

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

**Judicial Council of the State of Nevada
Certified Court Interpreter Advisory Committee**

January 10, 2025

12:00 p.m.

Summary prepared by: Amanda Walker

Members Present

Katherine Stocks
Judge Gloria Sturman
Napoleon Buenrostro
Maria Gutierrez
Judith Jenner
Alicia Lerud
Brad Lewis
Mariteresa Rivera-Rogers

AOC Staff Present

Kimberly Williams

- I. Call to Order
 - Ms. Stocks called the meeting to order at 12:02 pm.
 - Ms. Williams called roll. A quorum was present.
- II. Public Comment
 - Ms. Stocks asked if there were any members of the public that would like to address the committee or if there were any written comments.
 - Ms. Williams stated there are not.
- III. Review and Approval of September 20, 2024, Meeting Summary
 - Ms. Stocks discussed a correction to the September Meeting Summary, as the summer meeting had been included mistakenly.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers confirmed no other changes and made a motion to approve the September meeting summary.
 - Ms. Lerud seconded the motion. The September meeting summary was approved unanimously with consensus of change.
- IV. Program Updates
 - Fall Exam Information
 - Ms. Williams reported 27 exams administered with 12 passing. 1 OPI administered for Japanese with a passing score. 1 of 14 oral exams were passed, with that individual being previously conditionally approved for Spanish.

- Ms. Williams also reported that the program now has one Russian interpreter who is conditionally approved.
- Ms. Williams discussed upcoming exams with the Carson City administration being held May 5-6, and the Las Vegas administration being held May 12-16. This will give candidates 3 months to register and the potential for more sign ups.
 - Ms. Williams reported that Consecutive was the worst scoring portion for candidates on this last oral exam.
- Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked if the workshops being done online were through De La Mora, Ms. Williams confirmed. Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked if we had any CEUs for the consecutive that have been developed. Ms. Williams stated that we did not.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers discussed that it had been suggested by Mr. Buenrostro that it be done along with the note taking. Ms. Williams stated that we have not begun the workshop remake. There is a contract with De La Mora until June, at that time we will launch our workshop.
 - Ms. Stocks asked Ms. Williams to confirm that we have the first two quarters of 2025 to work on our updates to the workshop. Ms. Williams confirmed. Ms. Stocks assured the other committee members that they will present the information for the updated workshop at the most appropriate next meeting.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked if they will be informed when episodes are available for the committee to review prior to the meeting. She asked for clarification that exams are still being done the same way with proctoring and being sent out for scoring. Ms. Williams confirmed.

V. Educational Updates

- Ms. Williams discussed the recent hiring of an administrative assistant that will be working part-time for the CCIP. This AA will be proctor trained and will be able to help with exam administration.
- Ms. Williams discussed that due to feedback from the last meeting the podcast will be postponed. Efforts will be focused on new slides to present or email to the committee to speak on at the next meeting for opinions and notes.
- Ms. Williams reported that we will also be bringing in two interpreters as suggested to the interpreter basics class for teaching the new judges.
- Ms. Williams discussed a new class that was conducted in December with Corinne McKay. Ms. McKay presented practical strategies for improving consecutive interpretation, and this class can be made available to interpreting candidates.
 - Ms. Stocks clarified that Ms. Williams was spending a majority of her time answering certification questions and responding to emails, which made it difficult for her to delve into the policies and programming side. Now that she has additional part-time administrative support, it will give her the time to work on the programming piece and improve our delivery of our services.
- Ms. Williams discussed that, based on suggestions from the September meeting and additional communications, it was important to have a larger discussion in regard to the workshop.
 - Ms. Williams stated that there was a free workshop that would be pre-recorded so interpreters could take it at any time, and it could be updated as needed and repeated. However, there were overwhelming comments that the participants would benefit more from this workshop being in person.
 - Ms. Williams reported that we would be unable to make this workshop free if it were to be held in person. We would need to charge the participants. Ms. Williams asked the committee to consider a virtual option, though understandably not ideal, there are participants that are unable to attend physically. She asked that the committee keep in mind that we are having mini workshop at the

beginning for the written exam prep only, which will cover basic court terms, ethics, synonyms, antonyms, idioms, and practice. This workshop will differ from the one that will be held between the written exam and the oral exam. That one will be far more in depth, going into criminal procedures, deeper into court terms, and provide more practice for the consecutive and simultaneous.

- Ms. Williams asked the opinion of the committee on the workshop.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that the original workshop that was held was mainly to give an overall view of the practice of interpreters and the how to. It wasn't necessarily getting into the language or their language skills. That workshop was basically to lay out what interpreters do, how they do it, and this is how they were to be ready for it. Ms. Rivera-Rogers continued that the original exam that was given at the end of the workshop was just a sample of what interpreters would need to be ready for. This was to determine whether they were prepared at that point and study to get to the oral portion of the exam. Ms. Rivera-Rogers explained that the first exam was mostly testing English skills, but nothing else in the language area. She asked how this is different than the way it was done before.
 - Ms. Williams discussed how it would be split into parts. The first part for the written exam is going to be more basic to get participants started in the program. The second part is going to be more of what the orientation workshop was before. There will be more practice, without the synonyms, antonyms, and idioms. That will be pushed to the written exam prep, same with the court terms and usage. Everything else is going to be right before the oral exam. This is how it's structured right now. Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked if there would be a workshop one and workshop two. Ms. Williams confirmed.
 - Ms. Jenner asked for clarification if there would be a three-part workshop, a pre-workshop, then the written, then the orientation workshop and how these changes are being made.
 - Ms. Williams clarified that the plan is to have a mini workshop before the written exam to prepare the participants, so they know what they're getting into with the written exam. This workshop will go over terms, court usage and terminology, going into idioms, synonyms, antonyms, and ethics. A basics class just that would give them a heads up on what they're going into, and the knowledge that they must have for the written exam. Then that's when we bring in all the court-related information about criminal procedure and how that works, plus more in-depth terms for court usage.
 - Ms. Jenner reiterated that the idea is to give the candidates some sort of idea of what they're getting into. She then asked if that workshop would be online or in person, and how that pre-workshop would work.
 - Ms. Williams explained that the pre-workshop will be completely virtual. The candidates will be able to take it at any time. It is for the committee to decide whether the orientation should be a free, pre-recorded version or a paid, in-person orientation. Ms. Jenner asked who would be teaching the pre-workshop. Ms. Williams stated that she, alongside her supervisor who is an English Major, would be putting the workshop together. Ms. Jenner asked if there would be participation of an active interpreter for the curriculum, someone that would be a subject matter expert. Ms. Williams clarified that initially that was not part of the pre-workshop plan, but that an active interpreter could be added.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked if it was possible for the orientation to be in-person and virtual at the same time. Ms. Williams explained that it would be in person, but also that there would be a virtual option, but that candidates would need to attend live. Ms. Rivera-Rogers explained that she meant that the candidates could ask questions and be sure that the person who is taking the exam is the one taking the workshop. Ms. Williams confirmed. Ms.

Guterrez asked to recap; the first workshop will be a pre-workshop with general information, basics, one hundred percent virtual, followed by an orientation workshop right before the written exam with more in-depth information. She asked if there would be two options available; a pre-recorded free workshop that would be available to those who have taken the in-person workshop? Ms. Williams clarified that the free workshop would be the fully virtual one that participants could take at any time and would be before the written exam. After they pass the written exam then they would take the more in-depth one, which would be in person, but with an option to attend live virtually.

- Ms. Guterrez asked Ms. Williams if the question posited to the committee is to consider having the workshop completely virtual. Ms. Williams stated that the question for the committee is free vs. paid. If the orientation workshop is to be live then candidates will need to be charged, however it was the hopes to make the workshop free to encourage more participants. Ms. Guterrez agreed that having a free workshop would attract more candidates.
- Ms. Lerud stated that though she values in-person, in this case, to eliminate barriers to individuals showing interest in going into court interpreting and succeeding at these written exams she is in favor of having a free option. She is also in favor of having something everyone can attend virtually, especially once the candidates are getting into the rules and the state, it's just not feasible for some potential candidates to travel to an in-person orientation.
- Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that she understands the potential for some candidates not being able to attend in person, however she stated that a live person should be teaching the workshops and that someone will have to pay for that. She asked if every candidate decides to take the workshop virtually then how would that work. Ms. Williams stated that if the workshop is live then candidates will be charged whether you're in person or via zoom. Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked Ms. Williams to clarify whether that meant that you didn't have to be live in person, that candidates have the option live virtually or in person, but there would still be a fee. Ms. Williams stated that is correct.
- Ms. Stocks suggested that Ms. Williams could put together a chart of what the options are and what the cost would be and then send that out as follow-up based on the comments from this days committee meeting. At that time the group can make an informed decision. Ms. Stocks stated that the program will have the online option no matter what, it's the question of how to make the in-person happen because it's important to try to make it available in as many ways as possible. Ms. Stocks asked if that sounds like a reasonable next step for the committee. All agreed.
- Ms. Rivera-Rogers discussed that there used to be workshops in the North and the South. She then asked if there would be only one workshop in the North and people would have to travel if they wanted to be in person, or vice versa. She also asked if instead there would be a decision to split them so the workshops would not always happen in one location.
 - Ms. Williams stated that there would still be one workshop in each area, set on different days. She then followed up regarding the chart, affirming the idea. Ms. Williams questioned whether there would be any reason that a presenter couldn't appear virtually or would everyone prefer the workshop be completely in person.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers explained that she prefers the in-person, but that it is always a barrier on cost. She stated that after the committee receives the chart of what the options are then they will have a better idea of whether it's cost prohibitive or doable. She stated that she believes that the better option is to have a presenter who is there, otherwise it becomes more of a webinar, and with that comes lack of participation or difficulties in communication.
- Ms. Stocks asked if there were any other comments.

- Ms. Jenner stated that she agrees with Ms. Rivera-Rogers in regard to in-person always being a better option, even if there is a little bit of cost to the candidate. She stated that there should be a balance between the committee's desire to want more court interpreters and getting candidates who are serious about the program. Ms. Jenner also stated that we need certified court interpreters, and we want to make it as easy as possible, but we also need some sort of commitment from the candidates. If a candidate wants to be a certified court interpreter in Nevada, Ms. Jenner believes it is a reasonable expectation that they travel to take the course in Nevada.
- Ms. Stocks thanked Ms. Jenner for her comments and asked if there were any other comments.
 - Mr. Lewis stated that after reading the minutes from the last meeting a few things came to mind that he would like to discuss.
 - Mr. Lewis discussed having a volunteer put together a word game. He mentioned online apps for synonym and antonym games. He also stated that candidates might volunteer to participate and there could be kudos for the highest winner. It could also be a fun way to enhance the difficult test areas. If someone could create a contest it would create some fun around these words and concepts.
 - Another thought that Mr. Lewis had was regarding remote learning and how difficult it is to both be paying attention and worrying about the details of the technology. Mr. Lewis wondered if there was potential for a learning opportunity where someone performed the technology portion while someone was interpreting and whether that could earn CLE credit.
 - Next, Mr. Lewis stated that he believed there was the idea that interpreters could work on a pro-bono basis, and they could earn CLE credit. Mr. Lewis would like to know if there is an update on that.
 - Ms. Williams confirmed that CLE credit for pro-bono work has been live for a couple of years, but that there has only been one submission in the last 3 years.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that there is a possibility to do that with legal aid, senior program, or any of those organizations that do pro-bono and earn CEUs that way.
 - Mr. Lewis discussed the possibility of it being a lack of desire to do it, a lack of promotion, or a combination, but that it would seem a good way to both get practice and earn CLE, which interpreters need anyway. Mr. Lewis asked if more can be done with that program. He also stated that he would be happy to assist as it seems like an opportunity that he hadn't heard a lot about.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers clarified that the interpreters that are donating their time and earning the CEUs, those Continuing Education Units, must already be certified first, so it's not much practice. The interpreters are trying to keep up with the rules for renewal of their licensing. It's good because the interpreter doesn't have to pay for a webinar or go to a seminar, they can do it in many other ways and the pro-bono work is one of the ways that was developed to do that. Ms. Rivera-Rogers stated that it was not developed for the new court interpreters that are trying to get certified. She then addressed the word games and stated that these are great ways to learn, and the games are suggested to those starting to go through the program to get certified. Ms. Rivera-Rogers agreed that it would be a good idea to make it a prize, perhaps

the next workshop will be free if they win. Ms. Rivera-Rogers asked Ms. Jenner if she would like to comment.

- Ms. Jenner agreed that the CLE program is a fantastic idea, but she thinks the reason candidates don't participate is that there is not enough promotion. She stated that it wasn't on her radar even though she is on the committee. She then suggested some reminders via email, "We have a free program that can help you get CEUs and do something good for the community". These reminders, especially at the end of the year when interpreters are scrambling to get their CEUs, could be helpful. She recommended a quarterly reminder that the program exists. Ms. Jenner then discussed the apps posited by Mr. Lewis and agreed that it is something that should be included in the workshop. Ms. Jenner then stated that most of the work that candidates do to become certified is on their own. She stated that only 10% is what we teach them and the other 90% is on their own. If we could integrate or even suggest an app and possibly have a contest, then we are progressing.
 - Ms. Stocks asked Mr. Lewis if it would be possible to follow up with him. She also asked if there were any other items or suggestions.
 - Ms. Williams asked who the best people would be to send the quarterly reminders to, whether to the interpreters separately or to all the locations that apply for it.
 - Ms. Jenner suggested sending the quarterly reminders to all the certified and registered interpreters.
 - Ms. Rivera-Rogers also suggested that the interpreters can contact the nonprofit organizations that they would like to volunteer at, to ask that the facility let them know when things come up so that the interpreters are on the organization's radar as well.
- Ms. Stocks asked if there were any other items for the group. She stated that they will be following up in a couple weeks on the options for the curriculum going forward with potential cost implications. There will also be follow-up with Mr. Lewis to ensure that the wording is correct on notifications about those credits.

VI. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned by Ms. Stocks at 12:42pm.

VII. Public comment that was provided after the meeting by Ms. Natalia Cardillo: *"I support and echo Mariteresa's idea. As a certified interpreter and interpretation courses instructor. I firmly believe that the best would be to offer the orientation workshop in person again, but allow people that are not able to attend in person due to their location to join virtually. Active participation and feedback from the instructor/presenter are extremely important for aspiring interpreters and prerecorded training courses do not offer that."*