

**North Carolina Interpreter and Transliterater Licensing Board
June 22, 2017 Board Meeting – NCRID Conference – Winston Salem , NC**

1
2 Board Members Present: Kevin Earp, Donnie Dove Jr, Pam Smith, Bethany Hamm-Whitfield, Emily Pope,
3 Kim Calabretta, Lauren Pruett, Catherine Johnson

4 Board Members absent: Jeff Trader

5 Board Staff Present: Caitlin Schwab-Falzone and John Green

6 Interpreters: Mark Lineberger, Emily Jones, and Monica McGee

7 Public Members present: Karen Whittingham, Decie Shumate, Deborah Leisey, A.J. Sandossi, Jessica
8 Urcuiolio, Jennifer Bacon Farraro, Lawrence Schokey, Martha Ingel, Rachel Skipper, Pam King, Anita
9 Baker, Lee Williamson, Cherie Snow, Maddie Driggers, Matt Baccari, Paige Sprinkle, Kelli Owens, Antwan
10 Campbell, Leah Noe, Kimberly Falls

11 Called to order at 10:11 am

12 A quorum was established we have 7 of 9 Board members. (after Kevin’s arrival we have 8 members
13 present and still have a quorum).

14 *Conflict of interest statement read, no conflicts heard.*

Welcome and Introductions

15
16 The Board Members went around the table and did introductions.

Approval of Minutes

17
18 Pam: If the board could please review the minutes from February 24, 2017 and see if there is anything
19 that needs to be corrected.

20 *Kevin arrived at 10:17 am*

Motion June 2017-01 (Johnson/Pope) I move we approve the minutes from February 24, 2017 as written. Seconded by Emily. No discussion. All in favor. Motion Carries.

21
22 Pam: Please review the April 20, 2017 minutes.

Motion June 2017-02 (Pruett/Earp) I move we approve the minutes from April 20, 2017 with edits. Seconded by Kevin. No Discussion. All in Favor. Motion Carries.

23
24

New Point of Contact at DPI

25
26 Pam, introduced Antwan Campbell.

1 Antwan: (New interpreter specialist for DPI). The first thing we did was start an educational interpreter
2 cohort, and began to mentor, coach and practice with them (educational interpreters), and see about
3 upping the EIPA possibly to 3.5 or a 4.0 (currently 3.0 minimum). This will be a long process, but we are
4 gathering information. Trying to develop standard practices and procedures for educational
5 interpreters. Also, we wanted to see about getting people licensed if they are educational interpreters.
6 We would like to work with the Board on this.

7 Donnie: I think the EIPA increase needs to happen now.

8 Pam: I think that this looks very optimistic moving forward and working with DPI.

9 Antwan: We are looking at changing things and making improvements.

10 Catherine: Who is on the taskforce?

11 Antwan: We have an installation team, we 20 members that represent different areas.

12 Bethany: This would require a substantive change to the statute?

13 John: Yes.

14 Kevin: I think DPI is on the right track, we need good interpreters for educational interpreters. I do
15 believe this indicated an (positive) attitude change. I have a question, what will happen to
16 communication facilitators?

17 Antwan: We are working on making that role a “spoken language facilitator”, and educating LEAs on the
18 difference.

19 Kevin: You mentioned DSDHH is helping DPI, can you go into more detail about this?

20 Antwan: Right now the division is represented on the taskforce, and right now specifically DSDHH is
21 administering the EIPA exam, and they will provide the ISS coaching, and will provide the coaching
22 across the state.

23 Emily: I think it very important to make sure that people like me who do the hiring for educational
24 interpreters are well versed in who can be hired to fit the needs of the students, and accommodate
25 those needs.

26 Bethany: Does DPI still offer the EIPA for interpreters to take?

27 Antwan: Yes, and we have partnered with DSDHH who administers the test.

28 Bethany: What would be your guess of educational interpreters who are RID certified?

29 Antwan: 10-12% are RID certified.

30 Bethany: Do you know how many have achieved 4.0 on the EIPA?

31 Antwan: I think it is about 165 who have a 4.0 or better.

32 Bethany: RID is no longer recognizing the 4.0 on the EIPA for certification. I would suggest that Pam and
33 I work with Antwan and stay involved in this process.

1 Atwan: We(DPI) are excited to work with the Board to see about getting educational interpreters
2 included in the licensure statute. We would go through a problem solving process to see about getting
3 licensure in place, and this is not a one man decision, and also with the coaching process it will be
4 consistent so that everyone have the same training.

5 Bethany: Let’s keep this action item open and continue to communicate. Antwan thank you for coming
6 and giving us the DPI update.

7 Antwan: We want the best outcome for our deaf and hard of hearing population and students. To make
8 sure we have the system in place to support the interpreters, and make the best decision possible. We
9 are going to work towards increasing the EIPA score standard just not sure what the score will be at this
10 time, until we have looked at all the information, and make the best decision.

DSDHH Mentoring and Training Program

11

12 Bethany: I would like to have Lee Williamson walk us through this request.

13 Lee: I submitted an email and letter to the Board and requested the Board review something our
14 division (DSDHH) established back in 2013. What we are looking for is looking for a way of getting our
15 deaf services specialists licensed. Since our Deaf services specialists are “on the clock” they could work
16 with the mentoring services specialists. There would be fully licensed interpreters mentoring people in
17 this program. We do not want to limit this to the Deaf persons on staff. We (DSDHH) would provide the
18 classroom training, and limit the settings people could work in; our ultimate goal is to have a language
19 model. There are many opportunities for Deaf interpreters to have an opportunity for employment. If
20 you need more details I can answer anything the best we can.

21 *Pam King from DSDHH also helped present information to the Board.*

22 Pam King: Our mentoring program is getting bigger, but our goal is to meet number 5 on the provisional
23 licensure requirements (5. A deaf interpreter who completes 16 hours of training in interpreting
24 coursework or workshops ,including role and function or ethics, and 20 hours in the 12 months
25 immediately preceding the date of application in the provision of interpreting services.). We are getting
26 people that we know are going to be good interpreters.

27 Bethany: What is the training you are providing?

28 Pam King: RID requires a bank of training for you to be able to sit for written test. There needs to be 8
29 hours of the CPC, and 8 hours on the role and function interpreting 101. We have offered some other
30 training for our staff in April, and we are encouraging people to not just get their provisional license, but
31 get fully licensed.

32 Bethany: Since the initial licensure with this mentor program (2013) has anyone received their CDI?

33 Pam King: The biggest barrier is that CDIs don’t get hired that often, but now we are going to use CDIs as
34 language mentors, we are hoping that changes how many CDIs there are, and will improve the number
35 of people earning their CDI. Wake Tech is using a provisionally licensed DI in their ADE classes. If we can
36 get more work for DIs we will get more people licensed.

1 John: My task is to keep them on the legal straight and narrow. Your February of 2013 letter was
2 approved by the Board. Does what you are asking for then differ from what you are asking for now?

3 Lee: The only thing would be the people who are providing the program.

4 Pam King: Basically it is the same thing.

5 John: It is simply a new crop of candidates, and just a new crop of teachers.

6 Pam King and Lee: Yes

7 Kevin: I think this is a great idea and I am glad to see it is happening.

8 Pam King: We are asking the Board's permission to do this training, and make sure it will work for
9 anyone who wants to be a DI or a language mentor. We need lots of language mentors.

10 Bethany: John, because it was a process approved in 2013 do we need a new motion to approve?

11 John: Yes, a new motion is needed. (Asking Lee and Pam King) Intern, you mentioned interns, have they
12 been trained?

13 Pam: Yes, we have had a training in April, and we do have others trainings that will be scheduled. Calling
14 someone an "intern" would be to get them into the intern route, if this training was not approved.

15 Donnie: I have 2 questions. Would that mean that DSSs would be expected to be RID certified as part of
16 the process?

17 Pam: No, it is not required of all staff, it is not appropriate for all staff.

18 Donnie: I'm a CDI and you are right the challenge is finding work. Can the interpreters work outside of
19 DSDHH?

20 Pam King: Yes, he would be able work outside of DSDHH, they are licensed.

**Motion June-03 (Johnson/Smith) I move the Board approve the DSDHH mentoring program.
Seconded by Pam. No discussion. All in favor. Motion carries.**

21
22 John: I do want to add that we cannot change or alter any requirements for licensure in any way.

LRC Report

23
24 Catherine: Since our last Board meeting we have one new case that we are working on, and one that
25 was unsubstantiated and closed. I am not seeking reappointment so there will be an opening on the
26 LRC.

27 *Break at 11:12 am*

28 *Reconvened at 11:32 am*

Financial Report

29

1 Emily: Just as a reminder we are a little bit higher for assets than we were at this time this year. We are
2 up over \$17,000 over last year. No expenses out of the ordinary. Our expenses are slightly lower than
3 what is expected. Nothing stands out to me, and total expenses are down \$20,000 from what is
4 budgeted. Any questions?

2016 Audit Report

5
6 Emily: The report is lengthy, this is an independent audit done of the Board. This is an analysis of our
7 financials. It is noted that there are no significant events coming up that should change the Board's
8 position. Everything was very positive. This has a lot of information please let me know if anyone has
9 any questions.

Sole Source Contract Update/Request for Proposals (RFP) Procedure

10
11 John: The sole source contract was denied. We (The Board) will need to put out a request for bids for a
12 management bid, and I am working with getting help with the RFP, and have that prepared for the
13 August Board meeting. At that point when the Board will discuss the RFP, we may go into closed
14 sessions, and have Caitlin leave the room. Drafting an RFP is confidential. Once it is put out it becomes
15 public. We also need to put out an RFP for the auditor, and I will have that ready for the August meeting
16 also. RFPs are pretty straight forward, and we are not doing anything out of the ordinary.

17 Bethany: How long do people have to respond to the RFP?

18 John: The minimum is 30 days; we will want to publicize it as well. We will want to get to word out
19 about the RFP.

20 Kevin: Who will be reviewing the contract and determining a winner?

21 John: We will have a deadline to submit the proposals, and we will go from there. It depends on how we
22 do the bid, and we (The Board) have to look at everything they are offering and make a determination
23 from there. Our goal is have this completed in November.

Periodic Rules Review

24
25 John: We were the first Board to ask them (Rules Review Commission/RRC) to consider our rules early,
26 and they did. We have done everything we needed to do, and once we received the information
27 notifying this Board of the need to review our rules, we started the process. We received public
28 comment, and we answered every single public comment. All of our rules have been approved and sent
29 to the legislature. The legislature has 60 days to approve the report. If the committee (Joint Legislative
30 Procedural Oversight Committee/APO) wants to do anything we will have to respond, but if they do
31 nothing we must readopt one rule. We must readopt the CEU rule, and this process for readoption will
32 start in August. The 60 days expire on the 61 day which is July 22. The Board has done a great job going
33 through this process.

34 Bethany: John can you give a brief legislative update?

35 John: It is quiet right now, right now the Legislature is concerned with the budget. We have not heard
36 anything about sun setting. If something is introduced it would be a surprise to me. Something can

1 always be added as an amendment, as long as they are in session I cannot speak about what they will or
2 will not do.

3 Bethany: No bills about oversight?

4 John: There were some bills early on in session, but nothing has been passed. If we do get any bills I will
5 do like I have before, and forward any information to the entire Board.

OLA (Occupational Licensing Agencies) Best Practice Seminar

6
7 Pam: I attended the Best Practice Seminar back in April. There were several different topics that were
8 discussed and presented. One topic was boards and how they handle hearings. It talked about antitrust
9 issues, and the last part was the most interesting was meeting other Boards and seeing what other
10 Boards are doing.

11 Bethany: I wanted to thank Pam for going.

Infractions Posted on the Website

12
13 Bethany: We have discussed having infractions posted on the website. The infractions would involve a
14 template. The template would be the licensee's name, the type of infraction, and the date the
15 infraction starts and then ends (if applicable). I really want to get this all decided today, and determine
16 what exactly we want to put on the website. Who thinks we should just post serious infractions of a
17 revocation and a suspension? (Many Board members raised their hands).

18 Donnie: What is RIDs process, do they post everything?

19 Bethany: They do post everything.

20 Pam: I'm inclined to post everything. Like RID they do post everything.

21 Bethany: In your opinion (to Pam), would that list on the Board's website be updated or stay the same?

22 Donnie: Take it off the website once the time has expired and it moves to archives.

23 Bethany: We are an occupational licensing agency, we have the authority to investigate those claims, we
24 can reprimand someone, fine the person, revoke licenses, etc. RIDs process is very different from our
25 process.

26 Donnie: I think transparency is important.

27 Catherine: I think we need to determine exactly what infractions need to be posted, and what we are
28 labeling as a serious infraction.

29 Kim: I'm trying to remember when we were discussing how the process works, if it's a complaint or a
30 minor infraction do those go right up on the website?

31 Bethany: There is a caveat for us to protect the public, and people can look at the website and see if
32 someone's license is revoked or suspended.

1 Donnie: If I'm remembering the severity of the issue is not the issue, it is public information, what right
2 do we have to prevent the deaf community from seeing these infractions?

3 John: We would put information that is factually accurate. If I am going to give attorney client privileged
4 advice we need to go into closed session.

5 Donnie: So if you are posting a substantiated case against Mark (interpreter) for example, someone can
6 request that information, and get that information. Anything that is posted becomes public
7 information?

8 John: Yes, someone could write in and ask for that information. The issue is what the board is going to
9 put on the website. Is it going to be simple or is it going to more detailed.

10 Donnie: Whatever you post the point is the name would show up, and it is a public record.

11 John: What is the purpose? Is it because this person is not licensed so people know who is not licensed?

12 Donnie: My main point is access to the information, we need to protect the Deaf community.
13 Complaints are public record and anyone can ask for this information and see the deaf consumer who
14 complained.

15 Bethany: I was thinking this would be more of a template of what was to be posted, and I want to John
16 off line and determine what we can and cannot do. This is a process, and let's table this until the August
17 Board meeting. When this first came up we were trying to find best practices and see what other states
18 have been doing.

19 Kevin: Make sure we have something in place to protect the Deaf community.

Central Office Report

20

21 **Current Number of Licensees: 548**

22 Grandfathered: 54 (10%)

23 Full: 339 (62%)

24 Provisional: 155 (28%)

25 **Licenses issues since last Board meeting (February 24, 2017): 13**

26 **Full : 4**

27 *Qualified for licensure by:*

28 RID Certification: 4 of 4 (100%)

29 **Provisional: 9**

30 *Qualified for licensure by:*

31 EIPA score of 3 or higher: 1 of 9 (11%)

32 2 year degree: 7 of 9 (78%)

33 Accumulated Hours: 1 of 9 (11%)

34 **Licenses Pending Issue: 6**

35 2 full and 4 provisional

- 1 -Renewal packets will be going out the week of June 26-30.
- 2
- 3 Catherine: Can we add something in the database to denote which school people are coming from?
- 4 Caitlin: Yes, I can start keeping track of that going forward.

Review of Action Items

5

#	Owner	Description	Due date	Status
1	Catherine, Pam, and Donnie	Develop a matrix for licenses that we can combine with the Rules Review Commission additions.	June 22, 2017	
2	Bethany and Donnie	Bethany and Donnie sub committee to see how NCITLB can partner with DSDHH for community outreach.	On Going	
3	Pam(chair), Catherine, Bethany	Ad hoc committee have the template for the disciplinary actions and how it will be posted on the website	June 22, 2017	
4	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.	June 22, 2017	
5	Caitlin & Bethany	To work on how to file a complaint info on the back of the licensure cards.	June 22, 2017	
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	Catherine (chair), 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	

- 6 Action Item #1:
- 7 Pam: We created a form so that the process for discretionary extensions would be more streamlined.
- 8 Bethany: Has John reviewed this form?
- 9 John: Yes.
- 10 Kevin: I was thinking we may want to add “discretionary” to the form.
- 11 Caitlin: We can do that.

Motion June-04 (Earp/Pruett) I move we accept the Provisional License Discretionary Extension Request Form with the suggested revisions to be used by the Board. Seconded by Lauren. No

discussion. All in favor. Motion Carries.

1 Action Item #2:

2 Donnie: Will work with Jan and Lee on this item, and get this community outreach going.

3 Action Item #3:

4 Take off Catherine and add John.

5 Action Item #4:

6 Donnie: We three have emailed some but there has been no headway made at this time.

7 Action Item #5:

8 Complete

9 Action Item #6:

10 On going

11 Action Item #7:

12 On going

13 Kim: Any new activities send to me, and any past activities please sent to me, and I will add to the list.

14 Action Item# 8:

15 On going

16 Action Item# 9:

17 On going

18 Catherine: We have been working on this committee and we have a survey that we want to send out in
19 the Fall.

20 Kevin: The results that we get from the survey can help us to move forward in determining what we
21 should do.

22 Action Items #10:

23 On going.

Motion June-05 (Johnson/Smith) I move we adjourn the meeting. Pam Seconds. No discussion. All in favor. Motion Carries.

24

25 **Adjourned at 12:58 pm.**

26