



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

LANGUAGE ACCESS PLAN
IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

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

LANGUAGE ACCESS PLAN IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

MINUTES OF COMMUNITY OUTREACH MEETING

March 14, 2017

10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Vineyard Training Center

9607 Business Center Drive, Building 13, Suite B

Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730

**Advisory Body
Members Present:**

Hon. Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar, Chair, Hon. Manuel Covarrubias, Vice-Chair, Hon. Steven Austin, Ms. Angie Birchfield, Hon. Terence L. Bruiniers, Hon. Michelle Williams Court, Ms. Ana Maria Garcia, Hon. Dennis Hayashi, Ms. Janet Hudec, Ms. Joann Lee, Ms. Ivette Peña, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Mr. David Yamasaki, and Hon. Laurie Zelon

**Advisory Body
Members Not
Present:**

Ms. Naomi Adelson, Mr. Kevin Baker, Ms. Tracy Clark, Hon. Jonathan Conklin, Hon. Janet Gaard, Ms. Susan Marie Gonzalez, Hon. Rosendo Peña, Hon. Jonathan Renner, Ms. Jeanine Tucker, Dr. Guadalupe Valdés, Mr. José Varela and Hon. Brian Walsh.

Others Present:

Ms. Paula Couselo-Findikoglu, Mr. Douglas Denton, Ms. Nancy Eberhardt, Ms. Susan Groves, Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Ms. Olivia Lawrence, Mr. Sean Lillywhite, Ms. Cristina Llop, Ms. Emy López Ms. Anne Marx, Ms. Cynthia Miranda, Ms. Irene Morales, Mr. Michael Planet, Ms. Jacquie Ring, Mr. Victor Rodriguez, Ms. Janice Shurlow, and Ms. Elizabeth Tam-Helmuth

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURTS, RULE 10.75 (C)(1))

Welcome and Introduction

The Chair, Supreme Court Justice Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar, welcomed everyone to the third community outreach meeting of the Language Access Plan (LAP) Implementation Task Force (ITF). Court Executive Officer Ms. Nancy Eberhardt of San Bernardino Court and her staff were recognized for hosting this meeting in Rancho Cucamonga. San Bernardino County is the largest county in the U.S. and has the most interpreted events in California outside of Los Angeles County. The chair welcomed Mr. Richard Park from the U.S. Department of Justice; other state language access representatives from Colorado and New Mexico; and the Language Access Representatives (and staff) from courts around the state, including Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Solano, and Tulare Courts.

Vice-Chair Hon. Manuel Covarrubias noted that community outreach meetings are a great opportunity for continued learning, to review language access progress made, and to identify challenges that exist.

SESSION ONE – LANGUAGE ACCESS EXPANSION: MEASURING STATEWIDE PROGRESS

Moderator: Hon. Steve Austin

Participants: Mr. Douglas Denton, Mr. Angie Birchfield, Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Ms. Irene Morales, and Ms. Ivette Peña

Mr. Douglas Denton (Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council) shared a Language Access Metrics Report, which was developed by staff and contains data to inform the day's discussion. The report provides a baseline of data and shows ongoing progress, including civil expansions, interpreter resources and usage, interpreter need by language, exam pass rates, and web analytics. The report was shared with the Department of Justice, all 50 states, and the 58 superior courts.

The graphic, *Court Progress in Providing Interpreters in Civil Cases* (as of December 31, 2016) shows that 47 courts now report full expansion (i.e., they provide interpreters in civil case types following the priority levels 1 through 8 dictated by statute in Evidence Code §756). The languages provided and the estimated interpreter coverage for each priority vary by court. Recent information gathered regarding each court's estimated coverage will help the Judicial Council with funding and other targeted efforts designed to help all 58 courts reach full expansion. The Task Force was successful, with the help of the Judicial Council, in securing an additional \$7 million for ongoing funding for interpreter reimbursements.

Ms. Ivette Peña (Court Counsel, Los Angeles Superior Court) shared that the Los Angeles Superior Court has focused on areas with the most limited English proficient (LEP) court users, including traffic matters. The court created an avatar call Gina for use on the traffic website to help litigants identify and resolve issues. It now provides services in six languages (English, Spanish, Chinese, Armenian, Vietnamese, and Korean). The court has a webpage to allow court users to schedule an appointment and request an interpreter for traffic court (the court has buttons online for court users to request an interpreter). Another great tool the court installed is traffic kiosks outside of the courthouse that accept cash 24 hours a day. Court users can access these services in the county's top six languages. The court has also created a portal for all court users in languages Other than Spanish (OTS) to request interpreters for all limited jurisdiction proceedings. The court is also working on expanding this feature to family law and probate. The court is working on launch of a Case Management System (CMS) to help with the early identification of LEP interpreter needs and to track interpreter usage throughout the life of the case. This CMS will help identify trends in usage, and includes a scheduling system for interpreters to allow for redirection of interpreters, resulting in less downtime. All new initiatives are anticipated to be in place by 2018.

Ms. Angie Birchfield (Independent Contractor Court Interpreter) shared her conversations with other court interpreters. A.B. 2370 is helping courts through its requirements for interpreters to provide their credentials on the record. Ms. Birchfield noted that she would like to see this used more in civil cases. She also noted that language expansion has increased the need for independent contractors to work in the courts. She stated that benchcards for judges and court staff on LEP rules have been helpful. Her biggest concern is the need for more interpreters in the OTS languages.

Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick (Court Executive Officer, Riverside Superior Court) referenced his prior work in federal court to illustrate how far California is ahead. He noted that only three languages are recognized in federal courts for certification (Spanish, Navajo, and Haitian Creole). There is also no continuing education in federal courts for interpreters. He noted that there is language access need in all places, at the front counter, in the collections counter, in the jury room, etc. He also noted that tension in the courtroom is relieved by adding a court interpreter. Riverside Court is at Priority Level 4, and is using interpreters in levels 5-8 as they are able. (The San Bernardino Court is similar in reaching these levels.) The Riverside Court hired interpreters in non-Spanish languages, such as two American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters. Also, Riverside is hiring an intermittent interpreter for Mandarin, and San Bernardino has a Vietnamese interpreter that is shared with Riverside.

Mr. Hamrick recommended continuing to look at real-time service, as much as we plan and calendar, to deal with the unexpected (urgent/last minute) requests for interpreter needs. The Court also has regional meetings to share information and make sure everyone on staff is up to date with language access and interpreter efforts.

Ms. Irene Morales (Executive Director, Inland Counties Legal Services) shared that there has been a dramatic change in the Inland Empire (Riverside and San Bernardino) with expansion efforts. All managing attorneys indicated that they can get Spanish interpreters and OTS languages if requested in advance. This goes a long way to making the civil justice system accessible. Ms. Morales reported that Asian populations have increased over the years (6-7% of the total now in both counties) and language access services are not reaching all communities (for example, the Hmong population). She also noted a need to explore Arab populations. She noted increased professionalism for certified interpreters and improved interactions with managing attorneys.

Judge Austin noted the challenges associated with estimating funding needs because better communication with LEP communities about services provided can increase the number of interpreters and other services utilized. There is a need to look at various ways to analyze data to assist with future projections. Ms. Peña stated that if there are further restrictions with immigration, individuals may be more reticent to come to court. She noted that recruitment continues to be a challenge and utilization is a challenge for OTS languages. She stated that it can be difficult to incentivize OTS interpreters when courts have a uniform payment structure.

Ms. Birchfield stated that there isn't enough interpreter coverage and the reason is mostly because of compensation. The private sector pays higher fees. Independent contractor rates haven't moved in over a decade, which is a big obstacle. Independent contractors are very willing and able to work in the courts, but the per diem rate is keeping them from doing so. She reported that some courts are still using non-certified interpreters, mostly because of compensation. This applies to both Spanish and OTS languages.

Judge Austin highlighted the new rule for using provisionally-qualified interpreters (Rule 2.893) includes language that encourages provisionally qualified interpreters to become certified or registered. Mr. Hamrick stated that part of the competition the court faces is that contract interpreters often have opportunities to do conference interpreting, which is more lucrative. The court needs to be able to compete with other paying assignments. He also noted the need to have additional funding to support the interpreter services, such as funding for language service

coordinators, supervisors, etc. There is a supply-side issue with recruitment because many people may not have ever thought of becoming an interpreter. Riverside Court is looking at going to high schools and getting the message out to the community about possible work. There are potential interpreters in the Inland Empire.

Ms. Morales noted that recruitment challenges are the same for legal services providers, especially for rural areas. There is a need for additional staff who speak needed languages, including OTS languages.

SESSION TWO – RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION – QUALIFIED INTERPRETERS AND BILINGUAL STAFF

Moderator: Hon. Manuel Covarrubias

Participants: Ms. Nancy Eberhardt, Ms. Emy López, Ms. Janet Hudec, Ms. Anne Marx, and Ms. Susan Groves

Judge Covarrubias noted that California currently has approximately 1,900 certified and registered interpreters. Around 1995, there were over 2,000 interpreters, with more than 1,500 interpreters in Spanish. During the listening sessions conducted by the Joint Working Group in the development of the Language Access Plan, court interpreters raised the concern that there would not be sufficient numbers of interpreters to meet civil expansion needs.

Ms. Janet Hudec (Court Employee Interpreter) explained there are a number of differences between bilingual staff and court interpreters. Bilingual staff are communicating at a conversational level. Interpreting is a skill set that is acquired through many years of training, education, and practice. It requires the three different modes of interpreting (consecutive, simultaneous, and sight translation). It is listening, processing, and delivering the message within a matter of seconds. Both bilingual staff and interpreters are important for language access planning since they are the conduits to bridge the gap for LEP court users. They allow the LEP person to be at an equal footing of anyone else that comes into court that day.

Ms. Eberhardt (Court Executive Officer, San Bernardino Superior Court) shared that San Bernardino Court currently has over 60 bilingual staff (mostly Spanish) at counters and public service areas. This is about 5% of the front line staff. The court does not limit where bilingual staff can work. The court assesses bilingual ability through a test provided by a company and conducted over the phone. If individuals pass, they are paid a premium. The court does not have continuing education for bilingual staff right now, but this could be a focus for the near future.

The court has an intranet of online resources and glossaries to assist with bilingual assistance. They encourage bilingual staff to go into the courtroom and see the process, which provides a more well-rounded education. The court needs to audit use of bilingual staff and know where they are working to identify if there are too many bilingual staff in one area and too few in another area. There are currently no local recruitment efforts for bilingual staff, but the court does go to career fairs, colleges, and military families to recruit court interpreters. They also provide information to students coming to court during Law Day.

Ms. Emy López (Administrator of the Office of Language Access, Colorado Judicial Department) reported that Colorado has a much smaller scale of interpreter resources than California. Currently, there are 30 certified interpreters on staff and about 80 Spanish

independent contractors who work in the courts each day. There are also over 200 OTS interpreters, in about 120 languages. They have two staff translators to help with document translation initiatives. Colorado's efforts focus on processes to certify and retain interpreters with limited funds. They have increased orientation and certification efforts to allow interpreters to prepare for testing free of charge. They absorb that cost through the Administrative Office. The state offers skills-building courses for those who go through orientation and pass the written exam. Additionally, two Saturdays of targeted training for Spanish candidates are provided, which has increased the pass rate on the interpreting exam. For those who fall right under the threshold for passing the test, Colorado used these individuals as qualified interpreters to work in events outside of the courtroom. This fosters practice and Colorado finds that people who are paid want to stay with the courts longer because they see that there is a future for them.

They use an internal telephone interpreting center to utilize independent contractors, which can provide more interpreting statewide and work for them. The state expanded to civil cases in 2011, which has expanded the work for interpreters. Colorado has pushed community events, job fairs, and events at other colleges to continually recruit interpreters in every language. The out of court area is the area with fastest growth. Colorado's case load is going down, but the need for interpreters in the out of court area is going up.

Ms. Susan Groves (Family Law Facilitator/Manager, San Diego Superior Court) reported that for out of court services, the self-help center assisted over 6,000 people in San Diego Court. Over 50% of their attorneys, paralegals, and court operations clerks are proficient in Spanish. The self-help center tries to put these people where they are most needed. They have a legal internship program, and the self-help center recruits from county law schools for internships and looks for students who speak OTS languages to assist. The Justice Corps program is funded through an AmeriCorps grant and Judicial Council funding. It recruits law students to provide services in self-help, and was expanded to San Diego County in 2007. The self-help center relies on the Justice Corps students and the language assistance that they provide is really helpful. Beginning in 2016, tracking shows 84% of language assistance is in Spanish; 7% ASL; 3% Russian, and 1% in a number of OTS languages (French, Korean, Arabic, Ukrainian, Hindi, and Vietnamese).

The San Diego Superior Court staff is multilingual and can speak Spanish, French, ASL, Tagalog and Arabic. The reduction in tension with a court user is visible when someone speaks the language. The self-help center encourages staff to take bilingual testing. Testing is available in Spanish using Spanish-speaking staff. In OTS languages, the self-help center has to rely on other direct supervisory techniques. The use of Language Select in the future will help convey to court users that they could come back to get additional assistance.

Ms. Anne Marx (Senior Analyst, Judicial Council) shared statewide work on recruitment efforts from the Court Interpreters Program (CIP). A hand-out illustrated the different levels of readiness for interpreter candidates and how long before individuals would be ready to be interpreters. CIP tries to target profile outreach and conduct certain kinds of training for individuals preparing to go into courts, as well as support the courts with outreach, such as providing materials that courts can use when they go out to an event. The proposed changes to forms for provisional qualification have turned into a piece of that strategy. The revised INT-

110 forms are a road map for preparation. The forms state that individuals should be testing, familiarizing themselves with ethics, be familiar with courts, etc.

Ms. Hudec reported that the private sector does pay a lot more (about 48% more) than the state courts pay, but it is not because it is a harder job. Court work can actually be more challenging than a deposition, because interpreters may be interpreting for multiple people, with background noise, switching from criminal to civil, and from mode to mode. If there is not a higher compensation for interpreters, the goals of the LAP may be undercut. She recommended that courts have mock trials to introduce the job of the interpreter. There is not a lot of outreach to universities. It is foreign to students to know that interpreting is a profession. There is no job fair for new interpreters so that they know what jobs are open. There needs to be a Judicial Council–centralized web posting to show jobs that are available in all the courts. There should be more explanation of full packages (medical, benefits, etc.) so interpreters know what jobs offer. Future recruitment efforts should look to the law enforcement profession which have hiring bonuses and different steps for career advancement. There should also be more outreach to interpreters in the medical profession and administrative professions. Courts offering stipends to clerks aspiring to become interpreters may encourage them to want to become interpreters. The courts and interpreter coordinators could check that non-certified interpreters are moving forward in the testing process, and don't give up.

Colorado is currently looking at providing premium pay for bilingual employees and starting to do testing. This is an important component for valuing the work. The state has requested an hourly pay increase for independent contract interpreters, which looks like it will go into effect January 2018. Colorado also conducts an annual compensation study for staff interpreters. The state tries to be able to provide free continuing education units every few months, which helps to maintain interpreters' skill set, which can be perishable.

Ms. Eberhardt noted that retention is a focus as well and compensation is an issue at San Bernardino Court. She referenced Jennifer de la Cruz — the Language Access Coordinator and managing interpreter in her court — who understands the needs of interpreters and looks at how we can promote interpreters in their career. She noted that it is important to let interpreters know what is going on in the courts, making sure that they have training and continuing education, and feel like they are a part of the team.

Ms. Groves mentioned looking at tuition reimbursement for language classes for bilingual staff, and providing them with legal terminology and an orientation when they are hired to think about court interpreting. In the Justice Corps program, the students get language training and there is information about a career in court interpreting. Several Justice Corps students expressed interest in a career in court interpreting.

Ms. Marx highlighted the availability of statewide oral proficiency exams (OPEs) that can be used by the courts. The exams are offered in English and 70 other languages. Individuals or courts could pay per language. A second Farsi skills building training is upcoming, as well as a near passers training. CIP has also started to talk about a centralized job board that would include jobs available for bilingual staff and jobs open for staff interpreters.

SESSION THREE – TECHNOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS AND ACCESSIBLE COURTHOUSES

Moderators: Hon. Terence Bruiniers and Hon. Laurie Zelon

Participants: Mr. Michael Planet, Ms. Paula Couselo-Findikoglu, Mr. Sean Lillywhite, and Ms. Janice Shurlow

Justice Bruiniers, Chair of the Task Force’s Technological Solutions Subcommittee, provided an update on current subcommittee efforts: (1) for the early identification of language access needs, the subcommittee has identified approximately 12 case management systems currently in use throughout the state. Though multiple courts may be on the same CMS, not all courts are using the same functionality. To capture language access needs and discover CMS capabilities, the subcommittee has created a preliminary matrix. The matrix is being circulated to vendors to see if capability has accurately been captured. (2) He reported on the progress of the Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) Pilot Project, which stems from LAP Recommendations 12–16. The pilot will collect data on due process issues and increase court user access to qualified court interpreters, especially in OTS languages, which have very limited resources. The pilot includes:

- Three pilot courts: Merced, Sacramento, and Ventura;
- Two vendors: Paras & Associates, and the Connected Justice Consortium; and
- Independent evaluator: San Diego State University Research Foundation

In February, the pilot courts, the evaluation consultant, and Judicial Council staff met in Sacramento to initiate the design phase of the pilot. Vendor contracts are in the final stages and will be executed soon. Once contracts are in place, vendors will also be conducting site visits to the pilot courts. A Workstream, comprised of subject matter experts, has also been formed to develop training in four tracks: interpreters, judges, court staff, and court IT staff. The Workstream will also help summarize pilot results and make recommendations to the council.

The subcommittee is hoping to have training and equipment in place in the three pilot courts by July 2017 in order to begin the 6-month equipment assessment period. Once the pilot courts have selected the VRI courtrooms and appropriate case events, the subcommittee will be able to finalize the VRI pilot design and the evaluation design. Data collection will take place during the course of the pilot, and will include an intensive observation period during a two-week period near the end of the pilot. In order to keep everyone informed of the project, a VRI web page has been created. The subcommittee will update the web page throughout the project.

Accessible Courthouses: Justice Laurie Zelon noted that the report, *Wayfinding and Signage Strategies for Language Access in the California Courts Report and Recommendations*, is the product of a collaboration between the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and the Task Force’s Translation, Signage and Tools for the Courts Subcommittee. The report addresses LAP Recommendations 41 and 42. The NCSC conducted four site visits to local courts and ten phone interviews with staff from a variety of courts to explore the current use of bilingual and multilingual signage. They made a variety of findings and conclusions in the report.

Most multilingual signage currently in place is in Spanish and English. There is very little use of icons and symbols on court signage. Icons are being used in other environments (i.e., airports

and hospitals). Courts do have other strategies, such as the presence of bilingual staff at help desks, the use of “I-Speak” cards, and telephonic interpreter services.

Justice Zelon reported that several courts are using electronic queuing systems, which allow court users to take a number and be called for assistance from staff. These electronic systems allow for multilingual messages to be displayed. There is a lot of potential to use technology to help deliver information to LEP court users in multiple languages.

Recommendations in the report address amendments to the Judicial Council Facility Standards to account for language access considerations and continue to incorporate wayfinding and signage considerations into the courthouse design and construction process. There is also a recommendation to identify commonly understood icons and to enhance the use of icons to create signage that can be understood by court users regardless of their first language and reading level. Another recommendation is to use signage that has been designed for flexibility: signage that allows courts to modify the information, including electronic signs, and hybrid signs that combine a static element with the ability to add languages or allow for changes.

Justice Zelon reported that the subcommittee is currently working on a glossary of signage terms. The glossary will contain signage terms and phrases that are commonly used and standardized in all courts; any icons that are appropriate for signage throughout the court, such as those that identify restrooms, exit doors, and disability access services. Standard terms will be edited for plain language to make them as clear as possible for the public to understand. Once the signage statements and phrases are in plain English, they will be translated into eight additional languages.

VRI and Current Collaboration with Technologies: Mr. Michael Planet (Court Executive Officer, Ventura Superior Court) indicated that lessons learned in other settings are generally applicable for technology used across the courts. VRI is a viable tool when used properly and it is better for shorter hearings, not trials. The Information Technology (IT) infrastructure and court staff must be very strong on the receiving end, where training for judges and court staff has to be really good. For technology to add value, it has to be appropriate for the need, have top notch support, and be accompanied with training.

There is interest in monitors that run Google video chat for filing counters, self-help centers, and traffic windows to help answer basic questions. Also, there is interest in headsets that could handle a crowd, something people could listen in to for knowing their rights. Better digital audio is needed in courtrooms (the Ventura Superior Court recently upgraded the audio in the courtrooms). The quality of audio in the courtroom is critical to the work of court interpreters and court reporters.

As a member of the Future's Commission Technology Working Group, and as Vice Chair of the Technology Working Group, Mr. Planet visited Google, Microsoft, Cisco, and Siemens. Some applications available and in development will be game changers. Examples included chat boxes in over 100 languages and the utilization of technology for digital wayfinding assistance, as well

as document wizards to assist with filling out forms and signing forms, which could be essential for remote work. He also noted digital audio systems and the use of virtual reality, such as seeing a video remote interpreter.

Video Shown Regarding SHARP (Self Help and Referral Program): SHARP is a Self-Help Center in Butte, Tehama, and Glenn Counties that provides assistance to people who do not have attorneys. This short video shows how the SHARP program uses remote technology to help LEP court users access a person who can assist them in their language.

New Mexico's Language Access Training and Certification Program: Ms. Paula Couselo-Findikoglu (Senior Statewide Program Manager, Center for Language Access, Administrative Office of the Courts, New Mexico) presented on the language access training and certification program that was developed in 2009 with funding from the State Justice Institute (SJI). The purpose is to train bilingual employees to perform services outside of the courtroom as part of their regular work. It is a 12-week instructor-led program. It includes direct communication and it has an audio recording applet. Homework is done online and an instructor gives students feedback. The program also includes cultural competency and has continuing education requirements. New Mexico also has webinars and symposiums to share information on what is going on in the courtroom and they are currently working on a code of ethics. New Mexico offers a pay differential for bilingual employees. Over the past several years, the state has certified over 100 bilingual specialists for use outside of the courtroom. Languages have included Spanish, Mandarin, Polish, Navajo, and Karen.

Ms. Couselo-Findikoglu also presented a demonstration of a module of a self-paced training suite to train judiciary employees on the fundamentals of language access. This module is accessible over the internet and employees can also print everything that has been scripted. Used to train legislators, judges, and interpreters, New Mexico is currently working with other states to develop more modules to train court interpreters. Employees can be tracked and the modules are customizable. Right now the modules are state-neutral.

Orange Court, Tracking Tool: Mr. Sean Lillywhite (Analyst, Operations Support Division, Orange Superior Court) reported that Orange Court developed a tool to help with tracking interpreter and language use. The court was looking to develop this to work with other CMSs to address LAP Goal 1 regarding early identification of language needs. The court can reserve a court date for traffic and give the court user an opportunity to request an interpreter. The CMS identifies the need at the party level. Orange Court is also developing a tracking tool that can be used for court reporters.

Orange Court, My Court Card Portal: The Orange Court has launched an initiative to allow court users to create an account with the court, register for workshops, and also track their cases. This will allow the court user to also select their language of preference. It is also anticipated, as the court innovation grants are awarded, that the court can look at different kiosks as possible options. The court has a kiosk queuing system in civil court and they would like to add on an interpreter/language request capability.

Los Angeles Court, Document Assembly Programs to Provide Language Access: Ms. Janice Shurlow (Senior Attorney, Self-Help Program, Los Angeles Superior Court) shared that family

law is extremely form driven and almost all steps have forms. The Judicial Council has created forms in plain English to make it easier for self-represented litigants to fill out, but it can still be overwhelming for self-help users to fill these forms out. The Family Law Facilitator's Office started about 10 years ago to build document assembly programs. Instead of putting the form on the screen, interview questions are on the screen. Once the court user completes the interview, the program will complete the form. This is much easier for litigants since interviews are designed to be user-friendly. Los Angeles Court has over 53 different interviews that can be used.

In 2013, the Legislature mandated that all family law must have case management. Many self-help users do not serve the other party because they are in another country. The Hague Convention allows each country to set up a central authority and their own requirements in their country. Mexico requires that all documents must be translated into Spanish. This can be extremely difficult and expensive, so the Family Law Facilitator's Office created service of process via the Hague Convention. By working with legal partners and the Judicial Council, the Family Law Facilitator's Office was able to create a program to translate these documents. Now information can be put into a document assembly program and the program translates the information. This creates extensive time, accuracy, and efficiency savings for a litigant.

They are working with the Judicial Council to move beyond initial programs created. The current program still requires a volunteer to help with the assembly process in another language because the interviews are still in English. There is an effort now to get interviews translated so that person can answer the questions as they come through. Current efforts include getting divorce and paternity programs translated into Spanish. There is also interest into expansion of forms for foreign service into Chinese.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Language Access Representative (LAR) from Santa Barbara Court provided public comment on the need for certified Spanish interpreters, Tagalog interpreters, and interpreters in indigenous languages from Oaxaca. She also stated that the compensation for court interpreters is a huge problem and one of the incentives for retention of interpreters is to offer continuing education courses. She offers a workshop on an "Introduction to Court Interpreting" to identify potential candidates for the profession. She plans to establish an internship program for college and high school students interested in court interpreting.

ADJOURNMENT

Justice Cuéllar thanked everyone for participating in today's meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on May 10, 2017.