available on the web site cited as being helpful included schedules and costs for orientation programs, information about certification, explanations about requirements for court interpreting, and steps to become a court interpreter. Courts commented positively on the completeness and accuracy of the information reflected.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSION 1: Statewide Program

AOC's have a significant and useful role to play in court interpreter programs which could not be fulfilled by most trial courts on their own. AOC's which do not have statewide interpreter programs should consider developing some sort of program, even if it initially needs to be small. There is a need for organization and communication from a state level which will help move the trial courts in a particular state forward.

CONCLUSION 2: Communication

One benefit of AOC involvement is a venue for communicating about interpreter issues across a particular state. AOC's should ensure that a portion of any program plan regarding interpreter services has a component which focuses on an exchange of information between trial court staff from different jurisdictions. There is richness in the exchange of information which is less likely to occur if these entities do not communicate directly. Ideas for improvements can be developed and support can be lent between people who have common interests and responsibilities.

It is also clear that the centralized nature of AOC's makes their role very beneficial in communicating information out to courts, interpreters and potential interpreters. There are a number of local innovations which were uncovered during these interviews; undoubtedly more would be discovered with further queries. AOC's are in the unique position to gather this type of information from the courts that they serve and share it with others.

An example of a positive outcome through communication between courts concerns costs associated with interpreting services. One of the trial courts interviewed described a situation in

which courts had been competing with each other monetarily to obtain interpreter resources. Contract interpreters were choosing to accept jobs from those courts that had a higher pay scale and declining jobs from lower paying courts, thereby leaving these courts without interpreting services. Court administrators in this region met together with judges to discuss the issue. In two meetings they accomplished a plan to equalize the costs associated with interpreters so that all of the courts would pay exactly the same amount. All existing contracts were allowed to expire and new contracts were put in place to address the new pay scale. The result has been a more even distribution of interpreting services. Particularly in rural areas where interpreting resources are scarce, this might be worth some investigation.

CONCLUSION 3: Rural Courts

Urban courts are most likely to know about efforts which the AOC is putting forth in a state in the area of increasing the interpreter pool, but rural courts are likely to receive the most benefit from these efforts.

AOC's need to find a way to make a more concerted effort to reach out and communicate to rural courts regarding efforts underway in interpreter programs and services which might be available. It is likely that more investigation would be needed to determine what the most effective method would be to achieve this goal.

CONCLUSION 4: Website

AOC maintained websites can have a very positive role in informing interpreters and potential interpreters. The interviews conducted clearly point to web pages maintained by AOC's as one of the most utilized and effective tools currently in place for increasing the pool as well as educating potential interpreters.

As an AOC maintained website has clearly been a useful tool to the trial courts interviewed, it makes sense to expand this presence as much as possible. One state interviewed has a plan which includes investing in web advertising with banners, having courts and government human resource departments link directly to the site. AOC's should ensure they have an interpreter specific area on their websites and work to develop and promote the site.

CONCLUSION 5: Human Resources

Human resource departments are in a unique position to gather information about potential future interpreters. AOC's and trial courts should reach out to any human resources departments which handle court (and if possible other government) application processes to try to gather information about applicants who are bilingual.

CONCLUSION 6: Advertising

AOCs are in a strong position to leverage media and other resources for outreach campaigns that have the potential for benefitting trial courts within a state. Advertising seems like a good idea. There is not currently enough data to prove whether or not it will be beneficial, but AOC's are in the best position to try campaigns and follow them to determine whether or not they are effective. Of the states interviewed, California is the furthest along in advertising efforts and has plans to expand these efforts over the next several years.

In those areas where some advertising was done, trial courts suggested that additional advertising including increased frequency and breadth be carried out. Another suggestion was to target younger people with the advertising. The idea behind this is to look at what is needed in 10 years rather than the immediate demand of today. Some AOC's are reaching out to colleges seeking those enrolled in language programs or students for whom English is their second language. It is possible that these same efforts could be extended to high schools, and perhaps

even younger school children. Advertising in this way would increase the awareness of interpreting as a career.

CONCLUSION 7: Registry

Statewide registries and interpreter lists are useful, but do not meet all of the needs that trial courts have. AOCs should seek out ways to make statewide registries more useful to trial courts.

CONCLUSION 8: Training

Current models for training and certification processes may be ineffective for rural residents. The result is a reduced likelihood of developing a rural pool of qualified interpreters. AOCs need to devote time and effort to find creative ways of delivering training to rural areas. Modes of training and paths to certification should be carefully examined for their impact on rural courts. AOCs tend to be located in urban areas and delivery of services tends to be most cost effective if held in a centralized area. This has led states to hold training and certification programs in urban areas which require potential rural participants to drive long distances and outlay expenses for lodging for multi-day sessions. This is prohibiting some people from functioning as certified interpreters in rural communities.

Suggestions of having county based training programs rather than those at a state level might make it easier for potential interpreters in rural areas to attend. This, in turn, would increase the availability of interpreters in these same rural areas. Unfortunately, the cost per participant for this mode of delivery would likely far exceed a centralized method. One jurisdiction tried to conduct training in different areas, but had difficulty getting enough participants to attend to make the training worthwhile, so these trainings were cancelled.

Further suggestions included the creation of distance learning opportunities for languages in which certification was not available. Perhaps distance universities with strong language programs could be tapped to address this niche of educational needs.

CONCLUSION 9: Continuing Education

More effort will need to be placed on continuing education in order to retain qualified interpreters. AOCs, where possible, should work to develop continuing education programs and/or venues for court interpreters in their communities. Languages evolve, as does the legal system. Courts generally expend effort and dollars on educating judges to keep them apprised of legal changes in order to ensure fair treatment of litigants. It is likely that maintaining well educated interpreters will be just as critical to the experience of LEP litigants.

CONCLUSION 10: Internship and Mentoring Programs

Internship and mentoring programs are valuable methods of providing access to potential and new interpreters to the courts in a structured manner with relatively little risk. Internship and mentoring programs should be considered as potential building blocks to obtaining and retaining future interpreters. One trial court described talked through its interpreter internship program and touted this as a good way to groom potential interpreters. In the program being developed by one trial court, the intern (a local university student) “shadows”¹⁵ certified interpreters for several months and is provided with opportunities to try to translate documents which are later verified by certified interpreters. Vocabulary and other language skill building is done as part of the experience as well. Interns are required to research five to ten words each day. At the end of the internship the individual has an understanding of court culture, the reality of court interpreting and has increased language skills... all of which put that individual on a good path for pursuing interpreting opportunities.

¹⁵ Shadowing refers to the act of following a person on the job to gain a better understanding of what the job entails.

A related idea to help ease new people into the realm of interpreting is to assign mentors. In fact, one study found that 72% of interpreters surveyed felt that a mentor would be valuable to them in their jobs (Institute for Social Science Research at Arizona State University, 2007, p. 23). It is possible that an internship program and mentorship program could be developed in tandem in some jurisdictions.

CONCLUSION 11: Untapped Resources

Trial courts may have internal resources that have remained untapped in terms of finding additional interpreting resources. Trial courts, in particular, should assess the resources they may already have. Judges or court staff who have links to ethnic communities or who are bilingual themselves may be able to reach potential interpreters through word of mouth. Likewise, contract interpreters with whom the court is already working may know others who are interested in pursuing court interpreting as a career, or know interpreters in other specialties who might be willing and able to learn to interpret in a court setting.

CONCLUSION 12: Inter-State and Inter-Country Coordination

Rural jurisdictions which border other states or countries, such as Mexico, could benefit from any successful efforts to share resources across borders. Efforts to reach out to bordering states and countries should be increased. The return on investment is likely to be great for these bordering communities. Hurdles will include pay structures and certification requirements, but reciprocal agreements could be broached to handle these issues. This particular recommendation could be driven by an AOC or individual trial courts.

CONCLUSION 13: Inter-Agency Coordination

Collaboration between agencies remains relatively untapped as a tool for making the best use of interpreter resources. A greater focus with strategic planning should be placed on

reaching out to other agencies and organizations which utilize interpreting services. Lesser used languages, in particular, in which contract interpreters may be contacted only sporadically, would benefit from this collaboration. There are a wide range of government agencies which require interpreters in various situations. Likewise, specialized areas, such as the medical arena, require high levels of linguistic competence from which collaboration might yield more work for contract interpreters which would retain more available interpreters and draw more people into the field.

CONCLUSION 14: Video Interpreting

Trial courts view video interpreting as a promising technology for the future which would not incur the same limitations as telephonic interpreting. AOC's should investigate technologies related to remote video interpreting. As opportunities permit, pilot programs should be established to determine whether or not trial courts find this method more effective than telephonic interpreting. This option should be re-evaluated periodically as technology improves and becomes less cost prohibitive.

Arizona is positioned well to utilize video over intranet lines because all courts in the state are supported by one network maintained by the AOC. That said, the portions of the network with the smallest bandwidth are in the most remote locations. Therefore, Arizona is positioned least well to deliver video in this way to the most rural of courts.

CONCLUSION 15: Research

Research regarding the ramifications of not having an interpreter to assist LEP though court proceedings is lacking.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: Statewide Program

Arizona should learn from other AOCs about the areas which will be most beneficial to include in its statewide program as it is developed. A balance between available resources and potential tools will need to be struck.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Communication

Arizona has established an informal work group of interpreter coordinators throughout the state. This group is positioned well to serve this function in Arizona. The results of this study support the continuation of that group and the value in the informal communication which occurs there.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Rural

Arizona needs to investigate ways to do more outreach to rural courts that have not identified a specific person as an interpreter coordinator and make sure these courts are aware of services becoming available.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Website

Arizona currently has an intranet website specific to interpreter issues available only to the court community, but has recently developed a work group to identify appropriate content for an Internet site. The results of this study support these efforts and suggest that marketing the Internet site, once it is available, will be an important component to its success.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Human Resources

Arizona has not yet begun efforts in this area, but should research contacts in government human resource areas once the statewide Internet site has been established.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Advertising

Arizona should consider an advertising campaign as a long-term goal. This would help increase awareness of interpreting as a career in Arizona and would also be likely to identify many potential interpreters already resident in the state.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Registry

Arizona has created an automated tool to establish a statewide registry. It will be important for the AOC to continue to receive feedback as the tool is utilized more heavily to determine what needs are not being met and may need to be included in this tool. The goal should be to try to alleviate the effort required in keeping duplicate lists.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Training

If Arizona receives funding for a certification program, training needs to be developed as a strong component of the program. Particular attention will need to be paid to how to design the program such that it will be of benefit to rural courts and communities.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Continuing Education

Continuing education for interpreters should be a long-term goal for Arizona; however, initial training and orientation programs should be developed before adding in continuing education.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Internship and Mentoring Programs

Arizona should consider internship and mentorship programs as long-term goals of the interpreter program.

RECOMMENDATION 11: Untapped Resources

The Arizona AOC should encourage trial courts to evaluate whether they have untapped resources within their courts. Staff, judges or contract interpreters working in the courthouse may know of people who would be interested in pursuing a career in interpreting.

RECOMMENDATION 12: Inter-State and Inter-Country Coordination

Arizona should reach out to bordering states to determine if sharing resources close to the borders would be of benefit to each of the states. Arizona should also research any potential resources close to the border of Mexico which might be of benefit in reaching interpreter resources. Particular attention should be paid to Mexico’s indigenous languages during this research.

RECOMMENDATION 13: Inter-Agency Coordination

Arizona has made contact with the federal court located in Phoenix with regard to interpreter resources. Federal court representatives have engaged in Arizona’s Listserv which helps people reach out for interpreter resources. The Mexican Consulate has been contacted by at least one of Arizona’s courts to obtain an interpreter for indigenous Mexican languages. Arizona should strengthen existing relationships with other government agencies and continue to establish lists of potential government agencies for which sharing interpreter resources might be possible. A number of organizations already exist, such as the League of Cities and Towns, which was created for the purpose of collaboration. These organizations are recommended places to start discussions about the sharing of interpreter resources.

RECOMMENDATION 14: Video Interpreting

Arizona also has a remote court reporter project which is currently being piloted. This utilizes specific technology to allow court reporters in one location to record proceedings in

another location. Although this program is in its infancy, the hope is that once proven for court reporters, the program could be expanded for use by court interpreters.

RECOMMENDATION 15: Additional Research

Research should be conducted regarding how well those LEP individuals who are involved in court cases understand the proceedings and what they are required to do next. This might lead to increased understanding of funding authorities for the need for interpreters in all court cases.

One court study conducted in New Jersey utilized the National Center for State Courts CourTools Access and Fairness survey to determine the perception of Spanish speaking clientele about the court. This study noted areas of concern regarding forms and the removal of language barriers. The approach used by researchers in this study, focused on overall perception of the court rather than any test of whether defendants understood what had occurred in court (Hernandez, 2008, p. 1).

It would be interesting, albeit expensive, to conduct a study which delves more deeply into the understanding of court processes. How many people who needed an interpreter, but did not receive one understand the outcome of their case or the next steps for what they are to do? The results of such a study have a great potential for helping to pinpoint the issues that language barriers bring to the process of meting out justice. Further evidence of what happens without interpreters might help insure additional funding for these efforts in courts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2004). *A Report to the California Legislature on the Use of Interpreters in the California Courts*. Judicial Council of California.
- Abrahamson, S. (2005). *The Causes of Popular Satisfaction with the Administrative Justice*. State of the Judiciary Address to the Wisconsin Judicial Conference.
- Andrulis, D., Goodman, N., & Pryor, C. (2002, April). *What a Difference an Interpreter Can Make: Health Care Experiences of Uninsured with Limited English Proficiency*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Access Project:
http://www.accessproject.org/adobe/what_a_difference_an_interpreter_can_make.pdf
- Arizona Administrative Code - Agency, Board & Commission Rules: Chapter 26 COMMISSION FOR THE DEAF AND THE HARD OF HEARING. (n.d.).
- Arizona Makes English Official*. (2006, November 9). Retrieved March 13, 2008, from Washington Times: <http://www.washtimes.com/news/2006/nov/08/20061108-115125-7910r/>
- Bacon, D. (1999, September 5). *Cost-Cutting Undermines Language Rights in the L.A. Courts*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from David Bacon Stories and Photographs:
<http://dbacon.igc.org/Work/06LanguageRights.htm>
- Bancroft, M. (2007). *Overcoming Language Barriers in Health Care: Best Practices*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Cross Cultural Communications:
<http://dhmh.state.md.us/hd/presentations/pdf/24MarjorieBancroft.pdf>
- Benmaman, V. (2000). Interpreter Issues on Appeal. *Proteus* , Volume 9, Number 4.
- Bourgeois, J. (1998). *Establishing Interpreter Mentorship Programs in Postsecondary Institutions*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from PEPNET:
<http://www.pepnet.org/confpast/1998/pdf/bourgeois.pdf>
- Bruggeman, J. (2008, March 28). *Ayuda's Community Legal Interpreter Bank*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from State of Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations:
<http://hawaii.gov/labor/ola/conference-speeches-and-presentations/Ayuda2019s%20Community%20Interpreter%20Bank%20March%2029%20Jean%20Bruggeman.pdf>

- Carmichael, C. (2003). *Court Interpreters (Circuit Courts) Joint Committee on Finance Paper #211*. Madison, WI: Legislative Fiscal Bureau.
- Clark, D., & Gottlieb, K. (2002). *Telephonic Certified Court Interpreter Regional Consortium Project: A final report and independent evaluation submitted to the Supreme Court of New Mexico and its Administrative Office of the Courts*. Funded by a State Justice Institute Grant Award No. 01-N-064.
- Committee to Study Interpreter Issues in Arizona Courts. (2002). *Report to the Arizona Judicial Council on Interpreter Issues in Arizona Courts*. Phoenix: Arizona Supreme Court.
- Commonly Asked Questions and Answers Regarding Executive Order 13166*. (2008). Retrieved June 13, 2008, from U.S. Department of Justice: <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/Pubs/lepqapr.htm>
- Comstock, J. (n.d.). *Telephonic Interpreting Access*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Rauch: <http://www.rauchcom.com/idgrantreport.html>
- Conklin, A. (1999, November 30). *Hospital Bridges Language Gap*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from University of Wisconsin News: <http://www.news.wisc.edu/3449>
- Current Schedule*. (2008, June 2). Retrieved June 21, 2008, from Colorado Judicial Branch: <http://www.courts.state.co.us/chs/hr/interpreters/currentschedule.htm>
- Dafao, J. (2004). *Many Hospitals Lack Interpreters with more Patients' English Limited, Board Takes Survey*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from SFGate.com: <http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=c/a/2004/09/24/BAGQP8UE2T1.DTL>
- DiPietro, S., & Aiken, B. (2002). *Courts Report Shortage of Interpreters*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Alaska Bar Association: <http://www.alaskabar.org/index.cfm?id=6162>
- DiVasto, P. (1996). *Negotiating with Foreign Language-Speaking Subjects*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Law Enforcement Bulletin: http://www.au.af.mil/au.awc/awcgate/fbi/leb_june963.htm
- Doege, D. (2005). *Certified Interpreters not in All Courtrooms*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Online: <http://www.jsonline.com/story/index.aspx?id=306067>
- Duncan, L. (2001). Remote Court Interpreting: Development of a pilot project in California. (2006). *Family Law Interpreter Pilot Program Report to the Legislature*. San Francisco, California: Judicial Council of California Administrative Office of the Courts.

- Filling the Interpreter Shortage the Hard Way*. (2006, August 5). Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Strategy Page: <http://www.strategypage.com/htm/htintel/articles/20060805.aspx>
- FIRN*. (2007). Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Resources for the Foreign Born: <http://www.firnonline.org/services.html#3>
- Former Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Migrants*. (2008, January 31). Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Community & Public Health: A division of the Canterbury District Health board: www.cpublichealth.co.nz/about-us/refugees-and-asylum-seekers.asp
- Framer, I. (2000, Winter-Spring Volumn IX, Nos 1-2). *Interpreters and their Impact on the Criminal Justice System: The Alejandro Ramirez Case*. Retrieved August 6, 2008, from Proteus: <http://languageaccess.us/uploads/Interpreters%20and%20Their%20Impact%20PDF.pdf>
- Gagne, M. A. (2000). *Empirical Analysis of Outsourcing Spanish Interpreter Services in Hennepin County District Court*. Williamsburg, VA: Institute for Court Management.
- Gillepsie, P. (2007, July 30). *Courts Make Heavy Use of Translators: Local immigration drives demand*. Retrieved August 6, 2007, from The News Press: www.newspress.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070730/NEWS01/70729024/1075
- Griffin, P. W., & Cole, S. J. (2007). *Court Interpretation: Fundamental to Access to Justice*. Conference of State Court Administrators.
- Health Care Interpreter Network Taps Cisco Techonology to Meet the Needs of California's Diverse Patient Population: Innovative and collaborative effort aims to remove language as a barrier to quality healthcare*. (2006). Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Business Wire: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0EIN/is_2006_August_7/ai_n16609920
- Heppner, C. (2007, August 30). *Using Video Interpreters to Combat Interpreter Shortage - Part One*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Hearing Loss Web: <http://www.hearinglossweb.com/res/hlorg/tdi/cn/2007/vri.htm>
- Herman, M., & Skove, A. E. (1999, September 8). *Court Interpretation: State Court Rules for Language Interpreters Memorandum*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from National Center for State Courts: http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_CtInterpRulesPub.pdf
- Hernandez, S. E. (2008). *Spanish Speaker Perceptions of access and Fairness of the Superior Court of New Jersey in Vicinage XV and Improvement Recommendations*. Williamsburg, VA: Institute for Court Management.

- Hewitt, W. E. (1999). Telephone Interpretation: Options in accessing justice. *CTC Session Articles*.
- Hewitt, W. E., & Richardson, J. G. (1997). *Managing Language Problems: A court interpreting education program for judges, lawyers, and court managers*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Hewitt, W., Hannaford, P., Gill, C., & Cantrell, M. (1998). *Court Interpreting Services in State and Federal Courts: Reasons and options for inter-court coordination*. State Justice Institute Grant: SJI-96-12A-B-158.
- Immigrants Hindered by Sweden's Interpreter Shortage*. (2008, May 27). Retrieved June 16, 2008, from The Local: Sweden's News in English: <http://www.thelocal.se/12042/20080527/>
- (2000). *Improving Interpretation in Wisconsin's Courts*. Committee to Improve Interpreting and Translation in the Wisconsin Courts Report of the Director of State Courts.
- Institute for Social Science Research at Arizona State University. (2007, October). *Report of the Findings of a Survey of Arizona Interpreters for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and Consumers of Interpreting Services*. Retrieved August 5, 2008, from Arizona Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing: <http://www.acdhh.org/uploads/Interpreter-consumer%20report%20FINAL.pdf>
- Kingston, P. (2008, January 2008). *Wanted: English Speakers with Fluency in Sarcasm*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from The Guardian: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2008/jan/29/furthereducation.tefl>
- Laroe, G. (2007, October 21). *Need for court Interpreters Grows*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from <http://www.nwanews.com/adg/News/205099/>
- Lee, R. J. (2007). Recruitment Strategies. *2007 Annual Business Meeting Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification*.
- Legislative Analyst's Office. (2004). *Analysis of the 2004-05 Budget Bill: State Trial Court Funding (0450)*. California: Judiciary and Criminal Justice.
- Listing of Licensed Interpreters*. (June, 3 2008). Retrieved June 19, 2008, from Arizona Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing: <http://www.acdhh.org/uploads/6-4-08%20Licensed%20Interpreters.pdf>
- Lonergan, S. M. In-house Interpreters vs. Outsourcing in the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida.

- McCarthy, E., & Corren, B. (2002, July-August). Interpreters Wanted: Courts reach out to ethnic communities. *Court News* , p. 1.
- Meeting the Growing Need for American Sign Language Interpreters*. (2005, June). Retrieved June 19, 2008, from Sorenson Communications:
<http://www.sorensonvrs.com/newsletter/interpreterShortage.pdf>
- Morse, A. (2007, October 7). *Language Access: Giving immigrants a hand in navigating the health care system*. Retrieved July 3, 2008, from National Conference of State Legislatures:
www.ncsl.org/programs/immig/SHNarticle.htm
- Nelesen, A. (2005). Court Interpreters in Demand. *4HearingLoss* , Retrieved June 16, 2008, from
<http://www.greenbaypressgazette.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20051227/GPG0101/512270484/1207/GPGnews>.
- Powloski, J. (2008, August 30). County court over budget for jury costs. *The Olympian* , p. 1.
- Reeves, J. (2006, September 24). *Roving Interpreters Fill Void*. Retrieved June 14, 2008, from Associated Press: http://www.alabar.org/media/news_digest/sept06.cfm
- Romberger, W. (2007). Interpreters in Civil Cases. In N. C. Courts, *Future Trends in State Courts* (pp. 68-71). Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Romberger, W. (2007). *Skills Training for Foreign Language Court Interpreters: Does it increase the number of qualified interpreters? 2007*: Institute for Court Management.
- Romberger, W., & Hewitt, W. E. (2006). Wanted: Career Paths for Court Interpreters. In *Future Trends in State Courts 2006* (pp. 77-81). Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Romero, B., Foy, A., Langford, J. Y., & Saltzman, A. (2006). *Report on the Use of Interpreters in Ohio Courts*. The Supreme Court of Ohio.
- Schaefer, D. M. (2004). *Assessment of Spanish Court Interpreter Service Delivery Methods for the Superior Court in Yavapai County, Arizona*. Williamsburg, VA: Institute for Court Management.
- Schauffler, R., Green, C., Romberger, W., & Hewitt, W. (2008). *Interpreting Services in Civil Cases in California: An Exploratory Study*. Williamsburg, Virginia: National Center for State Courts.

- Soh, J. (2006, September 6). *Language Barriers Plague Hospitals in the US*. Retrieved June 13, 2008, from NewsVOA.com: <http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2006-09/2006-09-06-voa45.cfm?CFID=9394121&CFTOKEN=96268012>
- Solving an Interpreter Shortage*. (1994, Spring). Retrieved June 16, 2008, from OnCue: <http://dSPACE.wrlc.org/doc/bitstream/2041/48797/ONCUE-1984springdisplay.pdf>
- Sorenson Communications. (2005, June). *Meeting the Growing Need for American Sign Language Interpreters*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Sorenson VRS: <http://www.sorensonvrs.com/newsletter/interpreterShortage.pdf>
- Sources of Supply for Second Language Speakers*. (2007). Retrieved June 13, 2008, from Center for Applied Second Language Studies: Oregon Language Summit: <http://casls.uoregon.edu/roadmap/reportEdu.html>
- Steelman, D. C., & Hewitt, W. (2001). *Operational Review of the Provision of Court interpreter Services in the Courts of Massachusetts*. Denver, CO: National Center for State Courts.
- Stewart-Strobel, J. (2003). *Motivations and Attitudes Affecting High School Students' Choice of Foreign Language*. Retrieved July 5, 2008, from Bnet.com: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2248/is_149_38/ai_103381767/print?tag=artBody;coll
- Summers, C. (2005, November 10). *Interpreter Shortage Poses Threat*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from BBC News Website: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4416984.stm
- Suveiu, V. (2004). The Growing Need for Qualified Court Interpreters. In N. C. Courts, *Future Trends in State Courts 2004* (pp. 101-103). Williamsburg, Virginia: National Center for State Courts.
- The Advisory Board Company. (2005, February 28). *Pediatric Interpretation Issues*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Wisconsin Coalition for Linguistic Access to Healthcare: <http://www.wclah.org/PDFs/PedInterpretation.pdf>
- The Demand for Second Language Skills in Oregon*. (2007). Retrieved June 13, 2008, from <http://casls.uoregon.edu/roadmap/reportPublic.html>
- Tooman, G., Vasconcellas, S., Lopez, E., & Masias, M. (2007). *An Interpreter Workload Analysis. Report Prepared by the Office of the State Court Administrator*. Denver, CO.
- (2008). *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2006-2007*. Judicial Council of California.

U.S. Census Bureau *State and County Quick Facts for Arizona*. (2006). Retrieved June 16, 2008, from U.S. Census Bureau: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/04000.html>

U.S. ex rel. Negrón v. New York, 434 F.2d 386 (2nd Circuit 1970).

Valdex, G., & Wilcox, P. (1991). *The use of court interpreters in New Mexico: A handbook for judges, attorneys, and interpreters*.

Wantland, K. F. (2003). *The New E&P Workforce: How employers benefit from building the pool of independent employees*. Retrieved from www.hgs.org/en/articles/printview.asp

Weiss, D. C. (2007, August 10). *Judge Decries Interpreter Shortage*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from ABA Journal: http://abajournal.com/news/judge_decries_interpreter_shortage/

Wilczewski, W. (2007, October 2). *No habla in Nogales*. Retrieved June 28, 2008, from Nogales International: <http://www.nogalesinternational.com/articles/2007/10/02/opinion/opinion1.txt>

APPENDIX A: STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE SURVEY (SURVEY 1)

To be conducted over the phone unless a specific request is made for it to be mailed out.

SCRIPT:

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me today.

I am conducting an exploratory study to determine more about what methods courts are using to increase the pool of interpreters. The first part of this study focuses on the state level with the expectation that a second phase will be conducted with a sampling of courts that each state serves.

Information will eventually be published on the Internet in a Court Executive Development Paper available on the National Center for State Courts website.

I'm going to ask you about a series of areas in which your office may be expending efforts. By "efforts" I mean time that has been invested by you or your program staff in this area. I'm looking for the general proportion of time you've spent in each area. I will first ask you whether or not you have efforts in an area and then, if you have spent time in the area, what proportion of time is spent in that area using a scale of 1-19% of your time, 20-39% of your time, 40-59% of your time, 60-79% of your time or 80-100% of your time. After asking about specific areas, I will also give you the opportunity to tell me about other areas in which you may spend time.

Overview of Program

	Efforts in this area?	1-19%	20-39%	40-59%	60-79%	80-100%
Educating new and existing interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
Educating Judges and Staff about how to work with interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
Testing/Qualifying/Certifying Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
Increasing Pool of People Interested in Interpreting	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
Coordinating courts' calendars and interpreter availability	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
Other areas of focus of your program(please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
Other areas of focus of your program(please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N					

I'd like now to focus your attention on efforts you have made to increase the pool of interpreters. I will be asking you whether you have tried any methods to increase the pool and then ask for your opinion about how effective this method has been. You will be able to answer that it was: very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective or very ineffective. You will, again, be asked at the end of the list for any additional methods you have utilized which do not fall into the specific categories I have asked you about.

Increasing Pool						
		How effective was this method?				
	Have you tried a method in this category?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
General advertising	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advertising in foreign language periodicals	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaching out to colleges and universities	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Now, I'd like to focus on methods you have used to make the most use of the interpreter pool that you do have. In answering these questions please consider both contract and employee interpreters. Again I will ask if you have tried a particular method, and if so, how effective that method has been in your opinion. You will be able to answer very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective, or very ineffective.

Increasing Use of Existing Pool

		How effective was this method?				
	Have you tried a method in this category?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephonic interpreting using commercial service(s)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Video interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Video interpreting using commercial service(s)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinating use of interpreters with other non-court agencies	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Establishing inter-governmental agreements to share staff interpreters between courts	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Group or cluster cases on court calendars in accordance with interpreter needs	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today, what do you believe is the most beneficial to the courts you support?

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today which services have been most useful in meeting the need for interpreters in your state.

What additional information or details would you like to provide with regard to your efforts in increasing your interpreter pool?

Could you identify 2 rural and 2 urban courts in your state with contact names with respect to interpreter coordination?

	Court	Contact
Rural		
Rural		
Urban		
Urban		

APPENDIX B: TRIAL COURT SURVEYS (SURVEY 2A)-CALIFORNIA

To be conducted over the phone unless a specific request is made for it to be mailed out.

SCRIPT:

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me today.

As indicated in my earlier e-mail, I am conducting an exploratory study to determine more about which methods are most useful to increase the pool of interpreters. The first part of this study focused on the state level, so I have already had a conversation with your AOC. My goal in this, the second phase, is to get the trial court perspective.

Information will eventually be published on the Internet in a Court Executive Development Paper available on the National Center for State Courts website.

Overview of Court					
	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Proportion of Instances Using Staff Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Proportion of Instances using Contract Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Number of Courtrooms supported					

Other Comments About Court/Program:

I'd like now to focus your attention on efforts the AOC has made to increase the interpreter pool

Increasing Pool						
How effective has this been for you?						
	Are you aware of efforts in this area?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
General advertising	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advertising in foreign language periodicals	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts-radio and TV	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What are you doing locally to try to increase the pool of interpreters for your court?

Now, I'd like to focus on efforts the AOC is making to increase the use of the pool. In answering these questions please consider both contract and employee interpreters. Again I will ask if you have tried a particular method, and if so, how effective that method has been in your opinion. You will be able to answer very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective, or very ineffective.

Increasing Use of Existing Pool

How effective was this method?						
	Are you aware of efforts in this area?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Telephonic interpreting using commercial service(s)	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Cross-Assignment of interpreters at a regional level	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					

Please describe your program.

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today, what do you believe is the most beneficial to you?

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today which services have been most useful in meeting the need for interpreters in your state.

APPENDIX C: TRIAL COURT SURVEYS (SURVEY 2B)-COLORADO

To be conducted over the phone unless a specific request is made for it to be mailed out.

SCRIPT:

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me today.

As indicated in my earlier e-mail, I am conducting an exploratory study to determine more about which methods are most useful to increase the pool of interpreters. The first part of this study focused on the state level, so I have already had a conversation with your AOC. My goal in this, the second phase, is to get the trial court perspective.

Information will eventually be published on the Internet in a Court Executive Development Paper available on the National Center for State Courts website.

Overview of Court					
	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Proportion of Instances Using Staff Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Proportion of Instances using Contract Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Number of Courtrooms supported					

Other Comments About Court/Program:

I'd like now to focus your attention on efforts the AOC has made to increase the interpreter pool

Increasing Pool						
		How effective has this been for you?				
	Are you aware of efforts in this area?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
General advertising	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advertising in foreign language periodicals	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaching out to colleges and universities	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Orientation Program	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supreme Court Web Page, court interpreter page	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What are you doing locally to try to increase the pool of interpreters for your court?

Now, I'd like to focus on efforts the AOC is making to increase the use of the pool. In answering these questions please consider both contract and employee interpreters. Again I will ask if you have tried a particular method, and if so, how effective that method has been in your opinion. You will be able to answer very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective, or very ineffective.

Increasing Use of Existing Pool

		How effective was this method?				
	Are you aware of efforts in this area?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Telephonic interpreting using commercial service(s)	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Group or cluster cases on court calendars in accordance with interpreter needs	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	N <input type="checkbox"/>					

Please describe your program.

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today, what do you believe is the most beneficial to you?

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today which services have been most useful in meeting the need for interpreters in your state.

APPENDIX D: TRIAL COURT SURVEYS (SURVEY 2C)-NEVADA

To be conducted over the phone unless a specific request is made for it to be mailed out.

SCRIPT:

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me today.

As indicated in my earlier e-mail, I am conducting an exploratory study to determine more about which methods are most useful to increase the pool of interpreters. The first part of this study focused on the state level, so I have already had a conversation with your AOC. My goal in this, the second phase, is to get the trial court perspective.

Information will eventually be published on the Internet in a Court Executive Development Paper available on the National Center for State Courts website.

Overview of Court					
	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Proportion of Instances Using Staff Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Proportion of Instances using Contract Interpreters	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Number of Courtrooms supported					

Other Comments About Court/Program:

I'd like now to focus your attention on efforts the AOC has made to increase the interpreter pool

		Increasing Pool				
		How effective has this been for you?				
	Are you aware of efforts in this area?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
General advertising	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advertising in foreign language periodicals	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educating the community about the need for	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaching out to colleges and universities						
Visiting Courts						
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What are you doing locally to try to increase the pool of interpreters for your court?

Now, I'd like to focus on efforts the AOC is making to increase the use of the pool. In answering these questions please consider both contract and employee interpreters. Again I will ask if you have tried a particular method, and if so, how effective that method has been in your opinion. You will be able to answer very effective, somewhat effective, neither effective nor ineffective, somewhat ineffective, or very ineffective.

Increasing Use of Existing Pool

		How effective was this method?				
	Are you aware of efforts in this area?	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Neither Effective or Ineffective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephonic interpreting using commercial service(s)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinating use of interpreters with other non-court agencies	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (Please specify)	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe your program.

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today, what do you believe is the most beneficial to you?

From your perspective, of all of the things we have discussed today which services have been most useful in meeting the need for interpreters in your state.

APPENDIX E: DATA FROM AOC SURVEYS

AOC Survey Results				
	AOC1	AOC2	AOC3	Entry Instructions
Date	9/3/2008	8/28/2008	9/3/2008	
Length in minutes	32	22	60	
State	Nevada	Colorado	California	
Interviewer	Awood	Awood	Awood	
Interviewee	AK	EL	AM	
Data Entry Completed by	Awood	Awood	Awood	
Overview of Program				
Educating new and existing interpreters	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Percent Educating new and existing interpreters	4	1	1	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Educating judges and staff about how to work with interpreters	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Percentage educating judges and staff about how to work with interpreters	2	1	1	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Testing/qualifying/certifying interpreters	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Percentage testing/qualifying/certifying interpreters	5	1	3	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Increasing pool of people interested in interpreting	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Increasing pool of people interested in interpreting	3	1	2	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Coordinating courts' calendars and interpreter availability	0	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

AOC Survey Results				
	AOC1	AOC2	AOC3	Entry Instructions
Percentage time coordinating courts' calendars and interpreter availability	0	1	1	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Other areas of focus of your program	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Percentage time of other1	3	2	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Other areas of focus of your program	1	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Percentage time of other2	2	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=1-19%, 2=20-39%, 3=40-59%, 4=60-79%, 5=80-100%)
Increasing Pool				
General advertising	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of general advertising	5	0	1	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Advertising in foreign language periodicals	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of foreign language periodicals	2	0	5	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

AOC Survey Results				
	AOC1	AOC2	AOC3	Entry Instructions
Effectiveness of statewide registry	5	4	5	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of educating community	5	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Reaching out to colleges and universities	0	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of colleges/university outreach	0	4	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other1	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of Other1: Website	5	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other2	0	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

AOC Survey Results				
	AOC1	AOC2	AOC3	Entry Instructions
Effectiveness of Other2: Orientation Program	0	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Increasing use of Existing Pool				
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of in-state telephonic interpreting	2	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Telephonic interpreting using commercial services	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of commercial telephonic interpreting	2	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Video Interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of in-state video interpreting	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Video interpreting using commercial services	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

AOC Survey Results				
	AOC1	AOC2	AOC3	Entry Instructions
Effectiveness of commercial video interpreting	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Voice over IP interpreting	0	0	0	
Effectiveness of Voice over IP	0	0	0	
Coordinating use of interpreters with non-court agencies	1	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of coordinating interpreters	5	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Establishing inter-governmental agreements to share staff interpreters between courts	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of inter-governmental agreements	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Group or cluster cases on court calendars in accordance with interpreter needs	0	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of grouping cases	0	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)

AOC Survey Results				
	AOC1	AOC2	AOC3	Entry Instructions
Other1	0	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of other1	0	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other2	0	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of other2:	0	5	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)

APPENDIX F: DATA FROM NEVADA TRIAL COURT SURVEYS

State 1 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 1.1	Court 1.2	Court 1.3	
Date	11/14/2008	12/5/2008	11/14/2008	
Length in minutes	23	17	18	
State	State 1	State 1	State 1	
Interviewer	Amy Wood	Amy Wood	Amy Wood	
Interviewee	HJ	BI	AS	
Data Entry Completed by	Amy Wood	Amy Wood	Amy Wood	
Overview of Program				
Number of Courtrooms	21	1	14	
Proportion of Staff Interpreters	66%	0%	34%	
Proportion of Contract Interpreters	34%	100%	66%	
Urban/Rural	1	2	1	Enter 1 for Urban and 2 for Rural
Increasing Pool				
Advertising	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Utilize Advertising	1	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 1 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 1.1	Court 1.2	Court 1.3	
Effectiveness of advertising	1	0	4	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Utilize Registry	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of statewide registry	1	0	5	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 1 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 1.1	Court 1.2	Court 1.3	
Effectiveness of educating community	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Reaching out to colleges and universities	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of reaching out to colleges and universities	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Visiting Courts	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of visiting courts	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Increasing use of Existing Pool				

State 1 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 1.1	Court 1.2	Court 1.3	
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	0	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of in-state telephonic interpreting	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Telephonic interpreting using commercial services	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of commercial telephonic interpreting	3	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Coordination of interpreters with non-court agencies	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 1 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 1.1	Court 1.2	Court 1.3	
Effectiveness of Coordination of interpreters with non-court agencies		0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other1	0	0	0	
Effectiveness of other1	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other2	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of other2:	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)

APPENDIX G: DATA FROM COLORADO TRIAL COURT SURVEYS

State 2 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 2.1	Court 2.2	Court 2.3	
Date	10/31/2008	10/31/2008	11/7/2008	
Length in minutes	27	30	21	
State	State 2	State 2	State 2	
Interviewer	Awood	Awood	Awood	
Interviewee	HO	AH	LM	
Data Entry Completed by	Awood	Awood	Awood	
Quality assurance Check completed by				
Overview of Program				
Number of Courtrooms	20	12	15	
Proportion of Staff Interpreters	7%	80%	50%	
Proportion of Contract Interpreters	93%	20%	50%	
Urban/Rural	1	2	2	Enter 1 for Urban and 2 for Rural
Increasing Pool				
Advertising	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Utilize Advertising	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of advertising	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Utilize Registry	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 2 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 2.1	Court 2.2	Court 2.3	
Effectiveness of statewide registry	2	0	4	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts	0	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of educating community	0	0	3	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Reaching out to colleges and universities	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of colleges/university outreach	5	0	3	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Orientation Program	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of Orientation Program	5	5	4	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Supreme Court Website	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of Supreme Court Website	5	5	5	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Increasing use of Existing Pool				
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 2 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 2.1	Court 2.2	Court 2.3	
Effectiveness of in-state telephonic interpreting	3	0	4	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Telephonic interpreting using commercial services	1	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of commercial telephonic interpreting	2	0	3	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Group or cluster cases on court calendars in accordance with interpreter needs	1	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of grouping cases	4	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other1	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of other1	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Other2	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of other2:	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)

APPENDIX H: DATA FROM CALIFORNIA TRIAL COURT SURVEYS

State 3 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 3.1	Court 3.2	Court 3.3	
Date	11/14/2008	11/14/2008	11/12/2008	
Length in minutes	18	28	26	
State	State 3	State 3	State 3	
Interviewer	Awood	Awood	Awood	
Interviewee	LW	MO	JG	
Data Entry Completed by	Awood	Awood	Awood	
Overview of Program				
Number of Courtrooms	3	500	12	
Proportion of Staff Interpreters	0%	100%	70%	
Proportion of Contract Interpreters	100%	0%	30%	
Urban/Rural	1	2	1	Enter 1 for Urban and 2 for Rural
Increasing Pool				
Advertising	0	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Utilize Advertising	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 3 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 3.1	Court 3.2	Court 3.3	
Effectiveness of advertising	0	0	4	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Statewide registry of people interested in interpreting or those qualified to interpret	1	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Utilize Registry	1	1	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Effectiveness of statewide registry	4	0	5	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Educating the community about the need for interpreters in the courts	0	1	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 3 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 3.1	Court 3.2	Court 3.3	
Effectiveness of educating community	0	0	4	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Reaching out to colleges and universities	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Increasing use of Existing Pool				
Telephonic interpreting using in-state interpreters outside of a commercial venue	0	0	1	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Effectiveness of in-state telephonic interpreting	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 3 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 3.1	Court 3.2	Court 3.3	
Telephonic interpreting using commercial services	1	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Effectiveness of commercial telephonic interpreting	0	0	1	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no
Cross Assignment of Interpreters at Regional Level	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Effectiveness of cross Assignment	0	0	0	Enter a 1 for Yes and a 0 for no

State 3 Trial Court Survey Results				
	Court 3.1	Court 3.2	Court 3.3	
Other1	0	0	0	Enter 0 if no above, enter 1-5 for percentage (1=Very Ineffective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 3=neither effective nor ineffective, 4=somewhat effective, 5=very effective)
Effectiveness of other1	0	0	0	
Other2	0	0	0	
Effectiveness of other2:	0	0	0	

APPENDIX I: COMMENTS FROM INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
AOC	[AOC] ¹⁶ has been very responsive. They have so much to do, with a small amount of resources,	Court3.1
AOC	The [AOC] has implemented a support system, can't see other areas that they would be able to help with at this time.	Court3.2
AOC	[AOC] could do more advertising than the first job ads, public radio ads, start earlier than college	Court3.3
Certification	Certified interpreters undergo tests to meet written and oral and other requirements	AOC1
Certification	Would like to provide more and better test preparation materials to potential interpreters	AOC3
Certification	Oral proficiency screener hired. Hope to enhance certification.	AOC3
Certification	Pick from the roster based on seniority and certification.	Court1.1
Certification	We have local Spanish interpreter, going through the program now	Court1.3
Certification	Anticipate guy who we are using now to become certified.	Court1.3
Certification	Orientation – disadvantage in rural areas, can't travel 300 miles to attend the program. Too much time and expense for individuals (including lodging). Individuals are not sure if they will recoup expenses if they come back and work as interpreters.	Court3.1
Certification	A couple of people have been willing to interpret in indigenous languages of Mexico, but have not been able to afford orientation. Agreement was made with [AOC] to allow some to go to training without paying to address the cost issue. We try to go through Mexican consulate for guidance in finding people who speak indigenous languages of Mexico today. A couple of people will interpret on background basis, but refuse to appear in court.	Court3.1
Certification	Rely on [AOC] certification to get new talent, bring in to district court, no more than a couple new folks each year.	Court3.2

¹⁶ Brackets have been used in this table to reflect words or terms that were changed to be more consistent with the body of the paper. Every effort was made to retain the meaning of the conversation. For instance, the state court office name varies by state, but has been replaced with [AOC] for consistency.

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Costs	[To try to increase the pool] Requests for any language sent to all administrators to disseminate. Training to become interpreter – 3 year increase	Court1.2
Costs	Increase cost efficiency – if we standardize fees willing to work for our court and court next to us. Make sure not competing against each other... [interpreters] used to be not willing to come because we paid less.	Court1.2
Costs	Started with us noticing different rates, each month everyone at different rates, contacting other courts on rates, got all of the administrators together and in 2 meetings were able to get consensus on our approach. Phased out existing contracts and started new with agreed upon rates built in estimates	Court1.2
Costs	If required certification, wouldn't be able to afford [to hire interpreters in our court].	Court1.3
Education	New interpreters higher than others who are already certified, lots of educational opportunities	AOC1
Education	Informing pool through e-mail on continuing education. [Judge their] linguistic ability, and have them do 40 hours court observation, future interpreters. Then familiarize with court setting, pass background check, fingerprint cards, fill out certification request form. When pass unique ID card with number. Explore path of oral proficiency interviews, implement requirement of skill building if fail written exam. Used to be able to re-take, now new mechanism of skill building.	AOC1
Education	Mostly limited to new orientation and ethics. Right now limited training on newly certified interpreters. First training program, small group, haven't been able to pass. 2 day workshop in each oral exam have to have passed written. Think it should be 40-60.	AOC3
Education	Distance learning course being considered- for languages that don't have training programs (such as Tagalog and Cantonese)	AOC3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Education	Although it is slow in coming, there are more academic programs for the field of interpreting and translating, good but it moves at a slow pace. In the last 18 years, seen an improvement. Interpreters work in different areas, we all have to be ambassadors all of the time.	Court3.1
Education	Wish I had time to work on increasing pool at local level, but I don't. Denver district courts big dockets on the run all the time. If we have a slow afternoon, type of activities focus on continuing education, keeping interpreter skills sharp, etc.	Court3.2
Education	Ideally would like to see county court training environment	Court3.2
Education	Orientation program 1 full weekend Saturday and Sunday, Policy, ethics, complete view of expectations for the participants.	Court3.2
Education	Orientation program opens the door to the certification process, can come in and shadow, covers ethics,	Court3.3
Education	[Advertising]New thing in our state, only going for 1 year	AOC1
Education	Working on dissemination proposed voi dire for interpreters who aren't certified. Draft to judges... guidance if just bridging communication	AOC1
Education	About to start, small. Just hired staff. Judicial education had small component of what needed for new judges. About 2 hours in a week long program	AOC3
Education	Working on an interpreter internship program	Court3.3
Education	Pilot internship, student at university turned out well, but yet not certified. Took test, then fiancé took internship	Court3.3
Education	Shadowing is every day and 5-10 words to look up each day, compiled list of synonyms and did first draft of translations then had certified interpreters review and complete.	Court3.3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Language	What doing 0-2% of time is related to testing – all done through RID, only work with SCL required for legal –leaves us able to know just need to take extra step to get to the legal, focus efforts there. Already have interpreter events	AOC3
Language	Concept for spoken is broad exposure, ASL is not	AOC3
Language	Indigenous languages of Mexico have become a big issue.	Court3.2
Other	Credential of court certified interpreter. Not everyone understands the difference between bilingual person and the role of the interpreter	AOC1
Other	Easy communication – coordinate interpreter office in the past, think of what they need, try to provide services and promptly address their needs. They submit request for educational opportunities, approve promptly. Disseminate educational opportunities through website, encourage participation in NAJIT, upcoming federal exams in Spanish and Creole	AOC1
Other	Although we are not headed in this direction – one idea is to have a centralized remote interpreting bank which would allow people to live rurally and still provide work to urban areas or this often might be vice-versa, where the interpreter pool is in the urban area providing service to a rural area.	AOC3
Other	Budget cut situation, only 2 certified interpreter, 1 other is qualified and not certified, so much administrative work, difficult for certified supervisors to work, wind up giving priority to judicial demand	court1.1
Other	Use same guy who sets aside time for DA and defense counsel, sometimes use him 2-3 times/ month	Court1.3
Other	High month November we had 11 defendants and 10 hours of interpreting. In October, only 1 hour needed	Court1.3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Outreach	Exploring additional spoken linguistic oral proficiency interviews from credible agency, linguistic assessment skilled in language – just at the beginning, waiting for annual consortium business meeting to talk about it more.	AOC1
Outreach	Visiting rural courts across the state to meet with judges and administrators and explain the role of interpreters. Stimulated them to look for properly trained, they recommend individuals who might be future court interpreters and refer them to the AOC, direct communication most effective	AOC1
Outreach	Just starting this, first ad in the first month. Believe it will be very effective, don't have data to support that conclusion yet. From a press releases perspective we are doing in the same timeframe TV and radio spots working with ethnic focuses. Advertising targeting ethnic groups, might be in English (such as California Examiner which is the largest Filipino publication, but published in English).	AOC3
Outreach	Going out to public events with radio and TV stations at booths with public visibility	AOC3
Outreach	Unless have high level of language or interpreter program or concentration of ethnic group, this seems like a far reach. Try to go out to masters program in language for general schools	AOC3
Outreach	Planning to make 5 minute video on interpreting	AOC3
Outreach	Have links on other court websites to drive traffic to the CA AOC site. Particularly links from court employment websites. This has been very effective with surprisingly high traffic	AOC3
Outreach	Idea to have colleges and universities link back to us	AOC3
Outreach	Totally general – web banners send traffic to us, somewhat effective	AOC3
Outreach	Court reach to training programs, speaking to incoming students	AOC3
Outreach	ESL teachers advertising this year, teachers and high level students might be viable	AOC3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Outreach	Huge thing done – through PR agency could also do with interns: Special notebook, brochure, FAQ sheet, printed folder	AOC3
Outreach	Toolkit sent to 1000 organization, 1 st wave included courts to place in public places	AOC3
Outreach	Glitch – went so broad, didn’t have the ability to do good follow-up, and might have been better to go smaller to allow for follow-up with contact person at each location 100-200. Target churches, cultural organizations	AOC3
Outreach	Occasional press conference with high level official (Chief Justice) more exposure for less work	AOC3
Outreach	Going out to conferences such as NAJIT. Sponsors for organization at whatever level is permitted (i.e., on conference bag). Conferences rotate in terms of areas, so each year CA can choose which to target and can draw lines such as only those held in the west	AOC3
Outreach	Phoenix NAJIT this year, testing at NAJIT this year, first time for C• Lots of inquiries about interpreting, don’t have the time to follow-up with packet after initial inquiry. Follow-up with likely help keep people interested in pursuing careers in interpreting although other states have done it.	AOC3
Outreach	Going to career fairs, tell people about interpreting as a career, people provide their resumes, but no time currently to follow-up on those resumes	AOC3
Outreach	Easy to look good at events, exhibit hall materials, compare to places that just have table and stacks of paper	AOC3
Outreach	Opportunity to get ethnic community involved. They are helping to ensure enough students to make it worthwhile for colleges/universities to have programs	AOC3
Outreach	Plan to do outreach to SCL (possibly other states) next level down to encourage to do what they need to do to get the legal (ASL)	AOC3
Outreach	Outreach diversity career expo events	AOC3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Outreach	Plan to do ads with college and university language programs	AOC3
Outreach	Press releases – write up pitch, include the need for court interpreter “this is a career” present throughout the state. Stories done regionally and pitched to certain language	AOC3
Outreach	One story translated into Vietnamese	AOC3
Outreach	Spanish regional story	AOC3
Outreach	In some cases if language media, hungry for language	AOC3
Outreach	PR agency developed most materials to implement and language contacts events come from there	AOC3
Outreach	w/out PR agency would have to choose and focus initial efforts	AOC3
Outreach	Encourage participation with CJ, as an educational opportunity	AOC3
Outreach	Encouraging/helping interpreters to research courts and know how to market themselves.	AOC3
Outreach	Working with courts – important working with their HR and local people, plans – get courts engaged, put into HR function, know to ask “are you bilingual” hand out brochures	AOC3
Outreach	Locally, couple of judges from the Philippines, Asian community, a high demand for Tagalog, mostly boss does outreach	court1.1
Outreach	More effective than used to be, now hold bi-yearly workshops – advertise and post in	Court1.2
Outreach	E-mail all interpreters, those who have expressed interest	Court1.2
Outreach	University – language bank staffed by foreign students	Court1.2
Outreach	Language bank used if can’t find language – like Turkish and indigenous Mexican languages	Court1.2
Outreach	Locally, other than word of mouth, work with and live with people, 4 new interpreters through word of mouth	Court1.2

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Outreach	Increasing pool word of mouth much better with certified vs. non-certified	Court1.2
Outreach	Advertising has been discussed and planned, but not implemented. I'm on the managing interpreters meetings, majority of participants are urban. Talk about 1000 different things at different meetings. Difficult to find enough help, going through state recruitment, can't say what that is yielding.	Court3.1
Outreach	Bilingual folks think they can just walk in and interpret. The orientation is a good tool for that. Hurdle folks have to leap before I can give them work. Have tried to do training in different locations, but it has been cancelled because there haven't been enough signed up. Trainers are expensive. Might be more beneficial to those in Denver. Right now it probably works more as a mechanism for weeding people out than anything.	Court3.1
Outreach	Not doing specific efforts in my district. We've talked about what's out there. Small 4 year college-Grand Junction- what language programs there are, what classes are offered in interpreting in languages. I've worked with one professor who is also a federally certified interpreter. Worthwhile to follow up , but haven't done that yet.	Court3.1
Outreach	Reaching out the colleges and universities, believe it will be very effective, don't know how it is going, best to talk to SCAO	Court3.2
Registry	Registered interpreters only have written parts of exam, no oral portions yet, still have to comply with additional requirements. Example no certification in French, co through 2 day orientation workshop	AOC1
Registry	Master list by language of certified or registered by courts.	AOC3
Registry	Master list – allows people to find interpreters – seems simple—a lot of what will be most helpful are things we haven't done yet. Targeted to do and will wind up helpful, figure out how to use what you have – video.	AOC3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Registry	I always try for other languages, not testing for language, registered at least they have ethics and some interpreter... saw county as defendant, better than using friends of people, more challenging not going to court everyday	Court1.1
Registry	[registry] my bible 0 put on Internet site on IE, I go through certified every 6 months, effects increase contract \$40 non-certified, \$50 certified, encourage certified reaching speak foreign language unless out in another state	Court1.2
Registry	Update list of interpreters every quarter	Court1.2
Registry	Little bit of over own county – that allows me to pull out names – have vs. not have	Court1.2
Registry	We keep a local list, people come in with court interpreter, put in rolodex, start with him, if not form out of town... go down list until find someone, not a huge need.	Court1.3
Registry	Registered interpreters are certified, received calls from people, I know from the registry who certified interpreters are, I can also reach out to colleagues	Court3.1
Registry	Statewide registry: judges and look up online with attorney – assign registration number, easy to track down certification. Can use for lesser used languages, but many languages don't have certification.	Court3.2
Registry	Network of managing interpreters. Keep a roster online with non-certified. E-mail one another with who has done a good job, etc. References. Keep coordination – e-mail list, spreadsheet on a judicial server that all coordinators can access. Distribution list of coordinators utilized on a daily basis. Spreadsheet consists of contact information.	Court3.2
Registry	Definitely make use of shared file of those who are not certified which is shared between interpreter coordinators.	Court3.3
Scheduling	Cross-assignment when have court unified statewide. Happens at a regional level	AOC3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Scheduling	Group calendaring, grouping cases using the same language together, is one of the best practices.	AOC3
Scheduling	Locally work with calendared, dark calendar send home... working with clerks to flag cases to be more efficient, trying to improve but no money tele-language program Computer program, roster Spanish background check, research with ASL rides system to District court not family court yet	court1.1
Scheduling	We always use calendars, particularly when another person is already scheduled, put on same day, have calendar on the wall	Court1.3
Scheduling	Muni court has 1 day a week dedicated for Spanish speaking	Court1.3
Scheduling	Grouping cases. Judges intentionally don't do this, not very PC, take cases as they come.	Court3.1
Scheduling	Group Cases: 2 days per month set aside for Spanish drug court cases. Dependency and neglect cases try to combine and have a Spanish docket for paternity and support. Criminal which is the bulk of cases, have multiple parties and not able to effectively cluster cases. Our judges are aware and try to expedite when they can. They put into the record the request to take cases with interpreters first so that interpreters can be used in other courtrooms. Ask if there are any objections, if there are none they move forward. Legal issues, don't want to have people treated differently because of the need for language. Judges are aware of the interpreter use issues, sometimes they can be taken into consideration, sometimes they cannot. They put it on the record to optimize time.	Court3.2
Scheduling	Have thought about grouping or clustering cases, but both sides of fence, did have CourTools complaint people who use interpreters go first	Court3.3

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Scheduling	We interpret, track cases, we update in Outlook calendar, list the day before, not waiting each interpreter carries a log sheet which is updated based on the proceeding and compare with CMS to make sure dates and times match up to interpreters. Freelance interpreters comment on how organized we are, not sitting around doing nothing, use down time effectively when don't do scheduling	Court3.3
Statewide discussions	Convenes 3 times/year. AOC program coordinator proposes changes, amended code of professional ethics continuing education, disciplinary action	AOC1
Statewide discussions	We get together, managing interpreters, and brainstorm . Emy is an interpreter herself which helps, she knows intimately what the issues are that we face, she's been trying to do everything.	Court3.1
Telephonic	Telephonic has been discussed for rural courts, we don't need- discussed posting funds for video conferencing, no technology to do it right now	Court1.2
Telephonic	Had to prepare for telephonic interpreting but have never used	Court1.3
Telephonic	Phone interpreting is a difficult way to go. Groups of migratory workers with indigenous Spanish languages reading and writing skills are very low making it that much more difficult to communicate through the phone. Recently had a friend who is a managing interpreter filled in for me by phone as my back-ups were not available.	Court3.1
Telephonic	Aware that the pone service is available, don't generally use. I'm the only FT interpreter, have a back up of .10 who will become freelance and one freelancer now. If real need for jury trial, need to come in person,	Court3.1
Telephonic	Have heard from others that using a commercial service has worked out quite well at times. I have more information about the state interpreters and a greater understanding of the quality control they have been through.	Court3.1

Overall notes from Verbal Comments During Interviews

Area/Category	Comment	Court
Telephonic	Telephonic program. Pilot program to provide interpreters – need to support rural [courts], not up and running yet, testing technology.	Court3.2
Telephonic	Very rarely use commercial interpreting service. Preference not to use, preference is to use consulate and embassy and other contacts that have been developed over time. Not cost effective if long hearing or trial. Becomes very cumbersome, has to be done in consecutive mode, attorneys lose focus because of consecutive nature, also difficult to provide privacy for attorney/client discussions. Team of interpreters in room is preferable.	Court3.2
Telephonic	Don't use in-state telephonic for Spanish, other languages- actually due to weather, work out fine, not for anything substantial	Court3.3
Telephonic	Only use language line if not in Denver. Depends on interpreter, need to orientate, a couple didn't stay in their role	Court3.3
Website	The SC website	court1.1
Website	Supreme Court website is a great source of information, if folks call me about interpreters I send to them. They can see the cost of orientation and when the next scheduled orientation program is	Court3.1
Website	Supreme Court Website very complete, accurate. Good understanding of court rules and expectations. I get a lot of phone calls and e-mails for county information. I can refer them to the website, encourage them to call back if they have additional questions. 9 out of 10 times I get a thank you phone call. Tells me it is working.	Court3.2
Website	Use website all of the time, 95% or more never call back needing more information. They can shadow if they like	Court3.3