

<b>Meeting Date</b>		<b>Court Interpreter Committee</b>	
July 29, 2011		Judicial Council Room	
<b>Members Present</b>		<b>Member Excused</b>	
Greg Johnson		Deborah Kreek Mendez	
Jennifer Storrer		Judge Noonan	
Ghulam Hasnain		Daryl Hague	
Dinorah Padro			
Wendell Roberts			
Craig Johnson			
Luther Gaylord			
Judge Romney			
Maureen Magagna			
Judge Trease			
Evangelina Burrows			
<b>Staff:</b> Rosa Oakes			
<b>Guests:</b>			
Topic: Approve minutes of May 20, 2011			
Discussion: Craig Johnson moved to approve the minutes. Maureen Magagna seconded the motion.			
Motion:			
Vote: <b>Yes</b>		No	Abstain
		Motion: Passed	
Topic: Review of Application Denial (Appeal)		By Judge Trease	
<p>While the applicant was in the waiting area outside the meeting, Judge Trease questioned if there was anyone on the committee that would like to discuss the appeal prior to bringing in the applicant. Jennifer Storrer discussed her history with the applicant and decided not to participate in the discussion. Judge Trease brought in the applicant. The applicant stated she is not represented by counsel and will proceed on her own. The applicant states she has experience and education in sign language interpreting. The applicant distributed to the committee copies of her resume and cover letter. The applicant stated in the last 18 years she has lived an exemplary life including her interpreting skills that reach state and national level. She also states that she holds the masters level which is only held by three people in the state. She has volunteered for the past 15 years with various agencies including victims advocates. Utah State Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing has approved the applicant. Sego Lilly deaf center and Girl Scouts of Utah have also cleared her. She has quite a bit of leadership, including being one of eleven board members for interpreters for the deaf. She is a long-time educator for the past 12 years.</p> <p>Addressing her second degree felony conviction in 1993 when she was 18 years old. The applicant accepted a plea deal and was put on probation. She believed she would later be eligible for expungement. America-on-Line was her employer at the time. They later changed their policy to terminate employees convicted of a crime. She discussed getting an expungement with her employer so that she could retain her</p>			

employment. The applicant did not state whether she was terminated but did state her employment lasted only a few weeks.

She paid off all the restitution and completed her two year probation successfully in 1995. In 2007 she attempted an expungement. She requested to lower the felony to a class A non-violent. She was unsuccessful. She requested if this is not approved by the committee that the committee withdraw her application in its entirety so that she may pursue other avenues to include the possibility of reapplying at a later time. The committee addressed their questions with the applicant. The applicant was involved with a convenience store robbery. She was also facing aggravated kidnaping charges. Restitution was set at \$3,184. The applicant paid that in full. She stated that she never received any of the original \$3,184. that was stolen. The kidnaping involved the store clerks. The clerks were restrained in the store during the course of the robbery. The charge was aggravated robbery so the applicant assumes a weapon was used. One of her roommates did own a gun. The committee noted that the applicant had misdemeanors in 2002. The applicant stated that it was an incident with her husband. She contacted the police and believes she did not hurt her husband. Her husband was violent prior to their arrival. Her husband told the police she was the aggressor. She was required to complete a diversion. He was not charged.

The committee questioned if the applicant has interpreted for anyone in the jail system or prison. The applicant stated she had interpreted in the jail but was not required to go through a back-ground check. She stated it was in Davis County from April, 2007 and September, 2009. The applicant stated she has a masters degree and was considering law school but decided to become an interpreter. The applicant stated that there are no other convictions on her record. The applicant stated that when she spoke to the prosecutor they informed her she must go through her previous attorney. The applicant stated that she hired representation at one time but he has since passed away (John Kane). The applicant attempted in 2003 an expungement but was denied because it had previously been denied. The committee stated that her resume was "quite ample" so wondered why she would want to add court interpreting to her schedule. The applicant stated she was interested in how the police and court proceedings work. Currently she is more of an educator than an interpreter. The committee informed the applicant a decision would be made and she would be notified by a letter. The applicant left the room and discussions began. The committee is concerned with the precedence of allowing an exception for someone with a second degree felony. There is concern about the applicant having access to jail inmates with a felony conviction. There is also a concern for some of the committee members that the applicant did not accept responsibility, others felt she was heartfelt and remorseful. The committee discussed the possibility of limiting or restricting her interpretations (i.e. in the prison). The committee questioned the applicants involvement in the robbery due to the denial of her expungement. They also questioned the dollar amount being stolen was a significant amount. It was noted that the applicant did enter into a plea deal accepting her part of the crime. It was also noted that the police tracked her down, that she did not report the crime. It's important, as noted, to accept the limitations of information that is available. The committee proposed to allow the applicant to withdraw her application instead of denying it. However, the application will be kept on file. Luther Gaylord moved to deny the appeal without prejudice. Evangelina seconded the motion. The motion to deny the review (changing of the denial of her application) and allow applicant to withdraw her application passed unanimously.

Topic: Certification Testing Results

By Rosa Oakes

The certification process is once a year capable of testing 16 languages. There were three languages tested this year. Nineteen people tested this year, the majority were Spanish, however, there was also a test done for Russian, Mandarin, and Cantonese. There is a two day orientation, and a five day skill building workshop with an out-of-state trainer. Then the applicants complete an oral exam. Five people passed the Spanish test though only one person has completed all of the requirements to be a certified interpreter. One applicant moved from Arkansas as already a certified interpreter. We reciprocate the certification with 48 other states. We now have a Russian certified interpreter. The applicant who tested for Mandarin and Cantonese did not pass the simultaneous. She can come back next year for that test only. She successfully passed the other tests. The newly certified interpreters will be on the website shortly. The list has been provided to the webmaster. They are encouraged to get a blue badge as soon as possible to properly identify themselves in court.

Topic: Remote Interpreting Update

By Rosa Oakes

There has been an expansion. Vernal has been active with remote hearings with positive feedback. The setbacks are simple operating errors (i.e. headsets, log-on identification). Vernal contacted on an emergency basis for an interpreter. These glitches need to be identified and corrected. The committee realized that this is an occurrence that will happen from time to time. The red headsets are for the defendant. Overall the returned comments were positive. There is a preference for face to face interpreting but they are satisfied with the remote use as well. Roosevelt courthouse is being wired and should be up and running soon. Richfield's remote system is incorporated in their sound system. Interpreters are getting good experience in toggling the system between listening and responding to the attorneys and judges.

Topic: Staff Interpreters

By Evangelina Burrows

There are two staff interpreters. They are available from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. This has been fantastic for courts who have unexpected needs including juvenile court, district court and legal aid. The interpreters said they are welcomed by the clerks and bailiffs. Their experience has been positive. The staff interpreters spend approximately 70% of their time in the courtroom. They are spending 15% to 20% filling in and translation work. This has been very helpful especially now that we are getting civil matters. They have not been outsourced to other courthouses. They are both very responsive. Frank Chavez is an opera singer who enjoys singing in the court from the 5<sup>th</sup> floor early in the morning.

Topic: Outreach Action Plan

By Judge Vernice Trease

Interpreters in uncommon languages and public right to interpreters. The word needs to be spread that these services are available for multiple types of scenarios. A

suggestion was made to hand out cards with information on them. Contact with the Office of Refugee Services needs to be made. The NGO's typically choose to use their in-house interpreters, however contact needs to be made. Please email any suggestions you have to Rosa Oakes. Rosa and Jennifer has made great progress with the ASL program. The ADA has different rules that need to apply. Radio spots have been considered but with budget restrictions this is not possible for now. KRCL public service announcements may be at no-cost. They are a non-profit and need to be approached.