

**North Carolina Interpreter and Transliterater Licensing Board  
February 24, 2017 Board Meeting – Paragon Bank – Raleigh , NC**

1 Board Members Present: Kevin Earp, Donnie Dove Jr, Jeff Trader, Pam Smith, Bethany Hamm-Whitfield,  
2 Emily Pope ,and Kim Calabretta

3 Board Members absent: Lauren Pruett and Catherine Johnson

4 Interpreters: Nicole Fox and Mark Lineberger

5 Public Members present: Lee Williamson

6 Called to order at 9:15 am

7 A quorum was established, with 7 members present.

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

**Welcome and Introductions**

9

**Approval of Minutes**

10

**Motion Feb 2017-01 (Dove/Earp) I move we accept the November 18, 2016 meeting minutes with suggested edits. Seconded by Kevin. No discussion. All in favor. Motion Carries.**

11

**DPI Update**

12

13 Bethany: Antwan Campbell is the new liaison at DPI.

14 Pam: In your board packet, is a report submitted by Antwan Campbell, DPI is developing a team of  
15 diverse stakeholders to examine requirements for educational interpreters. The goal of this group is to  
16 identify organizational and structural changes needed, select the first practitioners, develop a training  
17 and coaching plan, begin the first cohort, evaluate the readiness of data systems, and establish  
18 communication links and protocols. There seems to be two phases of this, but they have to justify  
19 making the improvements in the school system.

20 Bethany: Pam, do you know if DPI is still trying to do a “step up plan” for the EIPA scores (from 3.0 to 3.5  
21 and then 3.5 to a 4.0)?

22 Pam: They have to gather the data first and review what the standard currently is, and see what the  
23 increase in standards can be. It is going to take some time. Antwan’s position is different then Rachel  
24 Ragin’s but he will be addressing qualifications for educational interpreters.

25 Kevin: I will forward an email I have with some information about this, and I will send this to Caitlin to  
26 send to everyone on the Board.

27

**SEI Filing Reminder**

1 Bethany: Its that time of year again, please be sure to file this form before April 15 to avoid paying any  
2 fines.

**LRC Report**

3 Donnie: We have had no cases since the last Board meeting.

4 Emily: Lauren and I were on a case as temporary LRC, there were 2 licensed interpreters involved in the  
5 complaint and after a through investigation those two cases were found to be unsubstantiated.

6 John: (In reference to past LRC cases)We have had a number of cases that have had violations, and we  
7 have to take every case on a case by case basis. The LRC takes the cases seriously, and the LRC performs  
8 several interviews, and what I have witnessed as the Board’s legal counsel is this Board doing their due  
9 diligence by making sure that they take each case and look at what the facts say. Like I said each case  
10 has to be viewed on a case by case basis.

11 Jeff: Is there a standard training the LRC goes through?

12 Bethany: Yes, there are standard forms that are completed so all interviews can be documented. These  
13 forms are then sent to the entire LRC after interviews are done so everyone can review the material.

**Financial Report**

14 Emily: Just a reminder the fiscal year of the Board is October 1 – September 30. Right now, comparing  
15 this year to last year, our total assets are up compared to where we were last year. I did talk to Caitlin  
16 about some items I noticed. We have had more late fees this year, and we didn’t have any last fiscal  
17 year. With the expenses, legal services is down quite a bit, and we have had less legal needs. Printing  
18 fees are low as of right now, but Caitlin let me know that our printing fees will go up closer to the  
19 renewal season. We also had an increase in the Interpreter services.

20 Bethany: That increase is due to securing our own interpreters for the NCRID conference.

21 Emily: We are slightly up from last year at this time. An audit was done.

22 Caitlin: I will email that audit report to you all.

**Budget Approval**

23 Emily: Some items we adjusted were the website expenses, the budget for the website was \$5,500, and  
24 Caitlin does not anticipate any significant changes to the website we lowered that to \$500. Line item  
25 652 (process server) we have not had to serve anyone with papers in a long time. 654 (contracted  
26 services for actors) this is at \$600 and we wanted to leave that there if we need to hire people/actors  
27 for some of the videos that the Board has been discussing. The Board member compensation, we know  
28 our board doesn’t all live in Raleigh and we increased that slightly. Also, public meeting expenses were  
29 for the NCRID conference, but everything else is pretty standard. Any questions?

30 Pam: I think there should be an increase to the Board member travel, in case there is additional travel  
31 expenses.

32 Caitlin: This budget can be adjusted how ever the Board wants to adjust it.

33 Bethany: We could increase board members travel to \$3,500.

**Motion Feb 2017-02 (Dove,/Smith) I move we accept the budget for fiscal year 2016-2017 with edits to the line items 662 (Board Member Travel) being increased to \$3,500. Seconded by Pam. No discussion. Motion Carries.**

1

### **Board Member Reappointments**

2 Caitlin: There are a few board members that need to be reappointed, if you would like to seek  
3 reappointment. Your terms are expiring as of June 2017.

### **Sole Source Contract**

4 John: I am working on a sole source contract to send to the interim state purchasing officer, and that  
5 was submitted the 7<sup>th</sup> of this month, and we are waiting to hear back them in regard to that. We are  
6 allowed to talk to Caitlin and the company she works (CHMS) for about the contract, if the sole source  
7 contract is approved. If the contract is denied we will have to get an RFP together and Caitlin cannot be  
8 included on these discussions, but CHMS can bid on the contract. If we do go the bidding route we  
9 would have to keep Caitlin out of the discussion. We will have to evaluate the bids and then take the  
10 steps necessary to determine who we accept for the new contract (if the sole course is denied). If the  
11 sole course is approved I will have to call a meeting with the Board to discuss what they want that  
12 contract to look like. I do want to emphasis that we have to be sure if the contract does go out for bid,  
13 that we keep Caitlin and CHMS out of the discussion.

14 Bethany: We do not have a timeline for when this will be approved or denied?

15 John: Correct, once we hear back we will make a plan of action.

16 Bethany: If it is denied I would ask we get that 6 month extension so we will have time to meet face to  
17 face.

### **Military Applicant Bill**

18 John: This current bill would be a change to a statute that already exists. This statue says that if a  
19 military trained applicant moves to North Carolina we cannot charge them the application fees, but we  
20 can charge them renewal fees. They have to be qualified for our license, and if they move here we have  
21 to make this pretty seamless for the applicants who fall under the qualifications of the statute.

22 Bethany: Where is this bill in the process now?

23 John: It is a stand-alone bill, and right now it is in committee. The other bill out there is House Bill 142.  
24 Bill 142 outlines more oversight over OLAs. This will have to see many committees and this will take  
25 some time to process. There are several things involved in this. We have to file a contact name with the  
26 legislature and keep that current. There is a part about training for the Board, and add training about  
27 anti trust law also. Rulemaking, the legislature is going to require more rulemaking for certain things,  
28 one of those things is that whenever we delineate our scope of practice. We will have to go through this  
29 process (meet, public comment, and then meet again). If this bill passes this Board would need to  
30 develop rules to delineate practice, and disciplinary actions. This bill also covers the complaint process,  
31 and this bill will allow for filing an electronic complaint process. I would be glad to answer any questions  
32 about this proposed bill. This bill has just been filed, and they do get amended and if something  
33 important comes out I will let you know. There is nothing about sun setting in this bill now, but if there  
34 is I will be sure to let you know.

1 Break 10:25 am

2 Reconvened at 10:46 am

**Central Office Report**

3 Caitlin:

4 **Current Number of Licensees: 535**

5 Grandfathered: 54 (10%)

6 Full: 335 (63%)

7 Provisional: 146 (27%)

---

8 **Licenses issues since last Board meeting (November 18, 2016): 21**

9 **Full : 5**

10 *Qualified for licensure by:*

11 RID Certification: 5 of 5 (100%)

12 **Provisional: 16**

13 *Qualified for licensure by:*

14 EIPA score of 3 or higher: 2 of 16 (13%)

15 2 year degree: 13 of 16 (81%)

16 Accumulated Hours: 1 of 16 (6%)

17 **Licenses Pending Issue: 2**

18 1 full and 1 provisional

19 Caitlin: We have also had a recent public records request, where a few people have asked for any and all  
20 reports on an certain interpreter. I have sent all the information to John and he is reviewing the  
21 information to see if anything needs to be redacted.

**NCRID Meeting 2017**

22 Bethany: Thursday June 22, the Board meeting will be from 10 am – 2pm and then the public forum will  
23 be from 630 pm to 830 pm in Winston Salem. It is in downtown Winston Salem.

24 Bethany: I need two volunteers to help with the forum. Bethany, Pam, and Kevin will be the presenters.  
25 We will do a call for questions in May 2017, and we can do our presentation, and we can take public  
26 comments after the presentation. Everything will be all in one day. I would like everyone to be present  
27 for the forum at 6 pm so we can be sure we are all set up.

28 Pam: (Quick question about the central office report) How many people didn't renew last year?

29 Caitlin: We had 41 people lapse for the 2016 renewal season.

30 Kevin: Do they all lapse based on certain items.

31 Caitlin: Some retire, some move out of state, some decide not to interpret any more.

32 Kevin: Do we have more licensees now?

1 Caitlin: Yes, we have 535 licensees, when I started with this Board three years ago we have slightly less  
2 than 400.

3 Pam: Do we have expired licensees listed on the website?

4 Caitlin: No I update the list for current licensees as I issue a license so all currently licensed people are on  
5 the website.

6 Lee (Public person): Is there a way we can work with Caitlin to make sure the DHHS list is up to date?

7 Caitlin: Yes, I can send you a list.

8 Lee (Public person): I can make the request monthly for the updated list.

9 Kevin: This could make sharing information easier. The communities can find out the newer people.

10 Jeff: This could help with seeing who is no longer licensed too.

### Infractions Posted on the Website

11 Bethany: I wanted this to be separate and not just on the action items list. The first question is do we  
12 want to post this information? The second is what does this look like if we do want to post it? First we  
13 could not post anything, or second we could only have certain types of actions on the website, such as  
14 revocations or suspensions. Do we want to post other infractions? As a chair of this Board I have  
15 thought about this a lot and I would like to take the middle of the road approach, I think we have to be  
16 careful of how much we are posting, our job is to protect the welfare of the community and the public,  
17 and we need to realize interpreting is a profession, and we do make mistakes. I do think it is important  
18 the community knows that that person has had their license revoked or suspended, but I do not think  
19 that we need to post that he person got a warning letter. We need to make a decision to move forward  
20 with this, and what the legal implications are and what should it look like.

21 John: I do have some things to advise on, first of all, whatever is put on the Board website it needs to be  
22 a matter of indisputable facts. This Board needs to determine what they want to put out there. Do you  
23 want to put everything out there or just the revocations and suspensions? We have to be very clear  
24 about what goes on this list, and these are just the things to consider. How will this effect the  
25 community, and what will this do for the community. Consider all of the options, and what ever steps  
26 you do or do not take, you can always change it later on.

27 Bethany: Should we post actions on the website? If yes, what should we post?

28 Kim: I am curious what you mean by infraction? Is there any time frame for how long it stays on the  
29 website?

30 Kevin: Any civil charges, misdemeanors we could post that, or a fine for example. I can understand the  
31 Deaf side, they want to know who they can trust.

32 Donnie: I don't think the deaf community really understands the Board and what we do. If I file against  
33 someone they have a right to request a public record would they share that with the community? If the  
34 deaf person wants to see that information, is it a public record, what about the protection for the  
35 community too.

1 Jeff: I'm with you (Bethany) major infractions should be posted like suspensions and revocations. We  
2 will have to have a searchable method. We should have some information on our license about filing a  
3 complaint.

4 Bethany: We have to balance the need to protect the public. I do think that our community is a little  
5 different from the other communities because of how many licensees each Occupational Licensing  
6 Board has. We are a small Board compared to some other Boards. Our community is very small, and I  
7 do feel if someone did something wrong the public should know, we need to find a balance. We need to  
8 make the decision today. We can start with the most egregious items, and we can add to that and have  
9 different categories going forward.

10 Emily: I agree with you Bethany, and I agree we need to post something and keep it simple with  
11 revocations and suspensions.

12 Bethany: We can change it over time.

13 Pam: John, what is the legal definition of slander?

14 John: Slander is a false statement meant maliciously. I want this Board to think about what impact or  
15 benefit there is for putting this information on the website.

16 Pam: Right I am thinking about the revocations and suspensions being posted.

17 John: The important part would be posting of the dates for certain items on the website.

18 Bethany: I think it should just be the licensee and the date of the suspension.

19 Kevin: How many suspensions or revocations have we had?

20 Caitlin: No revocations, and one suspension, to my knowledge.

21 Bethany: What I want the Board to decide today, and we can make a decision and have the sub  
22 committee work out the logistics. We can decide today about that.

23 Kevin: Caitlin, there was one suspension. How many other complaints have come in that have had civil  
24 penalties?

25 Caitlin: It is not a large number.

26 John: You have to look at each individual complaint and their own merits, you can not look at statistics.

27 Bethany: Let's take a break for lunch and then reconvene.

28 *Break: 11:51 am.*

29 *Reconvened at 12:55 PM*

30 Bethany: The subcommittee needs some direction from the Board. Do we want to post anything on the  
31 website in regard to substantiated infractions? No we don't want to post anything and then this ends,  
32 or yes we do, and then we have come up with a template.

33

**Motion Feb 2017-03 (Dove/Trader) I make a motion that the Board post substantiated infractions on the Boards website, pending terminology recommendations from the subcommittee. Seconded by Jeff. No discussion. All in favor. Motion carries.**

1 Bethany: Now the subcommittee will look at templates and bring that template to the Board in June.

**Script Approval DSDHH Video**

2 Bethany: Donnie and I are on the subcommittee and working with DSDHH we can work on that too.

**Periodic Rules Review**

3 John: We are ahead of schedule. Everything was approved in November, and I got it filed in early  
 4 January. There were two rules that are important with public interest. Otherwise our rules are well  
 5 underway. I did want to ask something of the Board, I am supposed to be out of town the week in June  
 6 the Rules Review Commission (RRC) is supposed to hear our rules, would the Board be ok with me  
 7 asking the RRC to move our rules up to the May meeting for the RRC?

**Motion Feb 2017-04 (Hamm-Whitfield/Pope) I move that the Board authorize its legal counsel to file a request with the North Carolina Rules Review Commission to move up to May of 2017, from June of 2017, consideration of the Board's rules in the periodic rules review process. Bethany, Emily seconded. All in favor.**

8  
 9 John: Thank you.

**Action Items Review**

#	Owner	Description	Due date	Status
	Catherine, Pam, and Donnie	Develop a matrix for licenses that we can combine with the Rules Review Commission additions.	Feb 24, 2017	Moved to due June 22, 2017
	Caitlin	Compile a list of what year each provisional license is in (how many 1 year, two year, 3 year, 4 year, etc.) Send to Kevin, catherine, and Jeff.	ASAP	Complete
	Pam(chair), Catherine, Bethany	Ad hoc committee have the disciplinary actions for website details worked out, and what will be posted on the website	Feb 24, 2017	Moved to being due the June 22, 2017 meeting
	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.	Feb 24, 2017	Update in June
	Pam and Bethany	Ad Hoc committee to look into NCAD's concerns (Craig Blevin's points) and see if we can have some solutions to these questions posed.	Feb 24, 2017	Complete
	Caitlin	Send out Pam's power point to everyone on the board for further review.	ASAP	Complete
	Bethany &	Update the Website as needed	On going	On going

	Caitlin			
	Kim	Compile a list of meetings and events for Board members to attend.	On Going	Board members to reach out to their groups they represent and send meetings to Kim,
	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	
	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	
	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 John (in regard to his action item): We exchanged emails and the complaints need to be in writing, and
- 3 utilizing the deaf resource centers around the state. We just need to make sure the complaint that is
- 4 being filed is being recorded accurately.
- 5
- 6 Jeff: We will need to work out the logistics of that. Having an interpreter from outside of the Board, and
- 7 we just need to figure out the logistics of that.
- 8
- 9 Bethany: We could contract with interpreters outside of the state of NC if needed.
- 10
- 11 Kevin: Right now there is nothing, we can start with Deaf resource centers as a resource where deaf
- 12 consumers can go. Later on we can maybe provide this service for the future. Having one way of doing
- 13 this is important.
- 14
- 15 Bethany: Would the subcommittee still want to work on the logistics of that? (How to send or submit a
- 16 video complaint).
- 17
- 18 Donnie: We just need to figure out how to get it posted.
- 19
- 20 Jeff: I would prefer to have someone who is tech minded.
- 21
- 22 Lee (public attendee): What about a video phone in the NCITLB office. Let the people know that they
- 23 can sign the complaint and that way we can have someone reach out to them. They would have to
- 24 leave their phone number/VP number, and that they would want to file a complaint. I know that the
- 25 video can be compressed and transcribed and emailed to NCITLB email address.
- 26
- 27 Bethany: I think we should keep this open and have the logistics figured out, and work with Caitlin to get
- 28 this video phone, and getting that all set up.
- 29
- 30 Bethany (subcommittee NCAD concerns): Two items that stuck out to us, were the ASL format of
- 31 complaints, and we are addressing that. He would also like to see about how to file a complaint on the
- 32 licensure cards, and that information.
- 33
- 34 Bethany (In regard to roles of SSP): This is still on going.

1 John: With house bill 142, if it does pass, we would have to delineate the roles of SSPs. We will get  
2 something, but I do not know if it will be by the June Board meeting.

3  
4 Bethany ( DPI item): Pam and I have been working with Antwan, and we have invited him to the June  
5 meeting and see what we can do to help.

6  
7 Kevin (action item licensure law): We have not been able to meet since the last meeting.

8  
9 Jeff: We are comparing the matrix and spread sheet.

10  
11 Bethany: I would like to see a more formal report and how other states compare to use.

12  
13 Kevin: At the meeting for the council for the deaf and hard of hearing, they referenced that many states  
14 have licensure for educational interpreters, and that NCITLB is the opposite. NCITLB has licensure for  
15 community interpreters.

16  
17 Bethany: DPI opted out near the end of the licensure being finalized, back when this Board was first  
18 being created.

19  
**Motion Feb 2017-05 (Earp/Hamm-Whitfield) I move we adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Bethany.  
All in favor. Motion carries.**

20  
21 Adjourned at 1:44 PM.