

1

North Carolina Interpreters and Transliterators Licensing Board NCRID/NCAD Conference- Charlotte, NC- June 25, 2015

2

3 Board Members Present: Jane Dolan, Bethany Hamm-Whitfield, Lynn Capps Dey, Wayne Giese,
4 Catherine Johnson, Pam Smith, Emily Pope, Ashley Benton

5 Board Member Absent: Jan Withers

6 Staff Present: Jim Wellons and Caitlin Schwab

7 Interpreters: Jeff Trader, Karen Magoon, Connie Jo Lewis, Pam King

8 Visitors: Pat Hauser, Winnie Pace, Deborah Leisey, Amanda Harker, Kellie Stewart, Martha Ingel, Elita
9 Hill, Anita Baker, Sam Witter

10 Jane called the meeting to order at 1: 01 PM

11 Jane: Welcome everyone to Charlotte, and I'd like to thank NCRID for hosting us again. Let me start by
12 reading the conflict of interest statement.

13 *(Jane read the statement and there were no conflicts.)*

14 Jane: Jan sends here regrets she could not be with us today, she had a schedule conflict.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

15

16 Jane: Let's start the meeting with the approval of the minutes. They are quite lengthy, but take a few
17 minutes to see if there are any corrections that need to be made.

18 Bethany: Also attached are the statements that people who were present at the meeting made.

19 Jane: There are 3 attachments to the minutes.

Motion June-2015-01 (Capps-Dey/Hamm-Whitfield) Made a motion to accept the minutes as edited.

20

REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

21

#	Owner	Description	Due date	Status
	Bethany	Follow up with RID with the changes to the website regarding the changes in 90D.	June 25	On going

	Bethany, Jan, Lynn	Will write up the roles of SSP compared to CDI and will submit their work to the board for their feedback.	June 25	On going
	Pam(chair), Catherine, Bethany	Ad hoc committee have the disciplinary actions for website details worked out.	June 25	On the agenda for the meeting, complete
	Bethany and Caitlin	Work on a possible audit system for the 2015 renewal season.	June 25	Complete
	Bethany and Caitlin	Come up with a checklist of what is required to request an extension of a provisional license for 2015 renewal season.	June 25	On going
	Pam (chair) Ashley, Bethany	Ad hoc committee to present at the NCRID conference forum	June 25	Complete
	Pam, Lynnn, Bethany	Ad hoc committee set up for work with DPI and helps go to meetings so they can work toward making the changes.	On going	On going
	Caitlin	Post the Policies and Procedures to the NCITLB Website	ASAP	Complete
	Pam	Send out disciplinary actions committee PowerPoint to Board members for review.	ASAP	Complete

1

2 Bethany: On the renewal packet we added the phrase “all CEUs are subject to review/audit” and we
3 added a column for Professional Studies (PS) and General Studies (GS). When we receive the application
4 we will do random checks on renewals that come in.

FINANCIAL REPORT

5

6 Lynn: May 31st of 2015 total amount for check and savings \$139,530.26
7 Fixed assets \$299.28
8 Total assets: \$139, 829.64
9 Total Liabilities and equity: \$139.829.64
10 Total income related to fees and everything else required: \$82, 665.68
11 Expenditures for all the items(website, SBI, office management): \$1,077.31
12 Membership expenses: \$2,716.
13 Total expenditures: \$56,291.30
14 Net income: \$26, 374. 38

15 Lynn: On the next page it talks about the deposit details. You will see there are different categories
16 listed. You can see an itemized of all the deposits.

1 Jane: We have received what we have received a bill for Jim that is \$4,100 that is an outstanding bill that
2 needs to be paid. We budgeted \$15,000 for legal this year. So if you add the outstanding bill that will
3 make what we spent \$7,400. It is in line with what we budgeted.

LICENSE REVIEW COMMITTEE (LRC) REPORT

4
5 Bethany: Since the last Board meeting the LRC has closed one case pending decision letters being sent
6 out. The committee currently has two open cases, one involving an interpreter interpreting without a
7 license, and one for ethical issues. We have received two requests for extension of a provisional license.
8 We will have an LRC meeting following this meeting.

9 Jane: I would like to thank the LRC for doing what they do, and taking all that time to be part of the
10 committee. Ashley, Bethany, and Catherine have been very dedicated to making sure they do their due
11 diligence and investigate all complaints thoroughly.

12 Bethany: We will have an opening Ashley is rotating off the board.

13 Jane: To the current Board members, be thinking if that is something you would like to do. Members of
14 this committee review complaints, do the interviews, and make decisions on the different cases that
15 come in.

CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT

16
17 Caitlin: Since the last meeting in February I have issued 33 licenses. Since October 1, 2015 I have issued
18 a total of 58 licenses. 36 of those licenses were provisional, and 22 of those licenses were full. There
19 are currently 2 licenses pending. I have spent hours responding to a few requests we have received,
20 helping compile data and sending it to Jim for his review. Also the PO Box has changed. Our old office
21 was in Garner and our new office is in Raleigh. We were driving 20-25 minutes each way a few times a
22 week to check the Garner PO Box. We have a new PO Box in Raleigh about 10 minutes from the Raleigh
23 office, and it is open, and active. We have sent an eblast to the current licensees about the change of
24 address, included a letter in all of the renewals that just went out, and added the new address to all the
25 forms and on the website.

CHMS CONTRACT EXTENSION

26
27 Jane: To give a background our old company was Management Concepts Inc (MCI) it was the old
28 company the Board had contracted with, and we did a Request For Proposal (RFP) for our services and
29 we signed a new contract with MCI. With MCI it was the most consistent and financial choice. We
30 signed another contract with MCI for 3 years then Capitol Hill Management Services (CHMS) bought
31 MCI. We have been very happy with CHMS, and the services that they provide. They are very
32 professional. From Caitlin to Ralph to Jim Thompson they are all very easy to work with. It is time to
33 take an option to extend the contract of one year. Is there any discussion on that? We will have this

1 fiscal year, and we will have another extension we can take for the following fiscal year. The Board will
2 have to start that RFP process in two years to put our contract out for bid again. Any questions on
3 Management services?

4 Jim: Let me provide clarification. You are a state agency you will have to procure services, through a
5 “request for proposal” which is an RFP. An RFP is a contract about what the Board needs, and for what
6 will be provided by our management services. CHMS cannot extend the contract. The Board can decide
7 not to go with CHMS, you have that right as a Board. Any questions? Let me address one other thing.
8 The manner of reimbursement. We have been on a percentage of reimbursement since the
9 Management company was hired. We asked for flat monthly rates in the RFPs. Everyone bid higher on
10 the RFP then we were paying MCI to pay on a contingent basis. I think when the Board wants to issue a
11 new RFP they should decide if they want a flat rate or a percentage fee. The percentage fees are usually
12 a better option.

13 Jane: Any questions for Jim? Any discussion?

14 Catherine: I have one question. Have there been any issues with CHMS at all?

15 Jane: I have not had an issues, but I can say openly that I have not had any trouble at all, and we had
16 issues with MCI. CHMS is nothing but professional and easy to work with and timely, they have been
17 great.

18 Bethany: I would agree, I have worked with Caitlin on minutes and LRC and she is on it, and I think we
19 should exercise out options to renew.

20 Ashley: In combination with my needs, and emailing hand outs so I can view them on my I Pad at the
21 Board meetings, I appreciate their support very much.

22 Motion June-2015-02 (Benton/Johnson) moved that NCILTB extend the CHMS contract by one year.

23 **POSTING DISPLINARY ACTIONS ON THE NCITLB WEBSITE**

24 Pam: I sent out the power point after the last meeting, I have a final recommendation, and Jim has
25 reviewed it. The Ad hoc committee’s final recommendation is:

26 **Based on the DAC's research and current practice in other states that license interpreters, the**
27 **committee would like to recommend that the NCITLB begin posting all final LRC decisions on the**
28 **Board’s website. Furthermore we would also like to recommend that the NCITLB retroactively post all**
29 **LRC decisions issued to and through the current date. Finally, the committee recommends that staff**
30 **be permitted to redact information in decision letters when necessary to protect consumers.**

31

32

1 Jim: Under the public record law everything is public record. So, in the past on occasion we have stated
2 the facts supporting a sanction supported that sanction. It makes no sense to fine an interpreter, and
3 then post that item on the website for everyone to see. I had Pam include a phrase on redacting so we
4 could remain consistent with the laws. I have reviewed every decision the board that has seen through
5 that date. We are ready to post those decisions online. I felt it was important that we redact items that
6 would maintain the confidence of persons involved.

7 Pam: Thank you for your help Jim. I think the other thing was that I could not remember what exactly it
8 was but I saw that many items were redacted.

9 Jim: I drafted many of those letters. I know I made sure to write a decision so that it never discloses the
10 violation.

11 Jane: I guess my thinking is, I still think there is still a lot of confidential information. What about just
12 putting the findings? "This interpreter was fined for violating..."

13 Jim: I believe that the letters as they currently are written could not be made public under your current
14 code of conduct. The public record won't let me go that far. I did just happen to read recently some
15 description of sanctions, and how they write them. They do go into detail and describe the outcome of
16 the offense. They describe the fault in general terms so that it didn't disclose any items from the
17 transaction.

18 Bethany: When we did our research there were ways that other states handled it, and one state had a
19 persons name, a license number, and what the infraction was. Other states had a hyperlink that would
20 send you to the decision letter. For me, being the chair of the LRC, shorter is better. There is so much in
21 that decision letter, and what needs to be redacted, and something else, how long do you want it on the
22 website? Do you want it on there forever, or until the sanction is up?

23 Ashley: I agree with what Bethany is saying, but we have to consider the amount of work, and what will
24 it involve. I am wondering if people are investigating this they could request a copy of the letter if they
25 need more information.

26 Jane: All people have to do is contact Caitlin and request the information. Legally we have to give it to
27 them. I think less is more.

28 Pam: I think it is Kentucky, and it just has the name and about 2 sentences. My thinking is that these
29 items should stay there and it does not go away. I don't know how other professions handle this. I think
30 it needs to be readily available.

31 Jim: These items stay on your record for ever, and it is still relevant today as it was yesterday. The only
32 way to take a sanction off if someone is no longer licensed, or if they pass away. The easiest thing to do
33 is just leave it.

34 Bethany: So based on what Jim said, and our committee, I would be in favor of posting items on the
35 website by protecting the public. I want to be cautious about the formatting of that item.

1 Jane: Are we ready to make a decision on this. I think we need to just fine tune the recommendations.
2 We need to decide how long it will be posted on the website.

3 Ashley: Is this something we need to get the public opinions on this?

4 Jane: We can certainly table it until tomorrow. If the Board decides if we want to see what the public
5 thinks about it.

6 Bethany: Ashley, I think that is good point. I think it would help the Board to have a mock template. The
7 sub committee can continue to work on this, and also get public comment.

8 Pam: I have the links connected to all the states so people can see what the other states look like.

9 Jim: I would discourage you for looking at a template. The format would be this" Jane Doe violated ____
10 by doing _____, she was sanctioned by _____. Its basic law, the person, the standard what they did
11 to violate the standard, and what was done.

12 Bethany: We would wait for all decisions and appeals to expire before we post anything.

13 Lynn: For those who have already been disciplined on the past, will this affect them?

14 Pam: It is past and current. So from the beginning of licensure, and following the format Jim suggested.

CORRESPONDENCE TO THE BOARD AND RESPONSES

15

16 Jane: At the last board meeting we had several people address the Board. We had several requests for
17 information and had response letters. We did response letters, to Martha Ingels, and Elita Hill, and then
18 we had a third request from Donnie Dove, and he requested all complaints and decision letters that was
19 issued from the beginning of licensure. That was a big request, and we had to provide that to him. We
20 posted the first two letters on the website (ML and EH) and then DD's request took a long time to dig
21 through the records getting all the information. Jim had to submit the redactions, and his bosses said he
22 could not redact that much. Caitlin and Jim worked on that for several months. Most of the bill we just
23 received from Jim was most of that time he worked on that request. Any questions?

24 Catherine: Do we have a process for filing these items now?

25 Caitlin: Yes, I created a folder with each complaint and decision letter and all of these items have their
26 own filing cabinet drawer in the office.

27 Bethany: Do you feel you were able to redact enough?

28 Jim: No, there were many things that would be confidential under your code of conduct that I can't
29 redact under the public record law. My opinion is you study your law and see if you can make your
30 complaint process more confidential. Many people asked that there complaint be confidential and we
31 cant do that. When someone says the nature of my sexuality was disclosed, and I redacted that, and I
32 was not going to allow the Board to be liable for that. The public record does not provide for redacting

1 that but the code of conduct does provide for that. There are a number of counseling boards and
2 pastoral boards their licensing law says that their complaints are confidential. I think this board needs to
3 think how they are going to protect the confidences of the people. I think the only way to do that well is
4 to amend the law so that notes, and complaints are confidential. It's hard to get the General Assembly
5 to recognize exceptions in the law. It troubled me that under your code of conduct had to be disclosed,
6 but under the public record law had to be disclosed. I talked to many people about what I could and
7 could not redact, and I was told I could not redact any of it. I was able to get permission to redact some
8 very sensitive information. This time I was able to redact some of the information. This is the first
9 public record request in 10 years of issuing licenses, and I'm sure there will be more. What do you tell
10 consumers about them wanting to protect their rights? I know we have had disagreements about the
11 changes in the law, but I'm sure we have people who support the rights of the Deaf and others in that
12 community.

13 Ashley: I agree with Jim, and I appreciate him bringing it up, and it is unfortunate we had to learn this
14 lesson because of this request. Why did we have to spend \$4000 to fulfill this request?

15 Jane: I asked Jim, and he said we have to provide the information.

16 Jim: It is not permissible to narrow the request. It was a very straight forward request. To see all
17 complaints and all sanctions.

18 Jane: Moving forward what we can do, and get some protection about this. It is not the right time to get
19 something through right now with PED report, but when the PED report process is done, we can see if
20 we can get something through.

21 Catherine: Is there a way to have a plan in motion with this?

22 Jim: you can have a committee that would allow for some combination of language that would allow for
23 the public record law and protect the clients in the process. The first step would be to get 3 people on a
24 committee. Then the 2nd step would be look at other licensing boards and see what they do.

25 Ashley: For the committee we establish, we need to make sure we protect consumers and it's vital that
26 we get a committee to get this process going.

27 Jane: We will have many people cycling off and should we just have a chairman for now, and then get a
28 committee during the next meeting.

29 Emily: As long as I know enough about it. I don't know about chairing it, but I would like to help.

30 Jane: Any one else want to volunteer to be on this committee? Catherine and Pam. Let's get the
31 process started.

32 Catherine: Can new members of the Board that are appointed join when we have them?

33 Jane: Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Jane: PED did their evaluation and had a very quick turn around. They issued the report to every board and they only had 2 weeks to respond. CHMS was instrumental in aiding in this along with the executive committee. Most Boards said the study was flawed and it was not a fair way to view the licensing Boards. We went through the findings, and that will be in the power point tomorrow. They slated us as one of the 12 Boards for further investigation. They interviewed 4 of the larger boards, and assigned the 4 factors. Risk to public harm, infractions in a fiscal year, and number of revocations in one year, and number of other states that have licensure. The Dental Board was then sued and that brought a lot of attention to licensing boards at that time. On May 5th we were invited to go to a best practices seminar. It was put on by some of the larger boards, and they wanted to show the state that all the licensing Boards are working together. Jim, Caitlin, and I attended the seminar. It was an informative day, and it was packed full of information. It was issues that licensing boards need to think about. They might do this every year, and hopefully they will continue to do this. Senator Hartsell (chair of PED committee) came and addressed the Boards and the status on where that process is. He said there will be some sort of oversight commission established, most likely. Some of the bigger boards got together and introduced legislation, but it is not going anywhere. This bill talks about reviewing reports, and address the maximum per diem that boards can receive, and also where these boards are housed. One other bill has been introduced that says the 12 OLAs that were identified says that they need to be looked at further and the 10 to be dissolved to be looked at more. I think they need to look at our board further. Questions?

Catherine: We are confident they will investigate further?

Jane: If you read the report it says these 12 have been recommended for further study, and they will be further evaluated.

Catherine: Do we know that procedure?

Jane: No, we do not.

Pam: One option, after talking to the PED, is that we could be “demoted”.

Jane: When a state looks at a licensing board, licensing is the highest level of protection. They will review if we need to be a licensing board or a registration/certification board. We provide protection to deaf and hard of hearing consumers, and we help provide protection to the boards on the PED they gave “10s” to.

Jim: I think the study was flawed. Looking at the time like complaints just shows how small some boards are and is not a measure of how effective a board is. I think that by looking at something like the number of complaints, and substantiations, is a flaw of whether a board is needed or not. They used fundamentally flawed standards. You do have an argument that what you do as an interpreter is fundamentally useful for consumers.

1 Ashley: It is too bad that spoken language interpreters don't have to be licensed. We could join forces.
2 Jim you always make me think.

3 Lynn: That's something else we need to look at. Community college interpreters and educational
4 interpreters in general. How we can work with that to make sure all interpreters are qualified to
5 interpret. If people don't have qualified interpreters when they are in school then that is something
6 that needs to be considered.

7 Jane: Just for point of comparison, in the PED report it gives the sizes of the Board, Law examiners board
8 has 56, 000 licenses and have 91 full time staff, and spent over \$2 million in a year.

9 Pam: Is there another board that it comparatively our size?

10 Jane: Yes, and they are looked at to be consolidated. Lucky we had enough in the bank to operate off
11 our fees, so we scored high on that. The original board went with \$150 for the fees to renew and that
12 has helped us be a more substantial board.

13 Jim: The surplus you have can be wiped out in a single lawsuit.

14 Jane: I would be happy if we had more of a cushion. It could be wiped out in a lawsuit, but it's expensive
15 with attorney fees to process complaints. We need a reserve like that.

16 *Break at 2:35.*

17 *Reconvened at 2:55 PM*

18 Jane: We were handed two different letters during the break. We don't have time to look at them now,
19 but one is from NCAD and it is in regards to the interpreters on the DHHS website. The letter in the
20 envelope is about the interpreters on the DHHS website on a list that has people that are no longer
21 licensed, and sending letters to individuals who are no longer licensed. That is something we will have
22 to work with DSDHH on. We appreciate these issues being brought to the board. We received another
23 letter about the formation of the coalition about NCITLB transparency.

DPI UPDATE

24

25 Rachel Ragin: Right now we have just finished a pilot program in Cumberland County and we are waiting
26 for that to be evaluated. We set that pilot up to see if the intervention has helped raised the EIPA
27 scores. I am a little concerned with how short that study was. We did have a lead interpreter in that
28 county, and we did have a nice number of people who had a score between 3-4 and we have Anna
29 Witter-Merihew and Kellie Stewart did a lot of work for that she focused a lot on discourse mapping. We
30 are going to wait and see, meanwhile we have tried to develop a scaling up plan, my understanding is
31 we are going ahead with that. With the hope folks will participate. We want more information we do
32 feel it will go before the school board in the next 3-6 months. Anything else you want to know?

33 Bethany: How long was the pilot supposed to last?

1 Rachel: I wanted to do it for the school year. It takes a while to train a mentor and the lead interpreters
2 with different evaluation tools, and me (Rachel) putting my research hat on, but I feel it has some
3 potential issues. We are working hard on that. We are having a summer institute at CPCC on Monday
4 and Tuesday. We are looking at a teacher kind of licensure that would be through DPI for the
5 interpreters. We want them to show that they are qualified and acceptable. We have a lot of
6 interpreters who go through back doors, and they can get a provisional with a 2 year degree. That is a
7 long time for a child, and I am a little concerned about that. Some agencies send them in with no score
8 or a failing score.

9 Bethany: You mean agencies on a sub contractor basis?

10 Rachel: Yes

11 Pam: You mentioned CEUs for interpreters through DPI?

12 Rachel: Yes, we have implemented that. It has to be RID approved, and we are looking that changes. It
13 is for the benefit of the children the interpret for.

14 Pam: Are the standards in place?

15 Rachel: No, it needs to go before the state board and be approved. We are going for a 3.5 first and then
16 give them about 3 years to get a 4. Hopefully we can get these people on board. They will be required
17 to have a 2 year degree. Right now you have to have a degree right now for a level 2. We still have not
18 dealt with the issues with interpreters who are out there now and don't have that education now.
19 Research has shown that interpreters coming out of the interpreting center in Colorado have very low
20 scores in English, literacy, and language. If they are weak in those areas it is going to impact how they
21 interpret. I think for that reason it is a better idea to require some education.

22 Jane: As far as the "back door" in the educational things, can it be part of your policy that they need to
23 have a full license to work in schools?

24 Rachel: I have told agencies not to send unqualified interpreters. They need to be fully licensed.

25 Jane: Once the results of this study is one Sherri said she would like to have someone on the Board in
26 that group.

27 Rachel: Let me know if you are interested.

28 Jane: Thank you Rachel.

FILING A COMPLAINT VIDEO

29

30 Jane: Jan said she is sad she cant be here and here is the rolling out of our video.

31 *Jane read Jan's notes as follows:*

1 The video that is the ASL version of the text on how to file a complaint will not replace the longer
2 educational video we plan to produce later. Even when the educational video is completed, we will still
3 leave this shorter video up on the website. At this time, it is still at the script-development stage.
4 Hopefully, those of us on the committee can resume work on it in July.

5 The educational video will elaborate on the rights of consumers of interpreting services, how they could
6 file a complaint, what they could expect once a complaint is filed and so forth. It will include a mix of
7 vignettes with actors and narration. Good news: Keith Cagle, a former Board member who represented
8 NCAD, has agreed to be the lead narrator.

9 Please know that even though my term expires at the end of this month, I and my staff will continue to
10 work with the Board to complete the educational video. Our work to identify a videographer is on hold at
11 this time due to the fact we are at the end of the fiscal year with numerous close-outs. We will be able to
12 resume all our work sometime in July.

13 (Video was shown)

14 Jane: I should have said before we realize the address does need to be changed.

15 Bethany: Is it 90 days from the interpreting assignment, or from the time of the infraction?

16 Caitlin: Bethany you are correct that the part is that the 90 days from the infraction.

17 Lynn: I'm concerned about some of the finger spelling being in front of her face, and I think it should be
18 in front of a dark background.

19 Bethany: Also in addition to this on the website we do have a fillable complaint form as well.

20 Jane: I'm excited it is up there and it will help with accessibility.

21 Lynn: I know many deaf people don't have the updated technology still have their old computer system,
22 and not be limited to doc.x documents. I just want to make sure they have accessibly to that. I think we
23 need to add an explanation of how to send in the fillable forms to the website.

24 Bethany: With this new fillable form we usually make it more mandatory going forward, it will
25 automatically be followed up with an ASL interview. The LRC Chair is usually the person to follow up
26 with that.

27 Caitlin: We can work on fixing that item so that it can be filled accurately.

28 Jane: I will let Jan know the corrections and get that fixed as quickly as possible.

29 Lynn: Do you have a script of Pat's video.

30 Jane: Yes we do. Since we are talking about websites, I was going through the master list of board
31 motions, and when I was looking at it I saw in 2011 we established a standing website committee. We
32 were totally revamping the website, and that committee did a great job but we disbanded it. According

1 to the motions list is a standing committee. We can establish it at the next meeting with the new
2 members. Make sure the website is up to date and make sure everything is accurate.

3 Jane: Related to accessibility, I received an informational time that a few deaf consumers that the board
4 can print up a business card with instructions about how to file a complaint, and give the basic
5 information about how to file a compliant. Is that something the board is interested in? We could put
6 those in regional resource centers.

7 Bethany: I think this would be great to have the cards at regional centers about how to file a complaint.

8 Lynn: Some business cards are in Braille for the deaf/blind. I think it would be good to do something for
9 them too.

10 Jane: Do we want to have an initial batch of cards printed up? For the next meeting?

11 Lynn: Do we need a motion for that?

Motion June-2015-03 (Capps-Dey/Hamm-Whitfield) A motion was made that the NCITLB authorize business cards be printed and designed for the deaf and the deaf blind and have on hand with how to file a compliant with the board, not to exceed \$250.

12

13 Jane: We can spearhead a committee to see what exactly we want on the card.

14 Lynn: We can have the website information or something really simple like that.

15 Bethany: I can work with Caitlin on that.

16 Pam: Since I'm new to the Board will DSDHH take the initiative to educate the community that this
17 resource is now available.

18 Jane: That is our responsibility, and I don't think they have any town hall meetings right now, and
19 hopefully these business cards will help too.

20 Pam: I hear stories all the time that their seems to be "a hole" that they don't know where to go or
21 what to do.

22 Bethany: I think we presented it at NCAD every year, how to file a complaint, so that consumers can be
23 educated about this process.

24 Jane: We talked about targeting meetings we could go to get the word out. 1 or 2 board members go to
25 these events.

26 Pam: Make sure its other groups other than official groups. We want people to feel comfortable that if
27 they feel there has been an infraction that it is hopeless or they are stuck.

1 Lynn: I was thinking about ASL nights and where interpreters and deaf people get together and do
2 trainings. They have a list of dates when they do that, and maybe 1 person go and do a short
3 presentation.

4 Jane: I think it would be every board members responsibility to figure out some events they can go to
5 and next meeting bring up those events.

6 Catherine: We can send out group emails and let people know.

7 Jane: We will show the how to file a complaint video tomorrow at the forum. This is our jumping off
8 point.

TERM EXPERIATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

9

10 Jane: Jan is our liaison with all of this. Jane, Jan, Ashley, Wayne, Bethany, Lynn all expire at the end of
11 this month. Only Bethany and Lynn are eligible to be reappointed.

12 *Jane read Jan's note as follows:*

13 Members whose terms expire at the end of this month: Jane Dolan, Jan Withers, Ashley Benton, Wayne
14 Geise, Bethany Hamm-Whitfield and Lynnn Dey. Only Bethany and Lynnn are eligible to serve a second
15 term.

16 Lynnn Dey has informed NCAD she will not be able to serve a second term. I spoke with Craig Blevins,
17 president of NCAD, last Friday. He informed me they have a person he will recommend to the Governor
18 for appointment. It is my understanding he was planning to submit a letter to the Governor over the
19 week-end.

20 The Governor's Office has Bethany's application for the NCRID position along with a letter of
21 recommendation from the NCRID president.

22 I spoke with the Office of the Senate President Pro Tempore: they have applications for all the following
23 positions: Cued/Oral Transliterator, HLAA-NC, and NCDBA.

24 A DHHS representative (to replace me) has been identified – the DHHS Secretary will submit her
25 recommendation to the Governor for appointment.

26 The Governor's Office informed me last Friday that they are extremely busy as there are hundreds of
27 positions on various boards and commissions whose terms expire at the end of this month. They hope to
28 finalize the appointments for the NCITLB positions sometime in July.

29 The General Assembly routinely waits until just prior to the end of the legislative session to vote on the
30 "appointments" bill which includes all the appointments for numerous boards and commissions (that is,
31 appointments that the House Speaker and the Senate President Pro Tempore are authorized to make).
32 Given the current state of the budget negotiations, it may be several weeks – even well into August -
33 before we see any movement.

1 So, bottom line: things are moving at this time, but all current members should be prepared to attend the
2 NCITLB meeting August 28 just in case appointments have not been made by then. Remember: we are
3 expected by the appointing authorities to continue to serve until appointments are made to replace us.
4 And all prospective members will need to be informed of the August meeting date as well. I will be
5 happy to communicate that date to all the respective organizations (e.g. HLAA-NC and NCDBA, etc) and
6 individuals.

7 Jane: That is a lot of people transitioning off the board. There will be some transition, and I can see all
8 current board members would be happy to available for guidance to new board members, and that the
9 orientation process to sit down before the meeting and go through the policies and procedures. New
10 members do you have any advice that could help with the process. A lot of it is go to a few meetings
11 and figure it out.

12 Pam: I find it helpful to talk to current members, it is easier to go to a current member and ask
13 questions.

14 Emily: I think having some background on the deaf community and the board would be very helpful.

15 Jane: We will wait to see when the appointments are made and we can get information out there.

16 Lynn: I currently live in Maryland, but I come back on a monthly basis.

17 Jim: The law states that the person on the board is on the board until their replacement is appointed.
18 There is a good chance there will be an appointment before the next meeting, but just so you are aware
19 of the rule.

20 Lynn: I have read the state ethics pact and I will be here (at the next meeting) if I have not been
21 replaced.

22 Ashley: I did take ethics training, and I was thinking about me stepping off, and Im not sure if I need to
23 take the ethics training because I am stepping off, if I need to take that training.

24 Jane: Reach out to Jan she is the ethics liaison.

25 Ashley: Jan told me to do it, but I am stepping off. When is the deadline for that?

26 Jane: it has to do with when you were appointed, and each persons case is different. Its every 2 years.

27 Lynn: I just took my SEC ethics training. They do encourage people to take the trainings even if they are
28 leaving the board. Even though I am leaving this board they still monitor my actions for the next two
29 years.

30 Jane: That is all on our agenda to day. We have the forum tomorrow. From 830-1030 the format with
31 be a presentation in an informational session, and we have a power point. Bethany and I (Jane) will
32 answer the questions that were submitted. The objective of a public forum is to hear what the public
33 want to hear. We were thinking of a 2 minute limit. We can do what we did last year, and go through
34 who we are. Any more questions comments about the forum? Anything else before we adjourn?

1 Adjourned at 4:02 PM.

2

3