



# **Interpreter Certification Board (ICB)**

## March 6, 2024 From: 3:00-5:00 PM, Zoom (Virtual Meeting)

# **Pending Meeting Minutes**

### Interpreter Certification Board Members:

#### In attendance:

Clint Behunin, Jessica Callahan, Ben Daniel, David Davenport, Paul DeGraw, Stephen Ehrlich, Teresa Judd, Tom Robertson **Not in attendance:** Allyson Hamilton, Jennifer Harvey, Amelia Willams

#### Guests:

Sarah Brenna, Melody Fico, Charity Harding, Cody Simonsen

### **Utah Interpreter Program Admin:**

Jes Nelson-Julander, Karen Rama, Jason Mauray

Voice Interpretation	and CART were	provided during	this meeting

Agenda Items	Announcements/Discussion	Actions/Recommendations
Update: Various Updates Sarah Brenna and Jes Nelson-Julander	<ul> <li>Ben welcomed Clint, a new member of the board and Sarah, USOR (Utah Services of Rehabilitation) Director to the meeting</li> <li>Ben opened the floor for Jes' updates</li> <li>Jes showed her appreciation to the board members and wanted them acknowledged for their excellence in helping make the examination process the way it is</li> <li>Two different states reached out to UIP (Utah Interpreter Program) to see if it would be possible to purchase our certification system</li> <li>Jes discussed the recent bill (HB 534) that was passed by the legislature and governor. It removed the requirement for the state to have various boards and committees. ICB is among those listed</li> </ul>	Meeting started at 3:05 PM

	<ul> <li>While the ICB will be dissolved on May 1st, UIP (Utah Interpreter Program) work toward expanding the communities' involvements</li> <li>Instead of having only 11 people to advise UIP, UIP will instead have the entire community to not just advise them but also keep them accountable</li> <li>UIP will still require committees for appeals and complaints. When UIP is ready to develop newer exams, they will</li> </ul>	
Discussion: Proposal Letter Draft: Recommendation to Publish Lapsed Certifications/Recog nized InterpretersBoard and Community MembersVote: Submit, Revise or Reject Proposal Letter DraftBoard Members	<ul> <li>also set up a committee for those as well</li> <li>There was no draft prepared for the board to review</li> <li>Currently, UIP announces newly certified interpreters. They do not post any information on lapsed interpreters</li> <li>This could be problematic as lapsed interpreters may still earn money as an interpreter when they're forbidden by state law</li> <li>Jes reminded the board of a previous discussion to recommend UIP provide a rolling 6 months list of lapsed interpreters directly on their website, not on social media</li> <li>UIP is now looking to the ICB for guidance and assistance</li> </ul>	David proposed that Ben contact Jennifer to get the draft worked on Ben will contact Jen and will work on getting the draft ready by March 15th • The board will be given up to March 31st to vote on whether they should submit, revise or reject the proposal draft letter
Discussion: State Requirement for Recognizing RID-certified Interpreters Providing Relay Services (VRS) Stephen Ehrlich	<ul> <li>Stephen mentioned that there may be several interpreters working without a proper certification in either VRS or face-to-face</li> <li>For the purpose of providing clarification, the state of Utah does not require interpreters to obtain Utah state certifications if they already have national-level certifications (RID - Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf) or holds an acceptable assessment score from EIPA (Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment)</li> <li>UIP can only know if a person holds RID certifications or EIPA assessments is if they follow the state law and get their credentials recognized with UIP</li> </ul>	

Agondo	Itome
Agenda	ICHIS

	<ul> <li>The only way UIP can become aware of an non-certified person providing interpreting service is by the communities and/or agencies filing complaints/grievances and/or letting UIP know</li> <li>Once a complaint has been made, UIP can start taking actions</li> <li>The same process is there for RID and/or EIPA interpreters who have yet to apply for recognition from UIP</li> </ul>	
Discussion: Review the Proposed Revision of The Policy and Procedure Manual Board Members	<ul> <li>Jes Nelson-Julander, Ben Daniel, Jennifer Harvey, Adam Janisieski and Amber Sidwell worked together to develop the proposed PPM (Policy and Procedure Manual)</li> <li>The manual is approximately 40 pages long and took almost one year to write</li> <li>Jessica shared some concerns about the newly added EPC (Ethical Practice Committee) section</li> </ul>	David proposed that the ICB vote on the revised PPM with the consideration that UIP will add some minor changes, such as: typos, organizational structures, and review the EPC portion Clint seconded
	<ul> <li>Interpreters' repeated code of ethical violations should be considered when evaluating whether or not the interpreters should be penalized for their current violations</li> <li>For example, the committee can look at prior punishments for similar violations or if one interpreter gets the same violations over and over</li> <li>Currently, the hearing process focuses on that one potential violation for that specific situation. There are concerns about looking into prior violations for determinations on how one should be penalized</li> <li>During Jessica's time with the UIP, there was an interpreter who got excused for a repeated violation because the committee looked at each case as a isolated incident, when in fact, they have done it repeatedly</li> </ul> Stephen suggested adding indexes for hierarchical headings to the policy and procedure manual. This will allow the users to easily find the information they're looking for	The board unanimously voted yes in favor of proposed manual Jessica proposed to close the meeting at 4:04 David seconded Meeting concluded at 4:04

Agenda Items	Announcements/Discussion	Actions/Recommendations
	<ul> <li>The current draft has letters for the top headers but not the numberings for the contents underneath. The PPM committee will work on adding those</li> <li>Jes has asked the board to vote in order to approve or reject the proposed manual as it is right now. There will be some changes needed in order to address the removal of the ICB's roles and duties within the document</li> </ul>	