

The Supreme Court of Ohio

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor

CC: Steven C. Hollon, Administrative Director

FROM: Judge Gary L. Yost, Chairperson
Bruno Romero, Manager of the Language Services Program

DATE: January 30, 2014

RE: Advisory Committee on Interpreter Services – 2013 Annual Report

Pursuant to Guideline 4.03 of the Operating Guidelines for the Advisory Committee on Interpreter Services, Judge Gary Yost, Chairperson of the advisory committee, and Bruno Romero, Manager of the Language Services Program and staff liaison to the advisory committee, hereby submit the advisory committee's 2013 annual report.

Purpose of Advisory Committee

The purpose of the advisory committee is to provide ongoing advice to the Court and its staff regarding the promotion of statewide rules and uniform standards concerning the establishment and operation of interpreter programs in Ohio courts; the development and delivery of interpreter services to Ohio courts, including training programs for judges and court personnel; and the consideration of any other issues the advisory committee deems necessary to assist the Court and its staff regarding the provision of interpreter services in Ohio courts.

2013 Activities and Accomplishments

The advisory committee met three times throughout 2013: on April 19th, August 23rd, and on September 10th. Over the course of these meetings, the advisory committee provided feedback on the proposed revisions to the Rules 80 – 88 and new Rule 89 of the Rules of Superintendence. Much of the advisory committee's efforts focused on proposed Rule 89 and Appendix J, which established standards for telephonic interpretation.

A number of additional topics were discussed by the advisory committee in 2013:

- (1) The committee identified a need for the creation of standards for the certification of interpreters in terms of moral turpitude. Should a crime of moral turpitude prevent an

interpreter from being eligible for certification? If so, how is that crime of moral turpitude defined? Work continues in this area.

- (2) Is the current time limit by which provisionally certified interpreters must achieve full certification appropriate? The Rules and Policies Subcommittee is reviewing this topic and will make recommendations to the court upon completion.
- (3) Should Ohio develop an interpreter mentoring program to encourage involvement in the field of court interpretation? The Training Subcommittee will assist the Languages Services Program to explore feasibility, options, and barriers to implementation.
- (4) The advisory committee proposed the development of standards for non-certified interpreters. Such standards may include a mandatory number of training hours, an oral assessment, and a minimal level of aptitude as demonstrated on a written test.
- (5) The committee began work to update the judges' hand book on court interpretation. They revised and submitted two previous bench cards and completed the Telephonic Interpretation Bench Card.
- (6) The American Sign Language Subcommittee is reviewing the role, function, and feasibility of implementing video remote interpreting to include deaf and hard of hearing individuals. This committee is also reviewing the training standards for interpreters permitted to interpret pursuant to Sup.R. 88(E)(2), which provides for the appointment of a non-certified sign language interpreter. It will also consider the revision and expansion of the hand book as it relates to individuals who are deaf and hard of hearing.
- (7) The Training Subcommittee has also discussed training needs of judges, court personnel, and attorneys. In the future, it will propose a standard training curriculum for legal professionals.

The Advisory Committee on Interpreter Services and the Language Services Program will continue to work together to strengthen access to justice for every non-English person in Ohio.