Consortium for Language Access in the Courts
Teleconference Meeting of Technical Committee
May 29, 2012
Minutes

Present: Osvaldo Aviles (PA), Agustin de la Mora (Professional member), Sridevi Gadiraju (NY), Katrin Johnson (WA), Andrea Krlickova (NV), Emy Lopez (CO), Jacquie Ring (CA), Bruno Romero (OH), Pam Sanchez (NM), and Wanda Romberger as staff.

Test writers/raters who fail an oral exam
Emy explained that she and Wanda have discussed an issue for which Wanda would like approval from the Technical Committee, but Emy suggested a separate teleconference for that conversation. The issue arises when test writers develop an exam for a new language (a language for which no exam already exists). Before being exposed to test content, the test writers are informed that once exposed, they will never be allowed to take that exam form and that if they are interested in becoming certified, they must take a simultaneous exam which will be set aside until the test writers are trained to be provisional raters for the new exam form. Once trained to be provisional raters, the raters rate each other's exams under the guidance of a rater supervisor. The problem arises when those subject matter experts (SMEs) fail the exam and the question arises whether the SME should continue to serve as a rater for the exam.

Structure of the Technical Committee in light of the transition of the Consortium
Emy explained that the Technical Committee will continue to operate as usual until at least December 2012, accomplishing as many on-going projects and tasks as possible before that time.

Tagalog and Korean new test audits
Prior to the meeting, Wanda distributed new test audits for Tagalog 1 and Korean 3 test forms to the committee for approval. In the Korean 3 audit, she had indicated that she would get word counts for the Korean portion of the consecutive section and the Korean-to-English sight translation from Prometric and supply that information. However, Wanda explained that Prometric responded that it didn't have the word counts; therefore, she was unable to supply the data. After discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and approved to approve the Tagalog exam and make it available to the general membership, but to update the word count in the Korean exam as consultants are available and resubmit for approval at a later date.

Scoring Unit Suggestion Forms
Wanda explained that California tests twice a year and after the rating has been completed, Prometric forwards the Scoring Unit Suggestion Forms to NCSC for each of the test forms. Wanda suggested that the process for updating scoring dictionaries for all test forms take place twice a year. NCSC will collect Scoring Unit Suggestion Forms as they are received during the year; once Prometric forwards the forms collected by them, staff will have all scoring dictionaries updated by consultants.

Updates and ongoing projects
Emy reviewed the Work Plan for 2011 and updated members on the progress of the exam maintenance project being conducted by Robert Joe Lee. Emy suggested that discussions about

any electronic rating project and the mix-and-match assembly of written exams be saved for a face-to-face meeting. She will send a description of the recommended bifurcated process for the Arabic exams to members prior to the next meeting for their thoughts and comments. Wanda will continue working on the Program Manager's Manual.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Next meetings are scheduled for:
- June 19
- July 17
- August 21
- September 18
- October 23
- November 20
- December 18

All meetings are scheduled for 11:00 a.m. Pacific, 12:00 p.m. Mountain, 1:00 p.m. Central, and 2:00 p.m. Eastern time unless otherwise noted above. The notes from previous meetings having to do with priorities set by the Technical Committee members remains as an attachment to these minutes.

Priorities for the Technical Committee as discussed at previous meeting – reviewed

1. **What immediate needs would you wish to identify as the primary focus / top priority of the Technical Committee?**
   - Testing and testing instruments…continuing development of testing (new and fixing of all tests).
   - In the short term determine how technology can help transfer versions of exams and other materials. Longer term, finding a way that the raters can enter exam rating on a computer screen.
   - Perform maintenance on tests and conduct rater calibration for current exams before moving into other exam development, and a continuation of training as part of the regular structure. Technology and FTP sites that are valuable and need for it to work correctly.
   - Standardization of data requirements in reference to information that should be sent back to Consortium staff from states that are testing. Staff decision about most useful data that is sent back, that can be compiled by states and then sent back for Staff to analyze.
   - Need for staffing for test liaison/expert who will always make sure that they follow up with necessary items and tasks
   - SharePoint working for all member states. Program Managers will have to go through Staff. Training is needed for Staff around the permissions. Creating FAQs for members. Upload and download and move multiple files at a time.
   - Research other SFTP site options to make sure we have a back-up plan if necessary.

2. **At the face-to-face meeting of voting members in January, the following tests were identified for the auditing/maintenance project that is currently underway: Arabic, Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean 2 and Vietnamese 1. At this time Arabic and Korean are actively being worked on, and we will update on the progress for other exams. The members also identified exams to be the focus of work in 2012: Laotian, Vietnamese 2, Russian 1 and 2 and Portuguese. What exams are of highest priority for your state?**
   - Review inventory of tests, checking latest versions to make sure that they are in compliance with TCM standards:
   - Vietnamese 2
   - Russian 1 and 2
   - Portuguese
   - Chuukese tests and test raters
   - Vietnamese 2 (specific scoring unit review), Vietnamese 1 (more in depth) Not the time investment that we have had to use for this year. Roll money over to 2012 that has not been used to complete project in 2011.

3. **The Technical Committee was allocated approximately $65,000 for three years to dedicate to Rater Calibration. 2012 will mark the third year of these allocations. We are looking at conducting some rater recruitment and completing the face-to-face calibration events in 2012. What are your thoughts in this area?**
   - Continuation of training of raters - every 2 years. Inconsistencies with raters - standards, notification, working with Program Managers.
   - Continue to work on rater calibration

4. Members also identified the Written Exam as priority for maintenance and development of new methods of administration. What priority would you give the maintenance/development of the Written Exam?

- More work done on WE, both from ground up and then maintenance of the current exam, ***translation component expanded in some way to capture more languages
- Testing company for CA and TX (WE), get data analysis
- Maintenance of the WE
- Development of a 3rd exam as exposure may be an issue
- Online administration of the exam

5. What else is the Committee not currently addressing in its workload that you feel should be given priority? What would our logical next steps be?

- Direction for Program managers regarding what to do with interpreters who work in languages for which no exams exist
- Bilingual testing - language access expansion and initiatives, differential pay for bilingual staff

Creation of Working Groups

The following working groups will be established and members may choose their area of interest in subsequent email exchanges:

1. **Bilingual Testing:** Options for testing/determining credentials of interpreters working in languages for which there is no certification exam and options for testing bilingual employees
2. **Technology/Secure Site:** Search for alternate Secure File Transfer Protocol options to take the place of SharePoint, as well as research of digital examination administration options
3. **Exam Raters:** Rater recommendations to include standards for rater recruitment, training and maintenance

Reassigning raters from Approved to Approved Lead

Approved raters must have rated at least fifteen (15) oral exams and have at least three (3) years of experience as a rater, have attended the face-to-face training within the past five (5) years, and must submit at least three (3) recommendations from individuals they have directly worked with:

- One recommendation from a rater supervisor;
- One recommendation from another rater; and
- One recommendation from a program manager or staff at the National Center for State Courts.

Training requirements for raters

- Inaugural training for all raters must be in-person.
- Following the initial in-person rater training, all raters must attend the online refresher training once every year.
- Based on available funds, raters (including approved lead raters) will be required to attend in-person training every five years (at a minimum), or less based on NCSC staff recommendations.
- Failure to attend required trainings (in-person or online) may result in removal from the Consortium's Approved List of Raters.
- Staff will keep an updated schedule of compliance in the members-only website and distribute or alert program managers when updates and changes are made.