

NCITLB Board Conference Call

April 28, 2016

NCITLB Board Members Present: Bethany Hamm- Whitfield, Emily Pope, Kevin Earp, Pam Smith, Lauren Pruett, Catherine Johnson

NCITLB Board Members Absent: Donnie Dove, Jeff Trader, Kim Calabretta

Staff Present: Caitlin Schwab and John Green

INTERPRETER # 7303

Called to order at 11:35 AM

Bethany: I want to do an official role call and establish a quorum.

Bethany-Present

Kevin-Present

Catherine- Present

Emily-Present

Pam-Present (*Pam had to leave the call at 11:55 am*)

Lauren-Present

Bethany: We have a quorum.

Bethany read the ethics statement about known conflicts of interest, and no conflicts heard.

Bethany: This meeting is open to the public and this meeting will be to discuss the rule proviso. At this time I would like to open the floor to the Board. Any discussion on the public comments, or the proposed rule?

Catherine: I would like to bring up Pat Hauser's concern and open that up interpreters can ask for unlimited extensions. The LRC can deny extensions, but I want to make sure that we have a limit on the extensions.

Bethany: It is my understanding it is the Board's discretion to allow for extensions, and extensions are not an automatic extension, people have to meet the parameters that we have put on our website. I would not expect RID to have a moratorium in place for a countless number of years. I am assuming there will be a lot of people who are trying to take the exam with RID one the moratorium is lifted.

Pam: My concern is the number of extensions. I think that three is too many. What's been happening is that extensions are too free. It needs to be defined clearly what is needed to get an extension, and what their plan needs to be in the future.

Bethany: I just want to review the purpose of this call is for the rule proviso and to vote on that or not.

Kevin: I believe what people are saying is that, with 3 extensions that is good enough, and the Moratorium is something that was not for seen and I do believe that some weight should be given to the majority at some point, we need to keep in mind people do abuse the system, and I do agree with Pam that their should be some limitations or time frames set up.

Bethany: Any more discussion?

Lauren: It seems that because we are working with strictly the proviso today, the concerns about extensions might need to be brought up at a different time or make sure they are included in the proviso. It was my thought the proviso was due to the moratorium, and since we don't know how long the moratorium would be lasting that I don't know how we can put a time limit on moratorium and extensions.

Bethany: Lauren, you are correct. The rubric Caitlin and I came up with and posted on the Board's website, is so people have a checklist/guideline for what is needed for an extension.

John: I have noticed with the Licensure Review Committee (LRC) that with an extension requests that the LRC does ask for as much detail as possible, and LRC does do follow up to get more information if needed. The rule change is because we don't know how long the moratorium will last and we can not limit based on not knowing how long the moratorium will last. In section 4 of the rule it does say "reasonably prevented", and depending when the moratorium is lifted, people are eligible for an additional extension after the moratorium is lifted in case it is lifted in August, for example, which would not provide time to get certified before the end of September. However, "it shall not be extended thereafter on the basis of a moratorium." That's a limitation.

Bethany: Any more comments?

Catherine: I guess I am not feeling very secure with RID, and the state it is now. We have no way of knowing what the test for RID will look like. Is there anything we can do allow for another test in the rule?

John: 90D-7 reads that RID is the recognized credential body. If you wanted to move from having an RID credential that would be a law change.

Kevin: Regarding the certification from another body is that something we can look into?

Bethany: That is what John as eluding to, we can not do that now, and that would not be something in our rules, that would be a statute change. That can be a long term goal.

John: The statue change is in the purview of the legislature, we (The Board) cannot change the statute.

Bethany: Any more discussion o t he proviso itself?

Catherine: I do have one more question, about the birth or adoption being determined a "life altering event", what determined that to be added to the rule?

John: When I first came on with the Board, I drafted this rule, and that is in there is because it was mentioned to be in there, and the board reviewed it in the December meeting, and I don't know the ultimate source of that going in the rule. If we change anything with this rule proviso, that is material, if we delete it we will have to go back out with another 60 day public comment period, and from a time stand point that would likely need to be required, but if there is a substantial change we would need to go through the public comment process again. You have deadlines coming up, and that is up to the board if you want to do something like that.

Kevin: If we remove that (birth or adoption of a child), would that be done with in a time period or with a vote?

John: The Board would need to vote, and the rule would have to go out for public comment, and after public comment the board would have to meet again to consider whether to adopt the rule or not, and then it would go to The Rules Review Commission (R RC) and given the time frame and deadlines I know it would be hard-pressed to be done, and all before the September deadline. It would have to be a quick succession of things. There are deadlines involved.

Kevin: So in other words, we can't make any changes to the rule proviso today, and it is as is and we accept or reject it?

John: I am not telling you need to adopt it by any means. Time may make it difficult to get another version of this rule through public comment and back to RRC in time for this renewal season.

Catherine: They are saying the moratorium maybe lifted in July which would not affect any of our current licensees. At that point the rule proviso would be a moot point. On the other hand the moratorium may not be lifted. I would love to have something we are 100% sure about, but it might not be necessary in a few months.

Bethany: I think it is a misnomer to s ay the proviso would be moot, and there would be a long list of people who would have to go in and test and get their results. This proviso does not deal with the moratorium we are having now, this will help with the moratorium we will have in the future.

Catherine: You're right about that Bethany, in the future if there are future moratoriums I hope we can strengthen the law so that we can add more ways of credentialing people, and maybe offer some other test for people.

Bethany: Any more discussion? I felt most of the public comments were very positive. I feel confident in this provision and John has done a great job drafting it.

Motion APR 2016-01 (Hamm-Whitfield/Johnson) I move that the Board adopt the proposed revised Rule, Rule 21 NCAC 25.0205, as written. All in favor. Motion Carries.

John: You still have quorum with Pam not being on the call.

Bethany: Any other business to take care of before we adjourn?

John: No, we will work with OAH to get this adoption of the rule out to the RRC in time.

Motion APR 2016-02 (Johnson/Hamm-Whitfield) I move that the meeting be adjourned. All in favor. Motion Carries.

Adjourned at 12:13 PM