

**Consortium for Language Access in the Courts
Teleconference Meeting of Technical Committee
March 6, 2012
Minutes**

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

Minutes

The minutes of January 2012 meeting were approved as revised in advance of the meeting.

Future of the committee

Emy reported that the Executive Committee is planning a face-to-face meeting immediately following the annual business meeting in Little Rock. She will share her concern that ongoing projects of the Technical Committee continue throughout and after the transition to the newly structured organization. Wanda reported that Rob Baldwin, NCSC's Executive Vice President reached out to her to inquire about what ongoing Consortium projects she would like members to continue to devote their time to. She requested that members continue to work on the following:

- How to qualify interpreters in languages for which there is no exam; bilingual staff evaluation and training;
- Rater management (recruitment, training, periodic refresher training, advancement, etc.)
- Revisions to manuals.

Each of those topics is of vital concern to the membership.

Subcommittee report: Raters and rating processes

In Jacquie's absence, Katrin reported that the subcommittee has broken the topic into four distinct issues:

1. Working with raters, getting materials out and returned in a timely and professional manner.
 - a. The subcommittee discussed the possibility of a coordinated rating schedule so that more exams were available to be rated during specific times of the year;
 - b. Wanda suggested introducing more formal language in the contracts members have with raters, dealing with expectations and deadlines;
 - c. Agustin noted that Prometric does schedule the raters in advance for a specific time frame and provides a deadline by which all work should be completed. He noted that seems to be pretty successful.

Katrin noted that the *Guide for Court Interpreter Program Coordinators on Managing the Rating of Consortium Oral Exams*, which was designed in 2011 and handed out at the annual meeting in Las Vegas, was not included on the flash drive that every attendee received, nor has it been posted on the Consortium's web site. It was decided that it will be distributed again at the 2012 meeting. Wanda will send the most recent version to Jacquie, with a copy to Katrin and Bruno.

2. Promoting raters from Approved to Approved Lead status.
The subcommittee is working on some recommended standards so that a process can be adopted that is the same for all languages, regardless of testing volume. The committee recommended that for promotional purposes, an Approved Rater must (1) rate a minimum number of exams (the precise number wasn't addressed); (2) have a minimum number of years of experience (again, not specified); (3) receive a written recommendation from a rating supervisor or lead rater; and (3) receive a written recommendation from a fellow-rater, NCSC staff, or a state program manager. Emy will follow up on this with Robert Joe, to include language in the "Becoming a Rater" manual.

Wanda reported that she did develop a draft explanation of how Approved Raters, Approved Lead Raters, and Rater Supervisors interact and what expectations are. She will share that document with the committee and maybe it can be distributed at the annual meeting.

3. Standards for ongoing rater training;
The subcommittee is developing draft recommendations for how frequently raters should participate in face-to-face training versus online refresher training. Recommendations include:
 - a. Inaugural face-to-face training for all new raters;
 - b. Online refresher training for all raters – required to attend at least once per year;
 - c. Refresher face-to-face training every five years, but giving NCSC staff discretion to require raters to participate more frequently due to concerns about performance.
4. The subcommittee discussed the draft survey form with questions about services provided by staff, and that includes feedback about raters and rater performance. The intention behind this form is to provide NCSC feedback in a systematic way.

It was suggested that Wanda provide a written review of internal processes (candidate lists, test history checks, etc.) to be used as a handout during the annual meeting.

Subcommittee report: Bilingual testing and procedures for languages for which no exam exists

Pam reported that she doesn't yet have the responses to the survey questions, so the subcommittee has been unable to move forward.

Subcommittee report: Secure document sharing site

Wanda wasn't sure where the NCSC is in regards to the secure site. She will follow up with the director of the IT department and discuss the progress with Emy.

The meeting adjourned.

Next meetings are scheduled as follows:

March 20, 2012

April 17, 2012

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