

**North Carolina Interpreter and Transliterators Licensing Board
Friday October 27, 2017 Board Meeting – Paragon Bank – Raleigh, NC**

- 1 NCITLB Board Members Present: Bethany Hamm- Whitfield, Pam Smith, Donnie Dove, Kevin Earp, Kim
2 Calabretta, Jeff Trader, Emily Pope, Jaime Staley, Lauren Pruett
- 3 Board Staff Present: Caitlin Schwab-Falzone and John Green
- 4 Interpreters Present: David Payne, Mark Lineberger, Kirk Fowler, Loretta Armstrong (CART services).
- 5 Members of the public present: Laura Aninboukas, Hannah Stocks, Amanda Massey, Treva Haynes, Alyx
6 Sporski, Lee Williamson

Introductions

- 7 A quorum was established with all 9 board members present. The Board members went around and
8 introduced themselves to the members present.
- 9 Conflict of interest statement read, and no conflicts heard.

Approval of Minutes

- 10 Pam: Please take a moment to review the minutes.

Motion OCT 2017-01 (Calabretta/Hamm-Whitfield) I move we accept the August 25, 2017 meeting minutes with suggest edits. Seconded By Bethany. No discussion. All in favor. Motion Carries.

11

LRC Report

- 12 Pam: The LRC has been very busy with the extension requests for the most recent renewal season. We
13 have a form we have come up with to make the process easier, but that does not seem to be helping the
14 way we thought it would. We received 43 extension requests, and sometimes we have more questions
15 than answers based on the information that was provided to us. We must keep asking for more
16 information. We have completed. We have 3 open complaints that the LRC will be discussing after this
17 meeting.
- 18 Kevin: I have learned a lot while being on the LRC, it has been very eye opening and it makes me
19 appreciate what we do.
- 20 Jaime: How are we investigating complaints?
- 21 *Bethany explained how the LRC does their complaint investigation.*
- 22 Jaime: Suggested a different option for doing interviews. For hearing Board members to deaf
23 consumers.
- 24 *Kevin gave more background to what Jaime was referencing.*

1 Bethany: This is a good discussion. Maybe Pam and Jaime can get together and talk about this issue and
2 see what the options for a solution are?

3 Jeff: If we have a deaf blind person, do we have any accommodations for those persons?

4 Bethany: In the past when we have had deaf blind people we have hired Communications Facilitator (CF)
5 or tactile interpreters for these interviews.

6 Bethany: Did you say 43 extension requests?

7 Pam: We have received 43, some are still open, but we are requesting more information. The template
8 is helping, but we still get requests that are one sentence long, and we must keep asking for more
9 information. We do get some beautiful forms that have all the necessary information and show they
10 have been working toward full licensure.

11 John: The LRC has been working hours on reviewing these requests, and they are working very hard for
12 this Board.

CDI Test Moratorium

13 Bethany: Pam King who works for DSDHH has some concerns about the CDI exam. RID is currently
14 revamping the exam, and people who have been prepping for the exam cannot take it. According to
15 Melvin Walker the new CDI test will be made available in 2019. The answers to her concerns would be
16 addressed by the extension request rule, and if there is a moratorium on the CDI test, then those people
17 could be granted extension requests. Pam King submitted an additional question about possibly having
18 another recognized credential such as the BEI, and that would require a statute change.

19 Pam: Can we change our statute?

20 Caitlin: The Legislature must make changes to statutes.

21 Bethany: I hope that the CDI test gets up and running sooner than later. I did want to recognize the
22 concern we have heard from Pam King.

Financial Report

23 Emily: We are up a little over \$2,500 from where we were in 2016. We are up over \$10,000 from our
24 position a year ago. We are up about \$2,500 with our equity. In income section, total income is up
25 about \$13,000 from budget for total income. The legal services is money we use to pay John, office
26 supplies is licensure cards, total expenses on top of page 3, are down nearly \$3,500 from the budget.
27 We are in a good financial situation.

Request for Proposal (RFP) Selection

28 John: Caitlin does not need to leave the room for this. Last time we had a closed session, and she had to
29 leave the room. We get one bid and it was from CHMS. This bid is for the Board's administrative
30 services. We must get this RFP approved through Office of State Budget Management (OSBM), once it is
31 approved, we can have a formal conversation with Capitol Hill Management Services (CHMS). The
32 committee tasked to review the RFPs has met and have a recommendation for the Board. I would send

1 the RFP to state purchasing and contract and submit a letter that the RFP has been reviewed and go into
2 those details.

3 Bethany: We did successfully get that RFP out and we did only get one bid from CHMS, we have been
4 very satisfied with the work that CHMS has done. We have been very happy with the work they
5 provided, and with the contract stipulations we felt we could give the RFP the full support. Any
6 questions or concerns from the Board?

7 Lauren: I have always had a great experience working with Caitlin and she is always very quick to get me
8 the information I need.

9 John: Caitlin had no prior knowledge of how many bids that were received, and I wanted to thank her
10 for that integrity through out the RFP process.

Motion Oct 2017-02 (Dove/Hamm-Whitfield) I move that: 1) the Board submit the required documentation and request approval of the offer from Capitol Hill to the North Carolina Division of Purchase and Contract; 2) if approved by Purchase and Contract, that our Board Chair Bethany Hamm-Whitfield be authorized to sign any documents to make Capitol Hill's offer a contract with the Board; and 3) the Board authorize legal counsel to work with the State purchase and Contract regarding any other necessary related steps and otherwise provide assistance as needed to complete this process. Seconded by Bethany. No Discussion. All in Favor. Motion Carries.

11

Public Forum 2018

12 Bethany: At the last Board meeting, we discussed if we wanted to go back to the NCRID conference this
13 year. If we went it would be the same time frame, and I think we have that date scheduled, and do a
14 cost benefit analysis.

15 Caitlin: To travel to that conference and present the Board spent close to \$6,000 in 2017.

16 Bethany: In years past the forum has been more informative but it has turned into a more contentious
17 forum. I feel that last forum got out of control, and I felt very bad for everyone on that stage, and I did
18 not feel that it was productive for our time and expense. Now, I do not feel that that is how it has
19 panned out to be.

20 Donnie: Bethany I don't think you should feel a sense of ownership for that forum. The interpreters
21 moved their boundaries. You should not feel ownership of that.

22 Pam: I still like my idea of moving the forum around the state. Maybe we move from East to West, and
23 the deaf community have access to the forum. I do not feel the forum needs to be at NCRID, and I do
24 not think Bethany needs to take ownership of the way the forum ended up last year. Maybe it can be a
25 small workshop?

26 Bethany: We are required to have one public forum a year, and it does not specify where or when, but
27 we do have to have at least one public forum a year. We used to have the public forum in Raleigh,
28 before we were involved with the NCRID conference. Do we want to go back to NCRID, or do we want
29 to have it here in Raleigh?

1 Kevin: You brought up some good points, I do not think this should be decided today, and I think this is
2 something we need to think over before we make this decision. They do need to hear from us, and we
3 do need to be visible. Most of the time the things they are bringing up could be simply cleared up, it
4 would be nice to leave and not feel attacked. I do see the benefit of going to the NCRID conference.

5 Bethany: We do need to decide today if we will go to the NCRID event in 2018 or not, but very valid
6 comments Kevin. If we do go we will have a committee to decide what we will do at the forum if we do
7 go.

8 Pam: I don't feel we have an obligation to have a forum with NCRID, it's time for a change, and we need
9 to be in a different place, if we do go back we need to have specific guidelines. We need a more neutral
10 place to have the forum.

11 Jaime: When I went to NCRID I was not a Board member, and I had no idea about the people on the
12 board. I had an increased respect for the Board, but this is a big deal, and a licensing board is not visible
13 enough, and we need to become more visible, and that will enhance our visibility and earn respect.

14 Treva (Member of the General Public): I can recall 2 NCRID conferences where the Board has been
15 there, and personally I like the idea of the Board being there. I think the idea of taking the questions
16 and answers and posting them on the website is a good idea. There were two sessions that talked about
17 horizontal and vertical violence towards interpreters. I think the sessions about the violence were very
18 informative. The profession is extreme and it is a systemic change that seems to be rising from
19 Interpreter training programs are discussing the issue, but it's more of being able to negotiate and
20 express opinions, it is a level of respect, and the Board did take the brunt of that discussion. Maybe you
21 could travel to other places and present there too.

22 Bethany: I think in public forums we do need to have time to elicit responses and feedback.

23 John: It is a general term and it can look like a variety of different things, the Board must have a forum
24 once a year, and it can be to receive, questions, comments, and criticisms. It can be an "open mic".
25 Raleigh is the capital, and that does not hold the Board to having a forum in Raleigh.

26 Bethany: NCRID will be back in Charlotte this year, and NCRID might favor Charlotte going forward, and
27 they also might have the conference every two years. I do want to focus on it being in Raleigh or at
28 NCRID. We must moderate the distinction that we are not a membership based organization, and we
29 have been asked to come present, those things are important, we are an Occupational licensing Agency,
30 and we cannot lose focus of that. We are ore that happy to supply one or two board members to go to
31 these events, and we do have to be good stewards with our time and money. We must work with in our
32 scope as an Occupational Licensing Board (OLB).

33 Kim: We have received the information from different groups and it may be important to go to those
34 events.

**Motion Oct 2017-03 (Smith/Trader) I move the NCITLB 2018 Public Forum not be in conjunction with
the NCRID conference in 2018. Seconded by Jeff. No discussion. All in favor. Motion carries.**

35 Bethany: Do we have an idea of where we could have the forum in 2018?

36 **Break 11:48 am**

1 **Reconvened 12:05 pm**

2 Bethany: I had a few thoughts, I like the idea of including other populations, my idea was to go ahead
3 and have it in Raleigh in 2018, and then have a subcommittee to help decided where we have it every
4 day next year. We would need a dedicated subcommittee and look at venues and costs every year after
5 that.

6 Kevin: Public forum needs to be in a public place.

7 Bethany: I have 2 thoughts, we either go to Charlotte because NCRID already invited us to go, and
8 partner with them for one more year, and then consider training to a more public place. If we want a
9 more public place we need to have a more dedicated people or committee on the Board to plan the
10 forum.

11 Kevin: Well we already voted not to go to NCRID.

12 Bethany: I support the idea of going out in the meeting, and as an OLB we are not a member driven
13 organization we must balance this out.

14 Kevin: Do other OLBs go to other organizations?

15 John: You must be careful. You can go to other places other than Raleigh. Beyond that, there are not a
16 lot of strict rules about where you have it you just have to have it.

17 Pam: I like Kevin's idea about holding it at the school for the deaf in Wilson. I am sure we can get a
18 room for free.

19 Kevin: If not in Wilson then maybe Morganton. One or the other.

20 Kim: What about something more centralized like Greensboro?

21 Bethany: I like Greensboro as a central location. Any motions?

22 Lauren: I like the idea of a community college, and it maybe a way to get into some of the interpreter
23 training programs for people, and they need to know what we are doing, maybe UNCG or CPCC.

24 Bethany: I would feel comfortable setting up a subcommittee to decided what we are going to do, and
25 keep it with the June Board meeting. I am comfortable setting that meeting with our June Board
26 meeting. I propose we move the June Board meeting to a different date so we can have the day already
27 set aside. The June Board meeting is now June 8, and the public forum will also take place on that date.

28 **Lunch Break 12:27.**

29 **Reconvened 1:09 pm**

Legal Update

30 John: Joint Legislative Administrative Procedural Oversight Committee (JLAPOC) meeting, some people
31 in the Legislature do not like licensure Boards, and want to get rid of them all. They did a presentation
32 at the last meeting, and they say boards hamper economic growth. It did not sound like they had any

1 plans to do away with OLBs yet, but I will keep this Board informed. We must hope the legislature does
2 not shut us down.

Rules Readoption Process

3 John: We went through the public hearing for the rule this morning. At the February meeting we will
4 have to decide to readopt the rule or not. We have until next fall to decide on these rules. That rule is
5 still out for public comment (renewal of a provisional license). The other rule we had public comment on
6 was the CEU rule, and most of the comments was getting more CEUs online. The Board made the
7 determination there is a real benefit to a face to face interpreting for CEUs. Jeff brought up the point
8 about CEUs being eligible to roll over. The proposed CEU rule has been proposed to roll over CEUs to
9 the next licensure year. The Board asked me to come up with a draft of the rule to allow for the excess
10 CEUs to roll over. This is the proposed rule. This is just a suggestion, just to get the conversation
11 started. We can amend this rule and try to get it approved by the Rules Review Commission (RRC). This
12 is up to the Board.

13 Jeff: I just want to say this is great and I want to thank you John and Lauren for all the work.

Motion Oct 2017-04 (Earp/Trader) I move the Board adopt the proposed revised rule, Rule 21 NCAC 25 .0501. Seconded by Jeff. No discussion. All in favor. Motion Carries.

14

Motion Oct 2017-05 (Earp/Trader) I Move the Board to authorize staff and legal counsel to submit the proposed rule, Rule 21 NCAC 25 .0501, to the Office of Administrative Hearings for publication in the NC Register, publish it on the Board’s website, and otherwise act as needed to accomplish the steps required until the matter returns to the Board for review of the public comments by the Board. Seconded by Jeff. No Discussion. All in Favor. Motion Carries.

15

Motion Oct 2017-06 (Earp/Smith) I move the Board to hold a public hearing on the proposed revised rule, rule 21 NCAC 25 . 0501, during its next quarterly meeting, which is expected to be in February of 2018, and that staff be provided flexibility in case of rescheduling of that meeting for inclement weather or other reason. Seconded by Pam. No Discussion. All in Favor. Motion Carries.

16

17 Bethany: Thank you for all that hard work John.

Alternative Complaint Resources

18 Caitlin: Due to the busy renewal season I was unable to adequately research options for being able to
19 upload a video to the Board’s website. I would like to ask the Board that I be allowed to gather more
20 information and present this information at the February 2018 meeting.

21 Bethany: Yes, that would be fine.

Central Office Report

1
2 **NCITLB Central Office Report** (as of October 26, 2017 at 9:00 AM)

3 **Current Number of Licensees: 533**

4 Grandfathered: 51 (9%)

5 Full: 329 (62%)

6 Provisional: 153 (29%)

7 **Licenses issues since last Board meeting (August 25, 2017): 20**

8 **Full : 3**

9 *Qualified for licensure by:*

10 RID Certification: 3 of 3 (100%)

11 **Provisional: 17**

12 *Qualified for licensure by:*

13 EIPA score of 3 or higher: 4 of 17 (24%)

14 2 year degree: 11 of 17 (65%)

15 Accumulated Hours: 1 of 17 (5.5%)

16 Recognized Credential from another State: 1 of 17 (5.5%)

17 **Licenses Pending Issue: 7**

18 All 7 are provisional

19 -Renewal season was very busy.

20 Of the 557 total licensees in 2016-2017, 40 licensees did not renew their license:

21 3 Grandfathered

22 17 Full

23 20 Provisional

24 There were a total of 43 discretionary extension requests received.

25 -Records retention standards for the state are changing, I am working with a representative of
26 state archives on any changed that need to be made to the current retention schedule.

27

Review of Action Items				
#	Owner	Description	Due date	Status
1	Pam(chair), Bethany & John	Ad hoc committee have the template for the disciplinary actions and how it will be posted on the website	October 27, 2017	
2	Donnie and Jeff w/John	Ad hoc committee to work with John about how to receive alternative complaint resources, and also process for having the complaint transcribed. <i>Caitlin to</i>	October 27, 2017	

		<i>report back to the Board at the October meeting.</i>		
3	Bethany, Kevin, and Emily	Ac hoc evaluation committee, to evaluation RFP responses for a Board Administrator.	October 27, 2017	
4	John Green	Research insurance for the Board and present findings and quotes at the October meeting.	October 27, 2017	
5	Bethany and Donnie	Bethany and Donnie sub committee to have open communication with DSDHH for community outreach.	On Going	
6	Bethany & Caitlin	Update the Website as needed	On Going	
7	Kim	Compile a list of meetings and events for Board members to attend.	On Going	
8	Bethany, Jeff, and Donnie	Will write up the roles of SSP compared to Interpreter and will submit their work to the board for their feedback.	On Going	
9	Bethany, Kevin, Jeff	Ad Hoc committee that will research what changes are needed to the licensure law, and what changes can be made to protect the complaint process.	On Going	
10	Pam & 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	

1

2 Action Item #1: Before we continue with the discussion, the Board needs to decide if we should post
3 these things on the website.

4 John: There have been some legal reasons that we want to determine what we need to post. Some
5 other Board's post suspended licenses on their website, does this Board want to "publicly shame"
6 someone on their website if they fine someone or substantiate a case? We have to consider the
7 legislature, if we are imposing minor penalties for something, we have anti trust concerns about posting
8 a penalty on the website, especially if you compete with that person in you area. It is a complicated
9 situation. The Board is safest on is if someone is practicing with out a license that is fair warning to the
10 public. This is something the board has been wrestling with for some time now.

11 Bethany: I agree it should post about not licensed activity and license that have been revoked.

12 Jaime: RID has a publication where they post the infraction in the newsletter. It is a brief statement, and
13 it is the national publication.

14 Bethany: RID is a membership driven organization, we are an occupational licensing agency. I do see
15 you point and I feel that become subjective.

16 Pam: Can we consider a searchable option for current licensees?

17 Donnie: Deaf people do not understand that people can ask for the information, it is a public record.

1 Kevin: We have had this discussion many times. If a person has violated something that will show up on
2 the RID website. I understand the other side of things.

3 Bethany: The subcommittee needs to decide what needs to be posted. Do we want to do what John
4 said, if someone has practiced without a license, etc, or do we decide not to post anything and this
5 committee goes away.

6 Lauren: I think we should start with licenses that have been revoked or something like that, and then
7 have further discussions on other pieces. The clear path is for licenses that we have acted on.

8 Bethany: Pam, John, and I can come up with a basic template of what that could look like on the
9 website. We will bring it back in February for a vote.

10 John: We must remember we are an OLA, and we are in place to protect the public of North Carolina.

11 Action Item #2: tables until February 2018.

12 Action item #3: Complete the process and come back with the final word in February.

13 Action Item #4: John is still looking for insurance companies to get more information. John is still
14 looking into the insurance options, and see what the Board's options are. John would like some help
15 with on the applications from the insurance group to get more information. Caitlin and Bethany will
16 help John with the application.

17 Action Item #5: on going.

18 Action Item #6: on going.

19 Jaime: Is it possible to categorize the licensee list?

20 Caitlin: We do not track the different RID credentials

21 Pam: You have a right as a consumer to see that person's credentials, and ask about their experience.
22 Maybe we can have DSDHH work with AOC to make sure they know who is qualified for court room
23 interpreting.

24 John: We must remember we are an OLA we do have to keep the health safety and welfare of the public
25 of North Carolina safe.

26 **Break 2:25 PM**

27 **Reconvened at 2:41 pm**

28 Action Item #7: On going.

29 Action Item #8: On going.

30 The Board discussed the differences between the services an SSP provides and what an interpreter does.

31 Action Item #9: On going. (Add Jaime to the committee and remove Bethany). Change this action item
32 to looking further into requirements for provisional licensees.

33 Action Item #10: On going.

**Motion Oct 2017-07 (Pope/Smith) I move we adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Pam. No Discussion.
All in favor. Motion carries.**

1

2 ***Adjourned 3:09 pm.***