

Tentative Agenda
STATE COMMITTEE OF INTERPRETERS
MARCH 16, 2004 1:00 PM
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City MO

OPEN MEETING

1.	Call to Order
2.	Roll Call
3.	Review and Approval of Agenda
4.	Review and Approval of Open Minutes -December 3, 2003
5.	Rules Update -4 CSR 232-3.010 (3) -4 CSR 232-3.010 (19) -4 CSR 232-3.010 (2)
6.	Report of MCDHH and/or BCI Meetings -2/24/04 MCDHH -3/5/04 BCI
7.	Report from Executive Director Financial Report Renewals Legislation NAD Conference (7/6-10/04) June Town Hall Meeting June Committee Meeting
8.	Review of mentor/mentee relationship rule wording

Tentative Agenda
State Committee of Interpreters
MARCH 16, 2004 10:30 AM
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City MO

CLOSED MEETING

Call to Order	Chair
Roll Call	Secretary
1. Review and Approval of Agenda	
2. Review and Approval of Closed Minutes	
3. Complaints	
4. Complaint Update	
5. Violations (reported on renewal MCDHH compliance)	
6. Assistant Attorney General Report	

STATE COMMITTEE OF INTERPRETERS
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City, Missouri

MARCH 16, 2004 -- OPEN MINUTES

The open session of the State Committee of Interpreters was called to order at 10:45am by Sandy Drummond, Secretary, who functioned as Chair in the absence of Lisa Guillory, at the Division of Professional Registration, 3605 Missouri Blvd, Jefferson City, Missouri.

Members Present:

Sandy Drummond, Secretary
John Adams
Carrie McCray
Lisa Betzler
Kim McEnulty

Members Absent:

Lisa Guillory, Chair

Staff Present:

Pamela Groose, Executive Director
Roxy Brockman, Clerk IV
Jamie Lee, Assistant Attorney General
Kelley Clark, Contract Interpreter
Peggy Withrow, Contract Interpreter

Visitors:

Amy Fowler, MCDHH
Kandice Allee, MCDHH
Roy Miller, MCDHH

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McCray to go into closed session for #1, #2, #8, and #9, at 10:47am. The committee returned to open session at 12:05pm and recessed for lunch at that time. The open session resumed at 1:05pm.

Review and Approval of Agenda

Ms. Groose added the January 16, 2004 BCI meeting under Report of MCDHH and/or BCI meetings and indicated that information from that BCI meeting was already enclosed in the agenda information given to the committee members. She also said that there were no handouts for the March 5, 2004 BCI meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McEnulty to approve the open agenda as amended. All approved.

Review and Approval of Open Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Mr. Adams to approve the open minutes from the December 3, 2003 meeting as amended. All approved.

Rules Update

- *4 CSR 232-3.010 (3) Mentorship rule* – Ms. Goose reported that this rule has not been prepared and submitted to the Division as of yet, but will be done very soon.
- *4 CSR 232-3.010 (19 Responding to Committee requests)* – Ms. Goose indicated his rule will become effective March 30, 2004.
- *4 CSR 232-3.010 (2) Correct MCD to MCDHH*– A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Mr. Adams to change 4 CSR 232-0.010 (2) to the Missouri Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. All approved.

Report of MCDHH and/or BCI Meetings

January 16, 2004 BCI Meeting – Ms. Fowler reported that one of their concerns is in regard to certified interpreters that have not done their CEUs for a number of years and they are still in the BCI/MCDHH database. She further explained that those that are certified as an intermediate, advanced or comprehensive do not have an expiration date on their certification, so they can't pull their certification. She said they could only verify that the certification is not valid. She said the BCI is proposing a rule change for those certified interpreters who have not completed their CEUs in a year from the date they were due in the MCDHH office. The rule change would give the MCDHH the ability to show that their certification is no longer valid at all, they would be pulled from the database and be shown that they are not certified. She said they would have to start the application and testing over as if they had never been certified before. Ms. Fowler also indicated that Oklahoma would be added to the MICS conversion table.

Ms. Goose said there was discussion when Ms. Fowler reported to the BCI about the SCI's proposed mentor / mentorship rule and it appeared that Dr. Miller may have been upset with the SCI's process. Ms. Fowler said she thought the BCI may have been confused about why the SCI would want a mentorship /mentee rule and this was like the first time they were hearing about it, in that particular meeting. She said the BCI was somewhat confused about what the intent was for and so at the last meeting Ms. Fowler asked them to discuss it so that they would have a better understanding. She said all she knew was that from the language that they saw that was written they weren't happy with it. But, she said, there was really nothing they could do about it since it wasn't their rule and was the SCI's rule. Ms. Fowler said from their impression of the rule and because the BCI sets the skill level standards that it looked like that the SCI was exempting anyone from the skill level standard as long as they say they are in a mentorship process. She said they were just confused reviewing the information, which was why she had asked Ms. Drummond talk about it during their last meeting.

Ms. Drummond clarified and responded by saying: "I would like to clarify something. I think sometimes we forget what happened way back in the past. Sometimes what happened way back in the past is very important. Back in the past BCI said they didn't want a mentorship rule under their rules. They decided the licensing board should be responsible for setting up a permission, if you will, for mentorship / mentee programs. So they asked us to set up the rule. I don't want the BCI thinking that we're trying to step on their toes because that is not our intent. So if you don't like the rule we made that's understandable but I also don't want them to think that we're trying to step on their toes because that's not the intent. They asked us to do that some time ago and we worked on it. And maybe because some of it -- commission members are new or maybe some of them forgot. In any case maybe they want to wear a *** so if they are not happy with our rule that's kind of the idea that I got from the March 5th meeting, that they had some suggestions for us as well."

Ms. Fowler responded and said that she and Ms. Allee were at the last SCI meeting and reported back to Dr. Miller since he was not at the meeting. She said that Dr. Miller did seem somewhat upset at that meeting but thought it was because he did not have enough information to go on. Ms. Groose said she got the indication that he felt like the SCI was trying to go around the rule making process but that she said she told him that the SCI was trying to get comments and suggestions so the process would go faster once the rule was filed. She said Dr. Miller's reaction and the things he was saying was very confrontational about it. She said the intention was to get input on the rule before it ever begins that process so that it does go quicker once filed.

February 24, 2004 MCDHH meeting -- Ms. Groose reported Dr. Miller indicated there were forty "yes" comments and four "no" comments in regard to the skill level standards CI/CT rule. She said no changes were made based on the comments and final order was filed. Ms. Fowler reported that MCDHH is a RID sponsored agency. Ms. Fowler also reported that the commissioners have given Dr. Miller the authority to file complaints with the State Committee of Interpreters in regard to information that MCDHH receives that may involve an interpreter practicing without current licensure and/or certification.

March 5, 2004 BCI Meeting – Ms. Drummond commented that she thought the SCI and the BCI were obviously having a little problem with communication. She said the SCI previously asked the BCI to look over the wording in the definition of interpreting because the SCI noticed that the definition was in conflict with the CDI definition. So, at the March 5, 2004 meeting it seemed to her that the BCI was talking about the law and saying "if you interpret in a casual setting, volunteering with no pay, then you are exempt for licensure". But, she said, then she thought they were talking about two different things. She said her perspective and the BCI perspective was different but she thought it was finally straightened out. She said when we are talking about the definition of interpreting and talking about that part of the law, having the exemption for volunteer interpreters and casual setting interpreter then she thought the MCDHH needed to define what volunteer interpreting was. She said she thought that if the MCDHH or BCI wanted to have a clarification of what casual setting and volunteer interpreting is – that is why she thought they included a discussion about the church interpreting or a family member interpreting. She said the SCI's concern has always been about the act of interpreting.

Ms. Fowler said the BCI talked about interpreting in the church, family members, and volunteers and that the BCI pretty much said that interpreting was interpreting and would pretty much let licensure deal with it. But, she said, if it came to an issue where someone tried to end their law they would deal with it at that time. She said they really didn't focus that much on that issue, they wanted to leave it with licensure. She said they didn't want to deal with changing the definition of interpreting. Ms. Groose said that MCDHH's attorney was going to look at the definition of interpreting, interpreter and the practice of interpreting for providing consistency among those three definitions. Ms. Groose also said that MCDHH's attorney had mentioned before that under the SCI's exemptions the casual, gratuitously, and it says as defined by rule. She said that the SCI could create a rule and define what are casual settings, if they so choose.

The next BCI meeting is scheduled for June 2, 2004.

Dr. Miller arrived at the meeting and he was asked if he had a legislative update on HB1195, specifically the proposed amendment. Dr. Miller said there was no change at the present time but in the coming week he intended to put together a task force of individual stakeholders to start discussing the educational interpreters question. He said the amendment was a bad

resolution of the issue. He said there had to be a better resolution of that issue and he thought the only way they could get there was to pull every one around the table and start seriously talking. He said he hoped by doing this it would garner the support to push Representative Holand to pull his amendment off and let the rest of the bill go.

Ms. Drummond said that she shared with the BCI the next SCI Town Hall and Board meeting dates. She said the BCI asked her about the rules with regard to mentorship and that she wanted to share the ideas that had been communicated to her. She said most of the concern was that they were afraid of people saying they were involved in a mentorship and they were getting into situations where they could work but they weren't really working in a mentorship, it would be a situation that wasn't really happening and they were taking advantage of that situation. Ms. Drummond said that she asked if interpreters could indicate their participation in mentorship situations on their CEU form but the concern was still expressed that someone could still fill out a form to get CEUs but you could still not really be involved in a mentorship, which would still be a problem. She said the BCI asked if the mentee / mentor relationship would have a time limit or be open forever. She said she believed Dr. Miller suggested mentorship should only be used for levels one and two of the skill levels.

Report from Executive Director

- *Financial Report* – A copy of the January, 2004 financial report was included for the committee members' review.
- *Renewals* – Ms. Goose reported that 502 renewal applications were mailed and as of March 16, 2004 sixty-five (65) interpreters had not renewed their licenses.
- *Legislation* – Ms. Goose indicated there was nothing new to report but that she would keep the committee members updated as much as possible.
- *NAD Conference (7/6-10/04)* – A letter from Nancy Bloch, Executive Director, National Association of the Deaf, was received and included for the committee members' review and discussion. The letter from Ms. Bloch requests the committee to allow out of state interpreters to attend and work at the July conference without having a current Missouri license or temporary license. After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Adams to waive the interpreters for the NAD conference via the letter and the form, provided they give us their RID, NAD or Missouri certification when completing the form with all of the information. The motion died for lack of a second. A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Mr. Adams to send NAD a letter indicating that each interpreter should apply for a temporary license. All approved. Dr. Miller indicated that MCDHH would have a booth at the NAD conference. The SCI members decided not to have a booth at the conference. Attendance by SCI members will be discussed at the June meeting.
- *June Town Hall Meeting* -- June 9, 2004, 7-9pm. The committee members reviewed the power point presentation and they recommended some minor changes to the presentation. The members divided the presentation among themselves as far as who would present each portion. Dr. Guillory – Introduction of members and staff, Mr. Adams – Rules, Ms. McEnulty – Difference between certification and licensure, Ms. McCray – Pending Legislation, Ms. Drummond – Board appointment process, and Ms. Betzler – Filing a complaint. Mr. Adams will take care of applying for continuing education for the workshop attendees. Additionally, Mr. Adams has created a flyer which will be sent out to interpreters in the Springfield, Missouri, area.
- *June Committee Meeting* -- June 10, 2004. Ms. Goose indicated that in October the committee members had also scheduled a conference call for June 21, 2004 to discuss their closed items but she indicated that she would be working towards setting the agenda for all

open and closed items to be discussed during the June 10, 2004 meeting and canceling the June 21, 2004 conference call.

Review of mentor/mentee relationship rule wording

The committee members discussed the proposed mentorship language and the issues the BCI brought up during their last meeting when they reviewed the proposed SCI mentorship language. Ms. Drummond said the BCI had voiced questions during their last meeting in regard to how are we going to prove that that it's really a mentor / mentee relationship, what kind of system do we have to enforce a more formal mentor / mentee relationship, and how do we acquire CEUs. Additionally, she said they asked, is there a time limit, can they work for six months, a year, or do we need a time limit. She said the BCI suggested that only levels one and two be allowed to participate in a mentorship relationship.

Ms. McCray left the meeting at 4:40pm.

After discussion a motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McEnulty to table this item for further discussion at the next meeting. All approved.

Ms. Drummond requested that Ms. Goose bring documents to the next meeting in regard to what psychologists do for their internship.

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McEnulty to adjourn at 5:00pm. All approved.

Executive Director Signature

Date Approved by Committee