

Interpreter Work Group Minutes– August 18, 2009

- 3 sites participated in the DDN meeting including: Rapid City, Tulare Middle School and Sioux Falls
- Those in attendance include:
 - Diane Svancina
 - Todd Christensen
 - Grady Kickul
 - Janet Ball
 - Kasey Entwisle
 - Larry Puthoff
 - Mark Johnson
 - Beth Driesen
 - Pat Ryder-CSD-in place of Bobbie Beth Scroggins / written designee provided
 - Mitch Richter
 - Lisa Fowler
 - Interpreters -Julie Paluch and Renee Standish, Department Secretary-Linda Noonan.

- The following were not present:
 - Bobbie Beth Scoggins
 - Marlee Dyce
 - Ann Larsen
 - Greta Howe
 - Tanya Miller
 - Mark Koterwski
 - Lance Sigdestad
 - Christa Gunderson.

- Introductions were done. Prior to review of last months minutes, Grady wanted to inform the group that for future meetings it would be more cost effective for state staff to participate at the Pierre DDN site. So future meetings we will remain in Pierre and there will be interpreters in Sioux Falls and Pierre. This was supported with the work group.

- Designee: It was also asked that if anyone was not able to attend a scheduled meeting and wanted to send a designee, it is requested that the person on the work group email Grady and Janet who your designee is prior to the meeting. This also is acceptable with the group.

- Review of the Minutes & Concerns: As we review these minutes, DRS stressed that you share the minutes with entities that you represent. Below is a recap:
 - Review of the certification/registration process and responded to questions.
 - Rule overview of the 2006 changes and looked at the 2008 changes.
 - Reviewed the areas of concern and what is working now in South Dakota.
 - Approved the minutes

Meeting now open for discussion:

- Pat representing CSD asked if we have more than 1 representative from an agency. Grady clarified there is more than 1 from CSD.
- Grady also clarified that we wanted additional members from the deaf community as we wanted a balance and that additional deaf individuals were added to the group.
- Discussion continued on Provisional Certification
 - Should the time be limited when a person receives their degree to when they may apply for Provisional Certification?
 - This is still a concern that someone may not interpret for years but still possess an IT degree.
 - Some interpreters go into other states that do not require certification, and then years later come back to SD.
 - How do we know how this person has been interpreting?
 - Some indicated that once you have the degree, it cannot be taken away from you and was referenced to other professions such as teaching, nursing, etc. They still have the degree and can work in that profession.
 - No decision made
- Pat introduced new discussion and asked about bringing SD certification back to testing? CSD would like to see bringing SD testing model again, even from another state.
- Todd from Rapid City indicated that the Rapid City school district has been trying to hire deaf educators and interpreters for 3 years and cannot. They are concerned about the inadequate number of available interpreters and deaf educators. If we brought back SD testing again, will it be easier to work in SD? In a small town like Lemmon, will this help us as a state finding a qualified interpreter?
- State versus national test - Rapid City or west would prefer the state process.
- Mark stated “having a state certification may be good or bad. Why bring it back? Or should we keep it the same way. It should have equal access for deaf interpreters.”
- Grady – If we bring back state certification testing process there will be a tremendous investment and Grady indicated that we don’t have the expertise or resources to do that...
 - Movement in the nation is to a higher standard.
 - DRS was concerned that the number of interpreters in SD would go down with the closing of the IT program at STI.
 - There is same number of interpreters from 5 years ago.
 - Grady – There are 91 certified interpreters. 44 national certified and RID. 34 SD certified interpreters. 10 provisional interpreters and 3 EIPA only.
 - I don’t know how we were 5 years ago

- We are looking at 8 that will be graduating in May. We want to keep them in SD and not moving to another state.
- Beth – Agreed and stated that SD has been in the forefront and raised the bar.
- Kasey - We want qualified interpreters
- Decision for present is to continue national certification

Provisional Certification:

- Diane suggested if a person that has been out from an IT program for 2 years, they need to submit a resume and show academics, have they been involved in the profession and keeping up their skills.
- Lisa agreed, nurses and doctors have taken workshops to keep up their skills. Lisa feels they have to prove themselves and further their education. If after 5 years the person has not been working as an interpreter, they need a resume to show dedication.
- Larry – Agree.
- Lisa suggested a working committee that reviews the resumes? We have a list of mentors who could look to them as they represent different groups.
- Pat – Why not allow the Department to determine if they are eligible. We need state control and not national. We have a responsibility to this state to the deaf and hard of hearing.
- Grady –We need to increase the number of interpreters and get them into the profession. Sioux Falls area is ok but outside of that area, interpreters are hard to come by. A person has demonstrated they can obtain a degree and provisional provides them a 5 year window to demonstrate and improve their skills. This approach allows people to get back into the field.
- Janet – For those who receive a Provisional Certification, there are strict guidelines and interpreters need to meet with mentors and being mentored ensuring they are progressing in their skills
- Pat – Can support that and the 5 year window
- Decision for present is to not require time lines for return if an IT degree is held

Complaint process

- Grady –currently there is no legal authority. In changing the law we managed to lose the legal authority for discipline action. We need the authority and we are looking at legislation that would provide the authority.
- Kasey –if interpreters became members of RID there is a good grievance process at the national level.
- Pat – If there is a complaint in state of SD and not national, should be able to come to the department.
- Mark – Most deaf individuals would like to have a neutral place. I have heard that they do not want to go to state with a grievance.
- Larry – Most deaf people would not go to the national level but the average person would like to go to the local level.
- Complaint for deaf children, the national doesn't take care of it, but the state does.
- Mitch – Complaint process should follow the national level.

- Grady- If there is a complaint about your work as a national RID; there is a process to follow. SD can adhere to the national standards and use their code of conduct, we need to remain consistent and need something locally.
- Grady – We have a window of mid-Oct for draft department legislative recommendations and we will pursue with legal council. Why we lost that legal authority? It cannot be changed. Janet can research why and where the legal authority went.
- For the last 5 years, how many complaints?
- Kasey – No serious complaints but something like odd behaviors. It will help the interpreter improve. Some deaf will go to a deaf person and complain but not to anyone else.
- Mark – Agency will cover the grievance
- No decision, issue of possible legislation will be further explored

Extension Process –

- Grant an extension for those who fail to meet their annual registration similar the RID process.
- Janet- There is an extension on the national level that grants an extension if an interpreter does not meet their continuing education units. They must have a very good reason, i.e.; an illness, taking care of family member that has a serious illness. They must make up the CEU hours and their new CEU cycle is not delayed, it starts on the scheduled time frame.
- Kasey – SD has 5 years to obtain 125 CEU's
- Grady – Don't agree with Janet. I am uncomfortable with the Department being judge and jury, deciding if a matter is catastrophic or not. What I may consider catastrophic, someone else may not agree. Need to research RID and see that language.
- Janet - Talked to legal counsel in the department and majority of other professions have an extension grant period
- Grady – This may also require law change
- No decision, further research & discussion needed

Annual Registration –

- Do we want everyone to register at the same time?
- Diane – Like the idea to register at the same date.
- National date is June 30 and if the state date is July 30, there would be time to get it back and send to Janet.
- Kasey, Lisa – Liked it too.
- Grady – Same date and that will help with a mass mailing.
- Lisa – I would like to see a different date other than June as June is an expensive month with RID requirements during that month. She would like to see SD extend the annual registration by a month or two so that it falls in July or August.
- Decision forthcoming, Grady – Also may need an administrative rule to change it. Firm date now? Bring the date back the next meeting and further discuss.

RID associate membership requirement for CMP maintenance for all SD interpreters.

- National membership would be an added expense.
- There are fewer SD certified interpreters that we are currently tracking.
- Kasey – mixed feelings about that.
- Janet – I heard from one interpreter who wanted me to voice her opinion. She does not want to participate on national level and does not want to pay the added expense.
- Diane – Not a requirement and not in favor.
- Lisa - There are 34 certificated interpreters and all certified SD and some may want to go to national level but want to stay locally.
- Decision is not to require. All in agreement, the decision is to not require national membership for CEU maintenance.

EIPA – Do we want to require the written test in addition to the performance test?

- Augie has performance test only.
- There is a shortage of interpreters.
- There are only 3 EIPA certified in the state.
- There is a problem with the school district finding certified interpreters.
- Decision is to not seek changes in the foreseeable future.

Do we need to look at the qualifications for educational interpreters?

- There are 34 FTE interpreters in the school district.
- They are only tracked by positions. School reports how much they are working.
- It's all levels of certification.
- There will be further work with the Dept of Ed,
- Ann Larsen, and special education having a meeting and Janet will be on the agenda for the monthly meeting.
- Mark – Education interpreters – Do all have mentors? Any interpreter can have a mentor.
- No decision, further research and discussion needed in the future to consider ramifications

Should we grant Provisional Certification for CODA's?

- Mark – Absolutely not. I know 2 CODA's that can finger spell and parents can sign. They need a training program.
- Lisa – The NIC written test is the history what we learn in the field and learn not from parent and learn in the field. Need interpreters but a CODA not eligible for provisional. CODA & SODA as well. Need a training program.
- Grady – Agree on standard of IT training.
- Janet – There is an Alternative Pathway on the national level. Janet will send it out.
- Decision is that CODA's should be required to have same degree requirements as any interpreter

Overview of Today's meeting

- Grady – One item added – possibility of state certification coming back.
- Lisa – Consensus on all items but #1. Discussion on the time limit not finished.
- Agreement on 5 year time limit should be set.
- Janet – Before they test and how far back to look at IT degree.
- Grady – It will require a change of law. 5 year plan is to bring skills up to speed.
- Lisa – Person who has shown no interest in 10-20 years and wants to get back into the field should test before allowed back in the profession. Our profession has changed and struggle with that point.
- Mark – Needs to have a mentor and require a deaf with a hearing mentor or both.
- Mitch - Draft legislation to the group? Area of complaint process and extension.
- Add to agenda: Number of CEU's -- RID has 20 and state 25 a year?
- Confusion with extension process, Can there be a grace period?

Grady – Good discussion, please share minutes and we have made progress.
Next meeting 4 weeks from now – September 15 from 3:30 to 5:30.

Janet – A list of mentors was put on the DRS website on Monday.