



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT INTERPRETERS
ADVISORY PANEL

www.courts.ca.gov/ciap.htm
ciap@jud.ca.gov

COURT INTERPRETERS ADVISORY PANEL PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND ETHICS SUBCOMMITTEE (PSE)

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 14, 2019
12:15 -1:30 p.m.
Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Mr. Gurinder Aujla, Ms. Carmen Benbrook, Ms. Claritza J. Callaci, Mr. Hector Gonzalez, Jr., Ms. Ivette Peña, Ms. Marta Selvi.
Also in attendance: Hon. Brian L. McCabe, Chair, Court Interpreters Advisory Panel

Judicial Council Staff Present: Ms. Debbie Chong, Ms. Claudia Ortega, Ms. Carmen Castro-Rojas, Ms. Edith Reyes, Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf

OPEN MEETING (CAL RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:15p.m and staff was asked to take roll.

II. Opening Remarks

- The subcommittee accomplished a major task with the development of the credential review procedures and revised rule of court 2.891. It was 2.5 years in the making, and the procedures and rule will go before the Judicial Council this coming July with the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel's (CIAP) recommendation for a January 1, 2020 effective date.
- PSE will review the procedures again, one year after they go into effect and make modifications as needed.
- The internal administrative and operational procedures, particularly the critical role Legal and CIAP will assume warranted internal discussion and review to insure internal staffing needs and protocols is clearly understood by all those involved in the implementation and ongoing execution of this important policy.

III. Meeting Goals

- With the rollout of the web-based interpreter portal this September, the subcommittee has an opportunity to review the current compliance requirements and to revise the format, clarify content, and organize them for the interpreters and continuing education providers, but, more importantly, to make immediate policy changes as illustrated in the chart that was provided.

- Staff identified areas of improvement in the current compliance requirements and identified points of clarification based on feedback from the interpreter community, providers, and the courts.
- After approval of the changes in the compliance requirements by CIAP, the changes will be submitted to the Administrative Director who has authority to approve changes to the compliance requirements. The deadline is July 1-15 for a date of September 1, 2019 for the revised copy of the compliance requirements incorporating all approved policy changes to go into effect.
- The meeting addressed phase 1, the changes that CIP staff identified as being rather straight forward and related to what staff observed over the past few years.
- There are other more substantive/major items, or possible changes that will require more in depth discussion that will be discussed at a later date, phase 2.

IV. Actions taken by the subcommittee

The subcommittee reviewed and discussed the policy changes provided in the chart and took the following actions/vote.

Approved by the subcommittee on March 14, 2019:

1. Does the Professional Standards and Ethics Subcommittee (PSE) recommend that effective September 2019, interpreters will no longer be required to turn in hard copies of documentation, and will attest under the penalty of perjury to completion of all compliance requirements and are subject to an audit?
2. Should PSE recommend that the CIP no longer accept retroactive annual renewal fees from inactive interpreters, the fees are to be paid during the annual renewal cycle?
3. Should Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) State Bar courses be approved for Court Interpreter Minimum Continuing Education (CIMCE) without the interpreter needing to submit an application?
4. Should CIMCE numbers granted by other State Judiciary bodies or Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) be automatically approved for CIMCE without the interpreter needing to submit an application?
5. Should references to the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) be removed that indicate CIAP is consulting with ongoing CIP work regarding: exemptions to the 40 hour professional assignments; consulting on all denied CIMCE applications; CIMCE courses deemed not relevant; and reviewing approved courses every quarter, with the understanding that in some cases consultation with the CIAP chair and/or legal services may be required in those instances where needed or requested?

Action by E-mail approved on March 27, 2019

Should CIP add the following (bold indicates additions to existing text) courses to the list of non-CIMCE approved activities?

1. Developing any state, federal, or consortium court interpreter exam, or **exam development for any profession.**

2. Attending classes in person, or via distance learning that provide instruction on how to take and pass any state or federal court certification and/or registered court exam. (passed but further discussion may be warranted regarding parameters)
3. Attending classes in person or via distance learning that provide instruction on how to take and pass any professional exam, and/or prepares one for any professional certification, licensing or credentialing exams.
4. Courses on brand development, marketing, running or building a business, or engaging in marketing or consulting activities.
5. Self-directed research or publishing.
6. Courses primarily based on works of fiction (novels, movies, podcasts)
7. Time spent on doing homework.
8. CIMCE credit is not guaranteed for participation in activities, such as interpreter vacations or conferences offered in a foreign country. Foreign travel per se, is not CIMCE eligible.
9. Should PSE recommend that interpreter vacation applications or conferences held outside the US only be approved if submitted by the vacation/conference provider?
10. Should PSE recommend the maximum allowed CIMCE granted per day go from 6 hours to 8 hours?(footnote will read: Up to 8 hours a day may be approved at the discretion of CIP for conferences or activities that last more than 6 hours).

Items to review at the next meeting:

1. Should PSE recommend that the waiver of 40 professional assignment not be limited to just registered interpreters, but include certified interpreters?
2. Should PSE recommend that the Professional Assignments be expanded to include additional professional assignments as listed in Handout 02, Professional Assignments?
Note: Other legal assignments that were not on the provided list were suggested by members. Staff will ask members for suggestions and incorporate into an updated list to be made available prior to the next meeting.

V. Adjournment

Members were reminded of the May 8, 2019 in person meeting. Staff will poll members for the next PSE meeting date where unfinished business will be discussed. Meeting was adjourned at: 1:22.

Approved by the subcommittee on: April 29, 2019