

BOARD OF INTERPRETERS FOR THE DEAF

MINUTES OF MEETING

January 27, 2013

Open Session

The Open Session of the Board of Interpreters For The Deaf was held on the above date in Room 104, Cannon Building, Rhode Island Department of Health, Three Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island, pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Open Meeting Law, so called, and other applicable provisions of the General Laws of the State of Rhode Island, as amended.

Board members in attendance: Staff members in attendance:

Carol Fay, Chairperson J. Michel Martineau

Dorothy Hodge, Vice Chairperson Amy Coleman, Esq.

Jonathan Brown Henry Gavin Meyers, Legal Services Intern

Board members not in attendance: Others in attendance:

Joseph Batiano Deanna L. Ammon Gagne, Interpreter

A quorum was established and the meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM.

The Minutes of the open session held on November December 4, 2013 were presented. Carol Fay made a motion to accept the Minutes,

seconded by Jonathan Henry, it was unanimously passed.

A Member indicates the board has made accomplishments, including discussing the licensing fee and their efforts to address multiple licensing areas.

Referencing the July 30, 2013 letter from Mr. Steve Florio, Areas for Improvements and Corrections, Item e. As it pertains to a passing score for the EIPA, Dorothy Hodge states the RID national standard will be followed and the standard is 4.0. Carol Fay and Jonathan Henry say the minimum is 4.0 and that is acceptable for RI. Dorothy Hodge states her research indicates that someone who scores a 3.5 gets up to 75%, and that is why we agree to a score of 4.0

As it pertains to Mr. Florio's letter Item f. Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI) and Deaf Interpreter (DI) members indicate we must work to address this issue.

A Member states that some people have 1 license but accept work that requires 2 licenses (Interpreter and Transliterater). A Member states a license holder may show up to the job without an understanding of the client's needs, also the client may not know what they need and the license holder may be trying to assist based on their determination of which service would help.

Members continue to review and discuss Mr. Florio's letter Item f referencing the colored handout compiled by Dorothy Hodge. Members discuss CDI and DI, both on page 2. Carol Fay states a certain CDI program may require only 8 hours of training, she states that definition is not acceptable and she will await clarification. Members state it is not possible to achieve credible competence through training of such a short duration. Dorothy Hodge asks if we can come to the next meeting with information on DI.

A Member suggests CDI could be placed under Certified Screened Interpreter category. There is discussion about the current number of licenses in the different categories, the administrator is asked to compile a list indicating the current number of licenses in the different categories.

A Member suggests creating a new license for CDI, and possibly DI. As it pertains to this, a Member states we will do more research on RID standards.

Referencing the colored handout created by Dorothy Hodge, Section 2.1 CDI a Member addresses and suggests we should define DI. Jonathan Henry suggests placing that in the Section 2.0 area. Carol Fay states that DI is a discussion about Screened Interpreters.

A Member states that according to RID a Transliterator and Interpreter

are separate, an Interpreter can only serve one role at a time, they should not be addressing both methods (Transliterator and Interpreter) in the same client session.

A Member states RI licensing law is clear, with 1 license you may practice as a Transliterator or an Interpreter, if you use both methods then it is required that you hold the 2 licenses, not just 1 license.

Carol Fay states she is concerned that a person may accept a job they cannot address. A Member states a Screened Interpreter is not always qualified under ADA, Jonathan Henry states that legally they are qualified.

A Member asks what can a client do when they engage the services of an Interpreter but the Interpreter didn't do what the individual needed; a Member and the administrator suggest they consider filing a complaint. A Member states agencies may place an unqualified licensed Interpreter, then the agency may have to address the legalities including but not limited to responding to a professional complaint.

Members review Mr. Florio's letter Item g indicating RI accepts licenses (by Endorsement, not Reciprocity) from other states.

Referencing Mr. Florio's letter Item h a Member states that Steve does not agree with 2 years and states a preference for "up to 5 years" be

acceptable, but not 6 years. Carol Fay indicates RI screening is okay for 5 years, the standard was borrowed from MA.

Dorothy Hodge states FL is no longer an acceptable state for a RI licensed individual to get qualified. Members discuss this matter.

A Member indicates there is merit to the consideration of all license holders to be Certified, phasing out the Screened category. Carol Fay states it may not be wise to do away with the Screened category, some new license holders get started with a Screened license and there is merit to those services being provided at informal meetings.

A Member states they want to make agenda recommendations for the next meeting. A Member states concerns about the approaching renewal, CEU must be completed before April. A Member suggests that renewal not be automatic, a Member states there has never been an audit of CEU. Members suggest the need to audit only the Screened licenses, the administrator suggests that may be targeting and indicates an audit is usually 10% or 10 single licenses randomly selected by our IT staff. Carol Fay asks the administrator to work on getting an audit and report back to the board.

Dorothy Hodge states all license holders recommends report a

physical domicile and not be allowed to use a PO Box as an address. The administrator states he is uncertain if a PO Box is currently acceptable, he will check with office staff and report back to the board.

Dorothy Hodge states in the event that a subpoena needs to be delivered, a physical address and not a PO Box would be necessary, Dorothy asks Atty. Amy Coleman for her input, Atty. Coleman states she will research this matter and get back to the board.

Members state they will continue to research the CDI and DI categories, stating they have work to do.

Dorothy Hodge states she will share her work product with Mr. Steve Florio of the RICDHH.

Adjournment

Having no further business, on motion of Dorothy Hodge, seconded by Carol Fay, it was unanimously voted to adjourn. The Open Session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michel Martineau

Health Policy Analyst