# Rules and Regulations – Task Force Meeting

November 16, 2020 Start 3:17pm – 4:55pm

Members Present: Frances Beaurivage, Julie Delkamiller, Judy Gouldsmith, Jonathan Scherling, Deb Teller, Peggy Williams, Barb Woodhead, and from NCDHH, Sharon Sinkler and Abby Giambattista

* Peggy opened with concerns and comments from the recent IRB meeting
* Discussed need to expand on “low risk.” Maybe use the term “limited risk.” Maybe need letter from training program *and* the kind of feedback given on the EIPA. With VRS we know it is not low risk, but perhaps we just mean there is more support there than in other settings.
* Sharon – Reminded the task force of the original purpose for an Apprentice License is to bridge the gap for ITP students to becoming certified and licensed.
* Barb mentioned that there is some opposition from the community to what we are doing.
* Having passed the NIC written as discussed, is still necessary.
* What kind of testing should be used to screen applicants? (If any)
* Peggy – Will the commission provide any kind of follow up for these interpreters? That is a concern.
* Discussion regarding low risk vs limited risk. Frances stated interpreters have a “Critical impact” Barb suggested “Limited Practice”
* “Lower risk” – just remove it (consensus by group)
* Frances – shared language from University of Northern Colorado
  + Group decided this addressed removal of “lower risk” and agreed to insert into first paragraph of Apprentice License draft language.
* Sharon – “Low risk” definitely raised red flags for many. Limited practice language is good. Defining those scenarios will go into a technical assistance document at a later date.
* IRB stated that some type of follow-up should be done and definitely wants that. We need to be sure that these interpreters are assessed and accountable. We need to be sure of their work. (Without babysitting them. Not our responsibility or within our bandwidth (available personnel at NCDHH)
* Sharon – Sorenson said that they have mentoring programs. Hopefully by the time the Rules and Regs are passed and Covid is over, interpreters can take advantage of that resource.
* Barb and Frances – We need mentoring and work documentation. We need contacts for where they (apprentices) have worked.
* How to keep track of interpreters? How can clients give their feedback? *Should* clients give feedback?
* Barbara- If there is a complaint or lack of documentation, there are repercussions just like in real life.
* Jonathan – Maybe just have generalized feedback?
* Julie – Simple documentation submissions, we want to retain young interpreters. We need to define where Apprentice Licensed interpreters can work, because they just need to get out there. Sometimes new people are *going* to mess up and that is part of what you pay for. Just like with teachers and hairdressers.
* We want to balance these young interpreters and consumers. Trying to protect school-aged deaf kids from the newer interpreters and place them with Deaf community members who can actually verbalize what they need. (accountability)
* Do apprentice terps get listed online? We would need this defined and listed.
  + All of this would be listed in the technical assistance document.
* We would define Limited Practice in the beginning of R&R.
* We will nix low risk and incorporate some of UNCO’s language and change the first paragraph accordingly. Might not even need the “not limited to” list.
* Double check to see if UNCO’s language is copyrighted or not. Need to send out that info and changes to group.
* (Send example of my internship hours logs) – Abby
* Give 30-day grace period to submit to NCDHH the hours logs and CEUs but if it is not taken seriously, you get your license taken away. We need to include this in our language. We need to be consistent across our licenses.
  + 30 days before revocation.
* For rules and regs we must require that we have our number of CEUs and then a subsection about a required log.
* If one fails to meet requirements their license will immediately expire.