

Registry Group

Minutes: Tues. Sept 25, 2007, 5:15

In attendance: Kathy Carey, Tom Hiendlmayr, Anna Esaybegyan, Bruce Downing, Tara Gibbs

Question: What is our goal for the registry?

- Answer 1: To provide a listing of all interpreters with a minimal threshold in all languages
- Answer 2: To provide a listing of interpreters who are reasonably qualified.
- Answer 3: To provide a listing of interpreters who are well qualified
- Answer 4: To provide a listing of interpreters you would feel comfortable having interpret for you.
- Answer 5: To provide a listing of interpreters who are close to certification level, but not quite there.
- Answer 6: Only certified interpreters
- Answer 7: To provide a list of everyone interested in interpreting.
- Answer 8: To provide a list for people who are interested in using qualified interpreters, but do not know how to find qualified interpreters.

Issues:

- Answer 1: minimal qualifications has many people listed, doesn't identify well qualified
- Answer 2: What does reasonably qualified mean? In what fields?
- Answer 3: What does well qualified mean? In what fields?
- Answer 4: "I want a certified interpreter."
- Answer 5: Assumes a certification exam exists.
- Answer 6: Too few people, no exams.
- Answer 7: Doesn't identify well qualified
- Answer 8: Would anyone use it?

Question: What is meant by "minimally qualified", "reasonably qualified", or "well qualified"?

- Answer 1: Demonstrated language proficiency in both languages
- Answer 2: Demonstrated language proficiency and had training
- Answer 3: Demonstrated language proficiency and had training with an exit exam
- Answer 4: Demonstrated language proficiency and had training and demonstrated skills performance on a test.

Issues:

- Answer 1: Bilinguals aren't necessarily ready to interpret—interpreting requires development of specific skills. Testing of any kind limits us to 32 languages or so.
- Answer 2: What if someone has passed the court exam and had no training? Are they qualified? They will resent not being on the list, but the tests only test accuracy of interpreting, not their understanding of the code of ethics,

their role as an interpreter, or their adherence to standards of practice. Passing the material in a particular class doesn't equal overall interpreter skill competence.

Answer 3: Exit exam helps ensure overall interpreter skill competence. What if someone has passed the court exam and had no training? Are they qualified? They will resent not being on the list, but the tests only test accuracy of interpreting, not their understanding of the code of ethics, their role as an interpreter, or their adherence to standards of practice. Limited to languages exit exam is available in and languages courses are available in.

Answer 4: Limited to languages exams exist in.

Question: If training is required, how much training? Interpreter specific?

Answer 1: 40 hours

Answer 2: 2 course equivalent (90 hours class time, 180 hours out of class)

Answer 3: Core courses only (6 courses: 270 hours class time, 540 hours out of class)

Answer 4: BA in interpreting

Answer 5: BA, no training in interpreting

Answer 6: MA in interpreting

Issues:

1. too short
2. minimal
3. better, not well rounded with critical thinking skills?
4. critical thinking skills and interpreting skills
5. critical thinking skills, no interpreting skills?
6. will do better on the exam.

Question: If test required, what test?

Answer 1: Exit exam

Answer 2: One of a large list of exams which are available: Court exam, Lang. Line exam, NetworkOmni exam (not public), Washington State exams, California Endowment exams-Hablamos Juntos exams, etc

Answer 3: Certification exam

Issues:

1. Is there a way to take it without taking the courses?
2. How are they equivalent?
3. None exist

Question: Does there need to be an ethics exam?

Answer 1: Yes

Answer 2: No, this is demonstrated better through coursework and role play evaluation

Answer 3: No, this is better checked through observation and check off.

Issues: no discussion

Question: What does passing a certification exam like the court exam mean?

Answer 1: Ready to be on any list

Answer 2: Demonstrates only accuracy, doesn't demonstrate knowledge of role, ethics, or medical terminology.

Issues: Agreement that those who have passed will say 1, but that 2 is the case.

Question: Do there need to be tests for each specialty area or is this general only?

No answers or discussion

Question: Should list be on-or-off, have tiers, or be gradient?

Opinions of group spanned the gambit.

Question: Will users of such a registry distinguish between levels?

CHIAs experience is that users don't understand distinctions of qualifications.

Question: Should being on the list be mandatory in order to work as an interpreter?

Answer 1: Yes, in languages in which list is available

Answer 2: No, but professional groups could require it as best practice

Answer 3: No. Entirely voluntary.

Issues:

1. Will there be enough interpreters?

Is this discrimination if not for all 7000 world languages? (No. Guidelines of DOJ would require only 8-12 languages on the list, and these would potentially cover 98% of all interpreting encounters.)

2. Doubt regarding whether groups will become interested in this or not.

3. Will it have any effect?

Question: All languages or some languages?

Answer 1. Yes

Answer 2. Most common languages only.

1. Equity

2. 10 languages is much more doable than 7000 and would potentially cover 98% of all interpreting encounters.

Issues:

1. Not feasible? Projects will never get off the ground?

2. Statistics are based on court cases only. Would this hold true in other areas? In high stakes areas does it matter? Would this at least be a doable first goal?

Question: Could we have an ebay for interpreters and just look at satisfaction of customers over time to rate people?

Question: Could there be a BBB for interpreters?

Recommendation: We should cease discussion until the legislative group has made its recommendations and the DOH group has come back with their completed studies for us, so that we are not wasting our time doing what someone else can do better?

Dissent: We should meet every two weeks and make recommendations to these groups because they don't have the expertise.

Decision: To meet in 2 weeks.

Recommendation: We circulate the CHIA model, Iowa Model, and NY model.

Recommendation: We put together several possible models with pros and cons.

Homework: Bruce will send out a ppt about the NY model. Tara or Bruce will find PPTs or PDFs for CHIA and Iowa models.

Homework: Each person will draft their "ideal" model.

Homework: Each person will draft their definition of the "minimum standard" to be on the registry.

Next meeting in about 2 weeks.