

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ROBIN SWEET  
Director and  
State Court Administrator



RICHARD A. STEFANI  
Deputy Director  
Information Technology

JOHN MCCORMICK  
Assistant Court Administrator  
Judicial Programs and Services

VERISE V. CAMPBELL  
Deputy Director  
Foreclosure Mediation

**AGENDA**

**CERTIFIED COURT INTERPRETERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Wednesday, February 24, 2016  
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 pm

Via VIDEO CONFERENCE  
Supreme Court Law Library – Room # 107, Carson City  
Regional Justice Center – Conference Room A, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, Las Vegas

Via TELE-CONFERENCE  
Phone number: (877) 873-8017-Access Code: 3407656#

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Public Comment**  
Because of time considerations, the period for public comment by each speaker may be limited, and speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers.
- III. **Approval of Meeting Notes of October 7 and December 14, 2015 Meetings\***
- IV. **Program Report**
- V. **Discussion of Draft Court Interpreter Conditionally Approved Designation Guidelines\***
- VI. **Public Comment**  
Because of time considerations, the period for public comment by each speaker may be limited, and speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers.
- VII. **Adjournment**

*\*Items for possible action*

### **Pre-Agenda Notices**

- Agenda items may be taken out of order at the discretion of the Chair in order to accommodate persons appearing before the Commission and/or to aid in the time efficiency of the meeting.
- If members of the public participate in the meeting, they must identify themselves when requested under agenda item one.
- Public comment is welcomed by the Advisory Committee but may be limited to five minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Public comment is provided either at the start and end of the meeting, or after every action item, to afford members of the public an opportunity to make comments to the committee.
- Action items are noted by “for possible action” and typically include review, approval, denial, and/or postponement of specific items. Certain items may be referred to a subcommittee for additional review and action.
- The Advisory Committee is pleased to provide reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If assistance is required, please notify Advisory Committee staff by phone or by email no later than two working days prior to the meeting, as follows: Kareen Prentice, (775) 687-9806 or [kprentice@nvcourts.nv.gov](mailto:kprentice@nvcourts.nv.gov).
- This meeting is exempt from the Nevada Open Meeting Law (NRS 241.030 (4) (a)).
- **Notice of this meeting was posted in the following locations:**
  - a) Nevada Supreme Court website – [www.nevadajudiciary.us](http://www.nevadajudiciary.us);
  - b) Carson City: Supreme Court Building, Administrative Office of the Courts, 201 South Carson Street;
  - c) Las Vegas: Regional Justice Center, 200 Lewis Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor.

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ROBIN SWEET  
Director and  
State Court Administrator



RICHARD A. STEFANI  
Deputy Director  
Information Technology

JOHN MCCORMICK  
Assistant Court Administrator  
Judicial Programs and Services

VERISE V. CAMPBELL  
Deputy Director  
Foreclosure Mediation

**NEVADA CERTIFIED COURT INTERPRETERS  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

Wednesday, October 7, 2015  
10:30 p.m. – 12:00 pm

Via VIDEO CONFERENCE  
Supreme Court Law Library – Room # 104/105, Carson City  
Regional Justice Center – Settlement Conference Room, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, Las Vegas  
Via TELE-CONFERENCE  
Phone number: (877) 873-8017-Access Code: 3407656#

Prepared by Kareen Prentice, Court Services Analyst

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Robin Sweet, *Committee Chair and State Court Administrator*  
Mariteresa Rivera-Rogers, *Federally Certified Court Interpreter (Private Attorney)*  
Dr. Nelson Rojas, *Representative of University System (University of Reno)*  
Judge Gloria Sturman, *District Court Judge (Eighth Judicial District Court)*  
Jackie Bryant, *Court Administrator (Second Judicial District Court)*  
Judge Richard Glasson, *Justice of the Peace (Tahoe Justice Court)*

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Dr. Carina Black, *Representative of a Non-Profit for LEPs (Northern Nevada International Center)*  
Maxine Cortez, *Court Administrator (First Judicial District Court)*

**COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:** Kareen Prentice, *Court Services Analyst*

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m. The meeting started without a quorum. Quorum was established later in the meeting.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public was present.

## **III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 17, 2014**

Once quorum was established, a motion was made to approve the October 17, 2014 meeting summary by Mariteresa Rivera-Rogers. It was seconded by Judge Glasson. Members passed with no edits.

## **IV. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS, JUDGE GLORIA STURMAN AND JACKIE BRYANT**

Chair Sweet said that Judge Sturman was going to try to join the meeting as soon as she could. Judge Sturman is a district judge from Clark County and replaced Judge Vega on the Committee. Chair Sweet introduced Jackie Bryant to the Committee. Ms. Bryant is the Second Judicial District Court Administrator. Ms. Bryant is replacing Steven Grierson who is the other eligible court administrator for this committee. Ms. Bryant is appointed for three years. Ms. Bryant stated that it is a pleasure to be on the Committee.

## **V. PROGRAM REPORT**

Chair Sweet asked Ms. Prentice to give the program report. Ms. Prentice reported that two certified interpreters and a registered interpreter were removed from the roster. They moved to other states and did not want to submit their renewal applications. Ms. Prentice advised that a Pennsylvania court interpreter is moving to Las Vegas and has submitted her application for reciprocity. Ms. Prentice discussed the Written Examination retake; one person passed the exam in Carson City and no one passed in Las Vegas. Ms. Prentice advised that she is working on scheduling the oral examinations.

Ms. Sweet updated the members regarding the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) offering to train Ms. Prentice and other Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff on the oral examination administration for a cost of approximately \$5,000. Another option would be for Ms. Prentice to attend the NCSC annual conference and attend the oral examination administration training in May. Options are being explored at this point.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that Ms. Krlickova is trained and could administer the oral examinations. Chair Sweet said she thought Ms. Krlickova would still be considered a proctor with the NCSC. Her assistance would be an option to consider.

Chair Sweet reported that Judge Glasson had joined the meeting and that we now had quorum. Chair Sweet asked that we go back to the Meeting Summary agenda item on page 3 of the meeting packet to vote. Ms. Rivera-Rogers advised she had reviewed the summary. She made a motion to approve the meeting summary and Judge Glasson seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

## **VI. COURT INTERPRETER CREDENTIALING LEVELS\***

Chair Sweet advised members to review the several pages of information regarding credentialing levels included in the meeting packet. She asked if any members had recommendations on how to proceed with the discussion. Ms. Rivera-Rogers expressed her worry about the credential level of conditionally approved. She asked about the conditionally approved score of 55 percent or more. Chair Sweet advised that is from the NCSC Reference Manual. Chair Sweet discussed other states conditionally approved qualifications. Ms. Rivera-Rogers talked about other states levels and that some states only have conditionally approved for rare languages. Ms. Prentice reported that she had spot checked six files of prospective court interpreters that had passed the written examination but had failed one or more of the oral exams. Of the six, all had over 50 percent on the oral exams, which seems to indicate that there would be plenty that would qualify for this special credential.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that if someone was not able to pass the written examination then she would be concerned about their ability to interpret in court. She stated that if they are working and they have not passed the oral examinations then what is their motivation to become certified? Chair Sweet replied that there would be a time frame, two years or three years, and then the designation of conditionally approved would expire. She advised that the members should discuss if they would be allowed to renew the conditionally approved designation.

Judge Glasson stated that when he reviewed the matrix last year, he tossed out states that did not have comparable geography to Nevada. He focused on Utah and that he liked their interpretation for conditional certification. He advised that conditionally certified in Utah were only on in-house rosters and only called upon when other credentialed interpreters are unavailable. Ms. Rivera-Rogers said that would work for traffic matters or misdemeanor courts.

Dr. Rojas asked about Utah's exam score percentages. Judge Glasson replied that Utah did not use a percentage. Utah is more subjective, in that they review the totality of circumstances. Conditional status is approved if the interpreter has language skills and knowledge. Dr. Rojas discussed the different state classifications. Dr. Rojas stated he did not think we were talking about too many people really for this credential level. He suggested that the committee give it a try once everything is decided upon.

Ms. Bryant stated if the committee were to go forward with this credential, then she would advocate for a year of conditional approval. She stated she believes that this idea would significantly water down the qualifications. Ms. Bryant advised that she would not hire an interpreter with this low of a pass rate; she would not be comfortable that they would satisfy the Code of Professional Responsibility criteria. Chair Sweet asked Ms. Bryant if the score was raised to 65 or 70 percent; would that make a difference. Ms. Bryant replied she thought a grade of 70 is more palatable than a 50 or 55.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that Ms. Bryant is right on point because of her situation as an administrator. She does not have the ability to assess the interpreter. She is just relying on the designation of the certification given. Members discussed various options for test scores and timing of tests. Dr. Rojas stated that 2 years might need to be the minimum. Ms. Rivera-Rogers agreed that 1 year might be too short because it does not give the opportunity for the retakes.

Chair Sweet asked members for their thoughts regarding the conditionally approved having to comply with the continuing education requirement. Dr. Rojas said there was not CEU requirement for conditional just for the registered and certified interpreters. Chair Sweet stated she had mixed feelings about requiring CEUs. Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated she did not think CEUs should be required for conditionally approved. She advised that making them complete CEUs would make them feel that they are certified.

Members discussed courtroom observation hours and background checks. Ms. Bryant stated that conditionally approved needed training more than certified. Ms. Rivera-Rogers reported that training options are much more available than they have been; there is very good training online. Chair Sweet advised that possibly the committee could require fewer CEUs than certified. Chair Sweet would like to encourage them to receive more education and relevant training.

Dr. Rojas stated that he would prefer conditionally approved not be required to take CEUs. He stated we want to encourage them to become certified. The Committee should make it simple, no CEUs, and 2 years and non-renewable and see how the program works. Chair Sweet asked for clarification on non-renewable. Dr. Rojas reported that there needs to be a reason to move up to certified. Chair Sweet replied that she was thinking it would be a 2-year process. She thought if they are progressing in their oral examination scores then they can be conditionally approved for 2 more years if they have met all other requirements. Judge Glasson offered if there is a minimum score and a requirement that either annually or bi-annually they sit again and the scores continue to improve, then they could be renewed. Ms. Bryant asked if conditional approval could occur only with a written exam score of 80 percent so that the English language skills were known.

Chair Sweet explained the recommendation process to the Language Access Committee and then the review and final approval by the Judicial Council. Chair Sweet discussed that there was focus on this issue last legislative session. There was a bill draft request and there is a need to have more court interpreters available statewide. Chair Sweet discussed engaging the conditionally approved and to keep them moving through the process. Chair Sweet shared an email from Ms. Cortez since she could not attend the meeting. Chair Sweet discussed the possibility of a pilot project approach to the conditionally approved interpreter. Ms. Bryant asked for clarification on timing of exams and scores. Ms. Prentice replied with information. Chair Sweet explained the oral examination process and the difficulty of the test process.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers suggested a 5-year window to test for the conditionally approved designation with at least a 70 percent on the written examination. She also suggested that if they are at least within 10 points of passing the oral exam, they can renew every 2 years.

Chair Sweet advised that Ms. Prentice had enough common themes to start the draft. The members can discuss in more detail once there is actual language to review. Judge Glasson remarked that there should be another way to become a conditionally approved interpreter. He advised that judicial districts outside the Second and Eighth could make an interpreter conditionally approved if nominated by the presiding judge of at least two courts; along with a district attorney/city attorney within those two jurisdictions and a public defender from either jurisdiction. Judge Glasson responded it would only be a person that is interpreting three or four times a year and has absolutely no interest in becoming certified.

Members discussed Judge Glasson's proposal. Judge Glasson reiterated the unique needs of rural courts and judges. Judge Glasson advised it is difficult to get folks with other language knowledge to come to court and interpret. They do not have any interest in the profession. Judge Glasson advised that the fewer barriers placed before rural judges and the more encouragement to become engaged in not only this conversation but interpretation is generally for the better. Discussion followed regarding rural judges and interpreter access issues. Judge Sturman responded that she had checked in over the phone and had been involved in the meeting.

Chair Sweet proposed to have Ms. Prentice draft guidelines or ask for Utah to share their guidelines. At the next meeting the members will discuss a very rough first draft.

Dr. Rojas said there seems to some agreement regarding if the person is making progress and the 5-year trial period. Ms. Rivera-Rogers said the 5 years might be needed so the conditionally approved could be evaluated after the fourth year. Chair Sweet said to use brackets for portions that need to be discussed in the draft. Chair Sweet suggested that getting it in writing and seeing a draft might give all of the members more perspective.

## **VII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public present at the meeting.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m.

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ROBIN SWEET  
Director and  
State Court Administrator



RICHARD A. STEFANI  
Deputy Director  
Information Technology

JOHN MCCORMICK  
Assistant Court Administrator  
Judicial Programs and Services

VERISE V. CAMPBELL  
Deputy Director  
Foreclosure Mediation

**NEVADA CERTIFIED COURT INTERPRETERS  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING NOTES – NO QUORUM**

Monday, December 14, 2015  
10:30 a.m.

Via VIDEO CONFERENCE  
Supreme Court Law Library – Room # 104/105, Carson City  
Regional Justice Center – Settlement Conference Room, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, Las Vegas  
Via TELE-CONFERENCE  
Phone number: (877) 873-8017-Access Code: 3407656#

Prepared by Kareen Prentice, Court Services Analyst

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Robin Sweet, *Committee Chair and State Court Administrator*  
Maxine Cortez, *Court Administrator* (First Judicial District Court)  
Mariteresa Rivera-Rogers, *Federally Certified Court Interpreter* (Private Attorney)  
Jackie Bryant, *Court Administrator* (Second Judicial District Court)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Dr. Carina Black, *Representative of a Non-Profit for LEPs* (Northern Nevada International Center)  
Dr. Nelson Rojas, *Representative of University System* (University of Reno)  
Judge Gloria Sturman, *District Court Judge* (Eighth Judicial District Court)  
Judge Richard Glasson, *Justice of the Peace* (Tahoe Justice Court)

**COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:** Kareen Prentice, *Court Services Analyst*

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m. There was no quorum and the meeting was discussion only.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public was present.



### **III. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 7, 2015**

The meeting did not have a quorum and no votes were taken.

### **IV. PROGRAM REPORT**

Chair Sweet asked Ms. Prentice to discuss the program report. Ms. Prentice reported two reciprocity applications are in process. Ms. Prentice discussed the scheduling of the Oral Examinations, Orientation Workshop/Written Examinations for 2016. Ms. Prentice advised that Ms. Rivera-Rogers would be facilitating the Workshop. The Nevada Interpreters and Translators Association and Napoleon Buenrostro would be conducting presentations for the Workshops as well.

Ms. Prentice updated the members regarding the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) training on February 11, 2016. Ms. Prentice and other Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff will be trained on the administration of the oral examination.

### **V. DISCUSSION OF DRAFT COURT INTERPRETER CREDENTIALING LEVELS\***

Ms. Prentice discussed her efforts drafting the document utilizing guidelines from New Jersey and Utah. Ms. Prentice shared that John McCormick had reviewed it and had questioned the term “substantial effort.” Chair Sweet asked for thoughts. Ms. Rivera-Rogers advised level 8 is missing from the *ALTA Language Services Oral Language Proficiency Testing*, which was included in the meeting materials. Ms. Prentice stated she would locate the missing level. Ms. Rivera-Rogers said she was more inclined to choose level 9 or 10 for the credentialing document.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked for clarification regarding “substantial effort” and “approved interpreter.” Chair Sweet advised that “credentialed” would be a better word than “approved.” Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated in the second paragraph after “conditionally approved” a word is missing.

Members discussed continuing education requirements for the conditionally approved designation. Chair Sweet advised this level was to assist prospective interpreters to improve and move forward towards certification. Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that training could be required instead of continuing education.

Discussion was held regarding Utah’s court rule on conditionally approved. Chair Sweet described Utah’s language as similar to the alternate language that Nevada has implemented. Chair Sweet advised she would like Ms. Prentice to contact previous exam participants and inform them of this new designation once it is approved.

Ms. Cortez responded that courts utilize folks that have not gone through any process, training, exams or experience, prior to interpreting in the courtroom. Ms. Cortez stated she likes the “A, B and C” portions of the draft document requirements. She said she would prefer 10 for the Oral Proficiency Interview. Ms. Cortez advised she is concerned about the section on district courts. She said this will affect the rural areas and there should not be a distinction between the different courts. Discussion was held regarding access to certified court interpreters in the smaller jurisdictions. Ms. Cortez advised that the conditionally approved will be very helpful for languages where she struggles to find interpreters.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers advised it is a problem when courts utilize people that are not qualified because then there is no incentive to become certified. Ms. Rivera-Rogers reported that it is very crucial in felony cases to have people that can interpret at a certain level.

Chair Sweet updated members regarding the National Center for State Courts remote interpreting project. Ms. Rivera-Rogers suggested adding the mandate of passing a background check to the draft. Members all agreed upon this edit.

Ms. Bryant stated she liked the Utah model best. She suggested that the appointing authority should be the administrator of the court where the conditionally approved interpreter would be working. She said that the administrator would be in the best position to evaluate that court's needs. Ms. Bryant advised a limit is needed for how long a person could be conditionally approved and then the person could take the required continuing education unit credit during the conditionally approved term. She discussed that she really dislikes the 55% mark for the Oral Examination because it makes the AOC look very weak. Ms. Bryant stated she thinks the Utah model gives court administrators the discretion they need without lowering the standards.

Chair Sweet asked for clarification from Ms. Bryant regarding having court administrators and not the AOC issuing the conditionally approved status. Ms. Bryant replied that conditionally approved interpreters would still need to register and apply with the AOC. Ms. Bryant responded that there should be a finding of a lack of resource of a credentialed interpreter and a two-year maximum for the designation. She said this process will give flexibility to the courts.

Ms. Rivera-Rogers disagreed with this proposal. She believes that court administrators will not be able to determine the language ability of prospective court interpreters. Ms. Rivera-Rogers explained the exam scoring to the members. Ms. Bryant stated that the Utah model shows that they are not being tested, and that their qualifications are based on other factors. Ms. Bryant said she is concerned about the AOC issuing a rule that says 55% is an appropriate score. Ms. Rivera-Rogers agrees with the Utah model for rarer language speakers.

Chair Sweet advised that the draft needs edits regarding "substantial effort" and "a finding due to a lack of resources." Possibly these two could be tied together in the next draft of the document. Chair Sweet asked Ms. Prentice to send Ms. Bryant a copy of the Judge's Bench Guide. Chair Sweet reported that Ms. Prentice will work on the suggestions and thoughts shared at the meeting today.

## **VI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public present at the meeting.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

**PROGRAM REPORT**

**TO:** Language Access Committee  
**FROM:** Kareen Prentice, Court Services Analyst  
**DATE:** February 10, 2016

Program Statistics as of February 2016:

<b>Interpreters</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Languages other than Spanish (LOTS)</b>	<b>Languages</b>
Certified	78	3	Vietnamese, Portuguese, Mandarin
Master Level	10	1	Vietnamese
Registered	0	10	Amharic, Amharic/ Tigrinya, Bosnian/ Croatian/Serbian, Bulgarian, Farsi/German, German, Italian/ Portuguese, Japanese (2), Korean, Slovak
<b>Certified Interpreters</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Languages other than Spanish (LOTS)</b>	<b>LOTS Registered Residence</b>
Northern NV	14	0	1
Southern NV	53	1	8
Other States	AZ – 5, CA – 8, CO – 2, NY – 1, UT – 2, PA-1, IL – 1	CA – 3	WI – 1
<b>Calendar of NV Program Events</b>	<b>Orientation Workshop(OW)/ Written Exam (WE)</b>	<b>Written Exam Retake</b>	<b>Oral Exam</b>
Date of Last	July 11-12, 2015 –LV (Pass – 14, Fail – 18) July 18-19, 2015 –Reno (Pass – 4, Fail – 3)	September 3, 2015 – Carson (1- Pass) September 11, 2015 – LV (6 – Fail)	September 2014
Date of Next	January 22-23 – Reno (7 participants) February 5-6 – LV (29 participants OW and 33 for WE)	April 2016	March 2-3 – LV March 9-10 – CC

- February 11, 2016 – National Center for State Courts Oral Examination Administration Training – 8 AOC staff participated

**Draft Court Interpreter Conditionally Approved Designation**

**Conditionally Approved** - To be considered for the classification of the Conditionally Approved level:

- A. Complete the Orientation Workshop for Interpreters in the NV Courts. The Nevada Orientation Workshop is the first step necessary toward certification/registration. The workshop covers fundamentals of court interpretation (modes, ethics, and role of the interpreter) as well as an introduction to Nevada’s court system. The written exam provided by the Consortium for Language Access in the Courts is administered at the conclusion of the workshop.
- B. Pass the NV Certified Court Interpreter Written Exam consisting of 4 sections (General English Language Vocabulary, Court Related Terms and Usage, Ethics and Professional Conduct) with a minimum score of 70%.
- C. Pass the NV Certified Court Interpreter Oral Examination consisting of 4 sections (Consecutive skills interpreting test, Simultaneous skills interpreting test and a two-part Sight translation skills test) with a minimum score of 60% in all sections.
- D. Persons testing in a language for which there is not an NCSC Oral Examination must score 10 in the Oral Proficiency Interview.
- E. Provide verification of Nevada courtroom observation or work (40 hours in total for a period of last 12 months).
- F. Submit a NV Conditionally Approved Application Request.
- G. Submit two (2) fingerprint cards; for a background check to be conducted prior to working in NV courts.
- H. Filing and processing fee of \$50.00.
- I. A passport size photograph.

The Nevada Supreme Court will invite persons eligible for the Conditionally Approved level to submit an application to the Nevada Supreme Court. Conditionally Approved interpreters may work in Nevada Courts. However, with respect to working in the Second or Eighth Judicial District Courts, Conditionally Approved interpreters are called for work “*only when there is a finding of a lack of a credentialed resource.*”

Persons who are designated Conditionally Approved may remain in that status no longer than two years from the date the candidate is approved by the Nevada Supreme Court. If the candidate does not attempt to successfully pass the Oral Examinations during that time period, their Conditionally Approved designation will not be extended.

Training Requirements for Conditionally Approved Designation:

6 credits	To be approved by the Nevada Supreme Court	2 out of the 6 credits must include ethics
-----------	--	--

# CERTIFIED COURT INTERPRETERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

## 2015/2016 ROLL CALL

Member Name	Term	10/7/15	12/14/15 No quorum	2/24/16	6/01/16	10/12/16	12/14/16	
Dr. Carina Black	1/1/14 – 12/31/16	Absent	Absent					
Maxine Cortes	1/1/14 – 12/31/16	Absent	X					
Jackie Bryant	9/1/15 – 9/30/18	X	X					
Judge Richard Glasson	1/1/13 – 12/31/15	X	Absent		Completed term			
Mariteresa Rivera-Rogers, Esq.	1/1/14 – 12/31/16	X	X					
Dr. Nelson Rojas	1/1/14 – 12/31/16	X	Absent					
*Robin Sweet	n/a	X	X					
Judge Gloria Sturman	5/1/15 – 5/31/18	X	Absent					

\*Ex-Officio Member

AP = Absent, with proxy

X = Present

Black Shaded = Prior to Start of Term