



Interpreter Commission
 Friday, December 8, 2017
 SeaTac AOC Main Conference Room,
 18000 International Blvd. SW, Suite 1106
 SeaTac, WA
 8:45 am-11:30 am

AGENDA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call to Order 	Justice Steven González
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of September 29, 2017 Minutes 	Justice Steven González
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Representative Committee Appointment • BJA Court Funding Task Force Update • May Commission Forum Planning 	Justice Steven González
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues Committee Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEU Hours Revision and Removal of Peer Review Requirement • Written Exam 3-Year Rule • Education Committee Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCJA/DMCJA Spring Presentation • LAP Implementation Training 	<p>Judge Andrea Beall</p> <p>Katrin Johnson</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission Manager's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of CEU Reporting Deadline • Joint Commissions Education Committee Update • Translated Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Protection Order Forms • Update - LAP Approval Criteria • AOC Interpreter Program Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tagalog-specific Course Update • Oral Exam 2017 Update • 2018 Exam Testing and Training Schedule • New Business for the Good of the Order 	<p>Cynthia Delostrinos</p> <p>James Wells and Bob Lichtenberg</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjourn- <u>Final Oath Administration</u> to Currently Credentialed Interpreters (In-Person) 	Justice Steven González

Next Meeting: Friday, March 8, 2018, 8:45 am. – 11:45 noon. AOC SeaTac Office Building, Large Conference Room



Interpreter Commission Meeting
Friday, September 29, 2017
AOC SeaTac Office Building
18000 International Blvd, Seattle, WA 98188

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Justice Steven González
Judge Andrea Beall
Judge Laura Bradley
Francis Adewale
Maria Lucia Gracia Camon
Thea Jennings
Katrin Johnson
Linda Noble
Fona Sugg
Alma Zuniga

AOC Staff:

Cynthia Delostrinos
Robert Lichtenberg
James Wells

Members By Phone:

Judge Teresa Doyle
Lynne Lumsden

Members Absent:

Eileen Farley
LaTricia Kinlow
Dirk Marler

Guests:

Elisa Young
Mary Toews

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by Justice Steven González at 8:45am.

APPROVAL OF MAY 12, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

Minutes were approved with modification.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Reappointment

- Judge Doyle and Judge Beall were reappointed for a second term.

Open Member Vacancy: Community Member Representative

- Ms. Young and Ms. Toews introduced themselves and described their backgrounds.

- Ms. Young discussed some of her past personal experience and her work in the language access field at a government agency.
- Ms. Toews went over her interpreting background, her interpreting agency, and her work at a non-profit. Both candidates discussed their experience reaching out to communities.
- The Commission discussed the two candidates and their qualifications.
- Ms. Young was nominated to the open Commission seat and the motion was unanimously approved by the present members of the Commission.

MOTION: Ms. Young is appointed to the Community Member Representative seat.

BJA Court Interpreting Task Force Overview and Timeline

- The Commission discussed the recently formed Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) Court Interpreting Task Force, its purpose to address the lack of funding for court interpreters and membership.
- The Task Force will explore strategies to obtain additional funding from the legislature.
- The AOC recruited a new staff person, Jeanne Englert, and discussed her role in supporting the Taskforce. She will be working on collecting data to support the legislative funding requests for interpreter services. A survey will be sent out to the state courts in November with questions about interpreter usage and other language access issues.
- Mr. Adewale stressed the importance of having the community who needs interpreters involved perhaps by including members from a non-profit.
- Ms. Johnson has been nominated to be on the Task Force representing the Office of Public Defense.

ANNUAL REPORT

The Commission reviewed the 2016 Annual Report suggested edits or additions include:

- The title of the annual reports should have the year that the report is published and not the year the information is about. This will make the report appear more relevant.
- Annual reports should showcase who is impacted by interpreters. It could include one or two short stories from people to illustrate the need and reason for interpreters and how they affect the community.
- The Education Committee could provide feedback on drafts of annual reports.
- A list of resources can be added.
- The purpose and audience of the report, such as legislators, should be considered so the content is more impactful.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Issues Committee

Revisions to GR 11.2

- The Commission reviewed the latest draft of the revised General Rule (GR) 11.2, the Code of Conduct of interpreters. The Issues Committee had been reviewing drafts written by a group of interpreters that are part of Northwest Translators and Interpreters Society (NOTIS).
- The group reviewed a number of codes of conduct from other states and professional organizations. They also added a commentary to the code to provide additional context for interpreters.
- The original title of the code focuses on interpreting in the court room whereas the code actually has a wider scope and includes legal interpreting in other settings.
- The title of the updated code was changed to indicate that the code applied to the person and not the place.
- The Commission discussed the settings where the code would apply and the scope of the Commission's authority. The code is often used during discipline proceedings.
- Some Commission members felt that that the code would apply anytime when the interpreting event related to court proceedings or involved evidence that could be used in court, such as depositions and probation interviews.
- An American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter was part of the NOTIS revision group but the Commission felt the code would benefit from more input from the ASL interpreting community.
- The deadline for submitting the updated code to the Supreme Court Rules Committee for 2017 is **October 15**.
- The Commission decided to wait until 2018 to submit the code to allow more time to finalize the code and get input from the interpreting community. A final draft should be presented at the **May 2018** Commission meeting.

ACTION:

- The issues surrounding the title would be flagged for the Supreme Court Rules Committee when the code was submitted to them.
- Mr. Lichtenberg would do some consultation at an upcoming Washington State Registry for the Deaf (WSRID) conference.

Interpreter Compensation Survey

- The Commission discussed how to distribute the Interpreter Compensation Survey. The survey will be sent out with the annual report to Judges and Court Administrators electronically and by physical mail.

CEU approvals

- The Commission discussed the policy about interpreters receiving Continuing Education Credits for doing Commission related work.
- Several interpreters had recently worked on the updates to the GR 11.2 and a presentation at the Fall Judicial Conference.
- The current policy addressed some of the kinds of work that had to been done for the Commission in the past, such as teaching and translating. However, this recent work fell outside this scope.
- The Commission voted and unanimously approved the CEUs for the interpreters working on GR 11.2 revisions and who helped with the Judicial Fall Conference.

MOTION: Continuing Education credits are approved for the interpreters helping with the revision to GR11.2 and who participated in the Fall Judicial conference session. AOC staff is given the authority to decide on the appropriate number of credits based on the individual's participation.

ACTION: The Issue Committee was tasked with reviewing and updating the CEU policy to include granting credit for additional kinds of work for the Commission.

Education Committee

- **Court Interpreter Coordinator Workshop**
 - This was the first workshop bringing together court staff involved with scheduling interpreters from across the state. It took place in June in SeaTac and Yakima.
- **Fall Judicial Conference**
 - This interpreter session was a plenary session on the first day of the conference. It included two skits illustrating the kinds of frustrations that Limited English Proficient (LEP) and Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) individuals face in the court house. A number of people were involved in planning and presenting the skits, including interpreters, Commission members, attendees at the Deaf School in Vancouver, and judicial officers. This session also included an informational presentation by Justice González, Judge Doyle, Judge Beall, and Mr. Lichtenberg.
 - The reviews for the session were very high with no negative reviews. The Bench Card and Mr. Lichtenberg's presentation about the deaf community and language acquisition were highly rated.
- **Washington State Bar Association Family Law Conference (WSBAFLC)**
 - Mr. Lichtenberg presented a short training on working with interpreters.

Future Presentations

- The Gender and Justice Commission will have a session at the District and Municipal Court Judicial Association (DMCJA) conference and the Committee will be working with them on a portion about immigrant victims and domestic and sexual violence. This session will include information on interpreter issues.
- The Education Committee hopes to move towards webinars, bench book revisions, and other non-traditional resources in the next year.

PROGRAM REPORT

Court Interpreter Coordinator Workshop

- This workshop went very well and the AOC hoped to have a similar workshop more regularly. Having the regional conferences was a good idea that we hope to continue.

Reimbursement Program Outreach

- The two regional meetings brought together representatives from courts in the reimbursed program. They were held in SeaTac and in Yakima.
- It gave AOC staff a bigger picture of interpreter costs and the need for court funding not provided by the program.
- Many courts also expressed that they would be willing to get less money if it meant more courts could be in the program.

LAP Approval Criteria

- AOC contracts with courts in the reimbursement program require courts to submit updated Language Access Plans.
- AOC currently does not have criteria to judge the LAPs. Since the AOC does not have authority to approve LAPs, the Commission must approve them.
- The Commission discussed how specific the criteria would need to be and it was suggested that more general criteria may be better. Many courts have an LAP and it was suggested courts check their own most recent plans to see when it was most recently updated. Many courts may not have updated their plans in a number of years.
- AOC staff and Justice González will have a meeting to discuss the criteria.
- Starting criteria would be to group courts into three categories: courts who have a current LAP, courts who have an LAP that is out-of-date, and courts that do not have one.

Domestic Violence /Sexual Assault Forms Translation

- New forms are being translated with the help of the Gender and Justice Commission. Languages of the forms include Spanish, Korean, Russian, and Vietnamese.
- The Interpreter Commission can help by spreading the word when the forms are available.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Certification Exams Update

- This year we had the most candidates in program history take the Written Exam. Prior to the exam, AOC staff worked to expand on the outreach done in the past to reach more potential test candidates.
- There was a focus on contacting people who would have the necessary English skills to pass the exam.
- The outreach resulted in a larger number of people taking the exam and a more diverse group of languages spoken by the test candidates.
- Over the summer, 14 interpreters took the registered oral exams and most will be taking the Ethics and Protocol class in early November. This includes the first registered Oromo and Yoruba interpreters in Washington.
- The certified oral exams would be taking place over two weekends in October, in Shoreline and in Spokane. Fifty-one candidates have registered for the exam.

Tagalog-Specific Course Proposal

- Mr. Wells described the development of an online training class aimed at providing Filipino/Tagalog interpreters the kinds of court interpreting skills that would be beneficial in passing the certified oral exam.
- The AOC has been collaborating with the state of California to identify faculty and create an outline for the class. The faculty had submitted a proposal, which was shared with the Commission.
- This class would include much more language specific instruction than other online training classes, other than Spanish-specific classes. It was hoped that course can be a model for language-specific classes in other languages in the future. A special session of the oral exam would be offered for Filipino/Tagalog interpreters at the end of the class.

NCSC glossary Collaboration

- The NCSC established a workgroup to draft a guide for creating court interpreter glossaries that could be used for test preparation and for working in the courts.
- After the guide is complete, it will be used and tested in making a legal glossary for Burmese.
- A draft of the guide is being reviewed by the Language Access Advisory Council at the NCSC. Work on the Burmese glossary was planned to start in the near future.
- Mr. Wells is the contact for the collaboration and can be reached at james.wells@courts.wa.gov .

NCSC VRI Workgroup

- The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) had started a Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) project with a particular vendor but it proved unsuccessful. The NCSC was moving towards a different model where they would act as a clearing house resource and states would find providers themselves.
- The Commission discussed some challenges of implementing VRI, including:
 - Washington is decentralized state and it is difficult to find courts willing to take on a new project.
 - For courts that may not use VRI that often, it may not be worth the cost of setting up the infrastructure.
 - Interpreting remotely is difficult since the interpreter is less connected to the LEP party.
 - Often money for technology goes in the court room and not at other locations in the court house where interpreters are also necessary.

ASL Certification Report

- The Registry for the Interpreters of the Deaf (RID) has stopped offering the legal certification test. Many states used this test to credential ASL interpreters, and are now very concerned.
- Texas does have their own test and raters and some states were considering using that exam.
- Finding a test that could be used nationwide would be preferable so that there is not a regional variation.
- The discussed role of the NCSC would be the repository for an exam, run the pool of raters etc.

NEW BUSINESS

- Seattle Municipal Court has begun a mentoring program and is currently in week 3 of 12. Six sessions are done by webinar and the remaining are in person.
- Participants are interpreting in a number of languages, including: Tagalog, Korean, Thai, Mongolian and Cambodian.
- The Commission discussed having a meeting or forum with interpreters in the future.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.

Motions
Continuing Education credits are approved for the interpreters helping the revision to GR11.2 and who participated in Fall Judicial conference session. AOC staff is given the authority to decide on the appropriate number of credits based on the individual's participation.

Ms. Young is appointed to the Community Member Representative seat.

Action Items

Commission Members - Submit any input for the GR11.2 draft to AOC staff.

Issue Committee – Review and update the CEU policy to include granting credit for additional kinds of work for the Commission.

Ms. Noble – Create a list of terms for the GR11.2 draft.

Ms. Noble and Ms. Gracia – Discuss possible meetings or forums involving the Interpreter Commission and court interpreters.

AOC Staff - Send survey and annual report to judges and court admins by email and physical mail.

AOC staff – Meet with Justice González to discuss criteria that could be used to evaluate LAPs. Suggest creating three categories to start: courts with a current LAP, courts with an old one, and courts that don't have any.

AOC staff – Provide the Fall Conference presentation to Judge Bui for next year's judicial college to all Commission members.

AOC staff – Consult Ms. Englert about what kind of content could be included in the annual report that would be relevant for legislators.

DRAFT

Purpose

The Interpreter Services Funding Task Force is conducting a survey to gather information about local courts' interpreter services and funding needs. In March 2017, the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) adopted "obtaining adequate and sustainable funding for interpreter services" as one of their strategic priorities for 2017-2019. The Interpreter Services Funding Task Force was created and is working on identifying the current demand for interpreter services statewide, the costs associated with providing these services, and statewide funding options to meet these needs.

The survey should take approximately 30 minutes. You can leave the survey and come back to it at any point. *Questions 11-13 are critical in identifying current local funding levels and interpreter needs and may involve a little more data collection on your end. Several survey questions are attached to the email to help with this.*

One survey per court please. If you manage more than one court, respond for each court separately. The survey closes end of business day on December 22, 2017.

For the purposes of this survey unless otherwise specified, interpreter services refer to services provided by an interpreter via in person, telephonic means and remote interpretation for individuals that are limited English proficient or deaf and hard of hearing. In-court proceedings refers to any pretrial hearings, trials, attorney meetings, case hearings, etc. Other court services refers to services such as courthouse facilitation, front desk services, court-mandated programs, etc.

Your responses to the survey will be kept confidential. No individual data or identifying data will be shared. Your responses will be compiled with others and shared as an overview summary of results. Summary results will be available upon request.

If you have any questions please contact Jeanne.Englert@courts.wa.gov or 360-705-5207.

Thank you in advance for helping with this very important endeavor!

Task Force Chairs, Justice Steven González, Judge Michael Downes and Judge Andrea Beall.

Respondent Information

* 1. Please list the name of the court you represent. If you manage more than one court, please fill out a survey for each court separately.

* 2. Please choose your county.

- Adams County
- Asotin County
- Benton County
- Chelan County
- Clallam County
- Clark County
- Columbia County
- Cowlitz County
- Douglas County
- Ferry County
- Franklin County
- Garfield County
- Grant County
- Grays Harbor County
- Island County
- Jefferson County
- King County
- Kitsap County
- Kittitas County
- Klickitat County
- Lewis County
- Lincoln County
- Mason County
- Okanogan County

- Pacific County
- Pend Oreille County
- Pierce County
- San Juan County
- Skagit County
- Skamania County
- Snohomish County
- Spokane County
- Stevens County
- Thurston County
- Wahkiakum County
- Walla Walla County
- Whatcom County
- Whitman County
- Yakima County

* 3. Please select the level of court you represent.

- Supreme Court
- Court of Appeals
- Superior Court
- District Court
- Municipal Court

* 4. Please select your current position at the court.

- Presiding Judge
- Court Administrator
- Interpreter Coordinator/Point of Contact
- Other (please specify)

5. Please provide your contact information for any follow up.

Name:

Email Address:

* 6. Is your court part of the AOC Interpreter Reimbursement Program (AOC program that contracts with local courts to reimburse some costs of hiring interpreters)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

* 7. During the last 2 years, how often did your court need interpreter services?

- Fewer than 12 times a year
- At least monthly
- At least weekly
- Daily
- Don't know

Data and Costs

* 8. Based on your experience, please provide an estimate of the percentage (%) of contacts requiring interpreters in your court for each of the following: (we are looking for your best guess, not precise numbers)

Pretrial hearings

Hearings/trials

Other court services (such as front desk, mandated court programs, courthouse facilitators, etc.)

Other

Data and Costs

* 9. Indicate the sources of funds used to pay for language court interpreters in court proceedings?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
County/city funds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other state dollars	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
AOC reimbursement program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Litigants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Data and Costs

* 10. Indicate the sources of funds used to pay for language court interpreters for any other court services.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
County/city funds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other state dollars	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
AOC reimbursement program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Litigants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Data and Costs

The next three questions are critical to quantify the demand and levels for interpreter funding. The same questions are asked for years 2014, 2015 and 2016. If you only have numbers for one of the years, only complete that year.

11. Please complete the following information for 2014 as fully as possible. If no actual budget or contact figures are available, use your best estimate. Please round to the nearest dollar and only write in numbers.
For example: Q: For 2014, indicate the total money spent on interpreter services. A: 1200.

1) For 2014 indicate the total number of times you provided interpreter services

Of these in #1, approximately how many cases were court interpreters provided?

Of these in #1, approximately how many other court services were interpreters provided?

2) For 2014 indicate the amount of money originally allocated or requested from the county to provide interpreters for your court

3) For 2014, indicate the total money spent on interpreter services

12. Please complete the following information for 2015 as fully as possible. If no actual budget or contact figures are available, use your best estimate. Please round to the nearest dollar and only write in numbers
For example: Q: For 2015, indicate the total money spent on interpreter services. A: 1200.

1) For 2015 indicate the total number of times you provided interpreter services

Of these in #1, approximately how many cases were court interpreters provided?

Of these in #1, approximately how many other court services were interpreters provided?

2) For 2015 indicate the amount of money originally allocated or requested from the county to provide interpreters for your court

3) For 2015, indicate the total money spent on interpreter services

13. Please complete the following information as fully as possible for 2016. If no actual budget or contact figures are available, use your best estimate. Please round to the nearest dollar and only write in numbers
For example: Q: For 2016, indicate the total money spent on interpreter services. A: 1200.

1) For 2016 indicate the total number of times you provided interpreter services

Of these in #1, approximately how many cases were court interpreters provided?

Of these in #1, approximately how many other court services were interpreters provided?

2) For 2016 indicate the amount of money originally allocated or requested from the county to provide interpreters for your court

3) For 2016, indicate the total money spent on interpreter services

* 14. Are there interpreter services your court has considered but not implemented due to lack of funds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

If yes, please explain

15. If applicable, please describe any unexpected or extraordinary costs associated with your court's interpreter needs in the past two years.

Interpreter Experiences

* 16. Do you use non-certified interpreters for in court proceedings when certified interpreters are available?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

If yes, briefly explain

Interpreter Experiences

* 17. What is the approximate total number of different languages you provided interpreter services for over the last 2 years?

- 0 - 5
- 6 - 10
- 11 - 20
- 21 +

If 21+, please fill in an estimated amount

Interpreter Experiences

* 18. During the last 2 years, how often were interpreter services provided for the different types of court cases? [For each item, please mark the appropriate column]

	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	N/A
Criminal	<input type="radio"/>				
Juvenile	<input type="radio"/>				
Civil	<input type="radio"/>				
Domestic relations	<input type="radio"/>				
Small Claims	<input type="radio"/>				
Traffic	<input type="radio"/>				
Dependency/termination	<input type="radio"/>				
Other	<input type="radio"/>				

Other (please specify)

Interpreter Experiences

* 19. What language services does your court provide? [For each item, please mark the appropriate column]

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Interpreters (in-court proceedings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interpreters (other court services)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Telephonic interpreters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff interpreters onsite	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Translated forms (either pattern state forms or locally developed)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other translated materials (brochures, legal information, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Multilingual signage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Interpreter Experiences

* 20. For which of the following services are interpreters available in your court? [For each item, please mark the appropriate column]

	Yes	No	Don't Know	N/A
Front desk inquiries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pro se access to courthouse facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Courthouse facilitators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Court mandated programs (such as parenting classes, rehab programs, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Interpreter Experiences

* 21. In the last 2 years, has your court been unable to acquire the services of an interpreter at the time that they were required?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

If Yes, how often, what were the reasons, and what alternative did the court employ?

Translated Forms

* 22. What are your experiences using translated forms? [Check all that apply]

	Yes	No	Don't Know
We use state translated pattern forms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We use interpreters to orally translate forms for court users	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We use interpreters to translate forms in writing for court users	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More translated forms would improve local court language services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

* 23. Do you use locally translated forms?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

If yes, please list the languages you provide translated forms in.

Data Collection

* 24. Does the court have data collection procedures to track any of the following interpreter services? [For each item, please mark the appropriate column]

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Use of interpreters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of telephonic services, such as Language Line or other vendor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of in house bilingual specialists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Language groups served (the top 3-5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Demand for interpreter services for court mandated programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Continuances/delays in court procedures because no interpreter services are available	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Program Evaluation

* 25. Do you have quality control or a means of evaluating interpreter services and/or locally translated forms?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

If yes, please describe.

Program Practices

* 26. Are there any practices utilized in your court to maximize resources for interpreter services?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Collaborative efforts with justice partners (includes shared calendars, shared interpreters)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of remote technology (such as video remote technology)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On-line interpreter scheduling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scheduling cases with interpreters on the same day	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

Program Practices

* 27. Are there interpreter services your court has heard about in other courts or in other jurisdictions that would be promising to implement at your court?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

If yes, please explain

Program Priorities

* 28. If budget constraints were not an issue, what is your top need/priority around language access?

29. Are there any other issues or challenges we should know about providing interpreter services in your court?

CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR JUDICIARY INTERPRETERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Preamble
- Scope
- Applicability
- Compliance
- Definitions
- Cannons and comments

PREAMBLE

The purpose of this code is to establish standards of conduct that interpreters must abide by in order to preserve the integrity and independence of the judicial system. It establishes core ethical principles of interpreter conduct in all aspects of their profession.

As officers of the court, interpreters shall maintain high standards of professional conduct that promote public trust and confidence in the administration of justice.

SCOPE

The text of each rule is authoritative, while the comments provide important guidance in understanding the rules.

APPLICABILITY

All interpreters serving in the judicial system shall abide by this Code of Professional Responsibility.

COMPLIANCE

Interpreters who violate the provisions of this code are subject to a citation for contempt, disciplinary action or any other sanction that may be imposed by law.

DEFINITIONS

Source Language – the original language of the writer or speaker.

Target Language – the language of the receiving reader or listener.

Register – the level of formality of language, determined by such factors as social occasion, context, purpose, and audience, also called stylistic variation.

(a) ACCURACY

Interpreters shall reproduce in the target language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message without explanation, and/or altering, omitting, or adding anything to the meaning of what is stated or written.

Comment

[1] Interpreters are obligated to conserve every element of information contained in the source and target languages. In doing so, they fulfill a twofold duty: 1. to ensure that legal proceedings reflect in English precisely what is said or signed by Limited English Proficient individuals; and 2. to place Limited English Proficient individuals on an equal linguistic footing with those who are fully English proficient.

[2] Interpreters are required to apply their best skills and judgment to preserve, as faithfully as reasonably possible, the meaning of what is said or signed, preserving the style and register of speech and the ambiguities and nuances of the speaker.

Every statement should be interpreted, even if it appears non-responsive, obscene, rambling, or incoherent. This includes apparent misstatements. However, verbatim, "word for word," or literal interpretation is inappropriate if it distorts the meaning of what is said or signed.

Spoken language interpreters should convey the emotional emphasis of the speaker without reenacting or mimicking the speaker's emotions or dramatic gestures. Sign language interpreters, however, employ visual cues, including facial expressions, body language and hand gestures, which are structural elements of sign languages.

[3] The obligation to preserve accuracy includes the interpreter's duty to correct any substantive errors of interpretation as soon as possible. Interpreters should be prepared to accept feedback, including challenges to their interpretation, in a professional and impersonal manner.

[4] Due to the difficulty of interpreting audio files on the spot, the practice of doing so in court should be discouraged at all times. If ordered by the presiding officer to interpret an audio file in court, interpreters should comply but state, on the record, that they cannot guarantee the accuracy of the interpretation.

[5] The ethical responsibility to interpret accurately includes the responsibility of being properly prepared for assignments. Interpreters are encouraged to obtain documents and other information necessary to familiarize themselves with the nature and purpose of an assignment. Prior preparation is described below, and is especially important when testimony or documents include highly specialized terminology and subject matter.

Preparation may include but is not limited to:

- a. reviewing relevant documents, such as criminal complaints, police reports, briefs, witness lists, jury instructions, etc.;
- b. asking interpreters previously involved in the case for information on language use or style;
- c. asking attorneys involved in the case for additional relevant information.

(b) COMPETENCE

Interpreters shall not knowingly accept any assignment beyond their skill level. If at any point they have reservations about their ability to satisfy an assignment competently, they shall immediately disclose this to all parties and the court, if applicable.

In their professional capacity, interpreters shall not give legal or other advice or engage in any activity that may be construed as a service other than interpreting or translating.

Comment

[1] Interpreters are duty-bound to inquire about the assignment in advance and assess their competence to render services.

[2] Interpreters are not qualified to give written or oral counsel about a legal matter that could affect the rights and responsibilities of the person receiving the advice. General Rule 24 sets forth what constitutes the practice of law.

[3] Interpreters should maintain and expand competence in their field through professional development. Professional development includes steady practice; professional training; ongoing education; terminology research; regular and frequent interaction with colleagues and specialists in related fields; and staying abreast of current issues, laws, policies, rules and regulations that affect their profession.

[4] Interpreters should know and follow established protocols for delivering interpreting services. When speaking in English, interpreters should speak at a volume that enables them to be heard throughout the courtroom. They should interpret in the first person and refer to themselves in the third person.

(c) HONESTY AND INTEGRITY

Interpreters have an inviolable duty to provide honest services in which their behavior upholds the values outlined in this Code. They shall accurately represent their credentials, training, and relevant experience. Interpreters shall not engage in conduct that impedes their compliance with this Code, or allow another to induce or encourage them to violate the law or this Code.

Comment

[1] It is essential that interpreters present a complete and truthful account of their credentials, training, and relevant experience prior to an assignment so that their ability to satisfy it competently can be fairly evaluated.

(d) IMPARTIALITY AND NEUTRALITY

Interpreters shall faithfully render the source message without allowing their own views to interfere. They shall refrain from conduct that may give an appearance of bias and shall disclose any real or potential conflict of interest to all parties and the court, if applicable, as soon as they become aware of it.

Comment

-[1] Interpreters should strive for professional detachment. Interpreters should uphold impartiality by avoiding verbal and non-verbal displays of personal attitudes, prejudices, emotions, or opinions. Interpreters should render differing views or opinions expressed on any issue without allowing their own to interfere.

[2] As officers of the court, interpreters serve the court and the public, regardless of whether publicly or privately retained. Interpreters should uphold neutrality by avoiding any behavior that creates the appearance of favoritism toward anyone. Interpreters should maintain professional relationships with persons using their services, discourage personal dependence on the interpreter, and avoid participation in the proceedings in any capacity other than providing interpreter services. During the course of the proceedings, interpreters should not converse with parties, witnesses, jurors, attorneys, or with friends or relatives of any party, except in the discharge of their official functions.

[3] Interpreters should not serve in any matter in which they have an interest, financial or otherwise, in the outcome, unless a specific exception is allowed by the judicial officer for good cause and noted on the record. Interpreters should not solicit or accept any gifts or gratuities from any of the parties. Interpreters shall disclose any circumstance that creates a potential conflict of interest, including but not limited to the following:

- a. the interpreter is a friend, associate, or relative of a party, witness, victim, or counsel;
- b. the interpreter or the interpreter's friend, associate, or relative has a financial interest in the case at issue, a shared financial interest with a party to the proceeding, or any other interest that might be affected by the outcome of the case;
- c. the interpreter has served in an investigative capacity for any party involved in the case;
- d. the interpreter has previously been retained by a law enforcement agency to assist in the preparation of the criminal case at issue;
- e. the interpreter is an attorney in the case at issue;
- f. the interpreter has previously been retained for employment by one of the parties.

The existence of any one of the above-mentioned circumstances should be evaluated by the parties and the court, but should not automatically disqualify an interpreter from providing services. If an actual or perceived conflict of interest exists, the parties should determine whether it is appropriate for the interpreter to withdraw based upon the totality of the circumstances.

(e) CONFIDENTIALITY

Interpreters shall not divulge privileged or confidential information obtained in their professional capacity. They shall refrain from publicly discussing matters in which they serve.

Comment

[1] Privileged communications take place within the context of a protected relationship, such as that between an attorney and client, a husband and wife, a priest and penitent, and a doctor and patient. The law often protects against forced disclosure of such conversations. Interpreters are bound to maintain the confidentiality of all privileged communications.

[2] Interpreters are also routinely privy to communications that, while not necessarily privileged by law, are conveyed in confidence. Accordingly, interpreters have the ethical duty to refrain from disclosing information obtained in their professional capacity.



Interpreter Commission - Issues Committee
Tuesday, September 5, 2017 (12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m)
Teleconference

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Judge Beall
Thea Jennings
Linda Noble
Alma Zuniga

AOC Staff:

Robert Lichtenberg
James Wells

Members Absent:

LaTricia Kinlow

Call to Order

Meeting minutes from the August meeting approved with modification.

GR11.2 Revisions

The Committee reviewed the updated draft of the revisions to General Rule (GR) 11.2. Some of the elements discussed were:

- **Title:** The title of the document had been modified to emphasize that the code applies to the interpreters themselves and not the location. The change will be brought at the Commission meeting for further discussion.
- **Impartiality:** Being consistent with some terms of art such as “potential conflict” versus “perceived conflict” conflict throughout the section. Stating that the list of possible conflicts is not exhaustive and adding language such as, “including but not limited to”.
- **Confidentiality:** Some parts of the code referenced very specific and infrequent circumstances. Rather than provide useful guidance, they may clutter the code and open the door to a very long list of similar situations. Some references could be moved to the comments rather than completely eliminated.
- **Professionalism:** It may be possible to eliminate this section. Some elements of this section seem more like best practices rather code of conduct, such as references to the interpreter’s attire. This element of professionalism is implied by the preamble which indicates interpreters are officers of the court. References to criminal conduct are in the interpreter policy manual. The first paragraph of the comments sections could be moved under the Accuracy or Competence section.

Authorization for CEUs for Commission-related Work

The Committee discussed the policy of giving members of the Commission who are certified interpreters CEUs for some of their work. There are two projects the Commission is involved in that seem eligible for credits: Revisions to GR11.2 and Skits for Fall Judicial Conference.

The Issues Committee will recommend to the Commission that interpreters in group revising GR11.2 receive credits. The Issues Committee was involved in this project as well and understood the project and the work the interpreters did. The Committee felt the Commission should decide for group working on the Fall Judicial Conference skit since the Issues Committee was not unfamiliar with the project and the work done by the interpreters.

The Committee also discussed the possibility of changing policy to allow AOC staff to determine whether or not interpreters should receive CEUs rather than having the Issues Committee involved in the process.

Complaint

The Committee discussed a complaint brought against an interpreter that misrepresented himself as a certified interpreter. They discussed how much authority the Commission had over an interpreter who is not credentialed. The Committee suggested that the Commission could send a letter and educating the court, court staff, and presiding judge. Before proceeding the Committee wanted to gather evidence beyond the content of the letter. A transcript of the court proceeding would be requested to further investigate the incident.

Action Item
AOC Staff – Request court transcript regarding complaint about interpreter.



Interpreter Commission - Issues Committee
Tuesday, November 7, 2017 (12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m)
Teleconference

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Judge Andrea Beall
Thea Jennings
Linda Noble
Alma Zuniga
Elisa Young

AOC Staff:

Robert Lichtenberg
James Wells

Members Absent:

LaTricia Kinlow

Call to Order

Meeting minutes from October meeting approved.

GR 11.2 Revisions

The Committee reviewed the latest draft of the revision to the Interpreter Code of Conduct:

- Headings and Titles: A system of short titles or numbering could be useful for discussing elements of the code. A heading probably not necessary since it may clutter the text when the canons are already so short.
- List of definitions: Currently 3 terms are defined. This list could be moved under the preamble. Judiciary interpreters was not defined because creating a specific list of settings where the code applies may unintentionally exclude occasions when it should.
- Plain English: The register of the language used in the code seemed sufficient for interpreters. However, some members of the public, including Limited English Proficient (LEP) individuals, may also need access to the code to understand the responsibilities of interpreters. Some confusing terms may need to be reworded, especially in the comment section, but it would be important to make sure that the language is not watered down such that it loses the meaning.

Continuing Education Unit Policy

The Committee discussed some revised language provided by AOC staff involving Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for interpreters who do work for the Interpreter Commission. The policy would expand the kinds of work that interpreters could do for the Commission and receive CEUs. This policy also put a cap on the amount of credit instructors could receive for class preparation. The Committee discussed the organization of the sections within the policy and the number of credits available for the different kinds of work.

Next Meeting

First Tuesday in December

Action Item
<i>AOC Staff</i> – Forward the next version of code of conduct to Lynne Lumsden to review code for ASL interpreters.
<i>AOC Staff</i> – For recently received complaint, request audio recording to identify what sections may need to be transcribed.
<i>AOC Staff</i> – Send out revision of CEU policy changes based on meeting discussion.

SCJA Judicial Education Committee Session Proposal Form

Superior Court Judges' Spring Program

April 8-11, 2018

Campbell's Resort, Chelan, WA

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: September 1st to phil.zitzelman@courts.wa.gov

PROPOSED SESSION TITLE: Immigration's Impact on the Judiciary: Maintaining the Integrity of Your Courtroom	STATUS: <input type="checkbox"/> Received Date: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Not Accepted Why: _____
---	---

PROPOSED BY: Washington State Minority and Justice/Gender & Justice/Interpreter Commission Education Committees CONTACT NAME: Carolyn Cole CONTACT PHONE: 360-704-5536 CONTACT EMAIL: Carolyn.cole@courts.wa.gov	TARGET AUDIENCE: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experienced Judges <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Judges <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experienced Commissioners <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Commissioners
---	---

PROPOSED DURATION: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 90 Minutes <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Hours <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Hours <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	SESSION TYPE: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plenary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choice	IS THERE A LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, maximum number:
--	---	---

TOPIC AREA:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Law <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Law <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Law <input type="checkbox"/> Ethics <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Decision-Making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Courtroom Skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good Communication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro Se Litigants <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Law <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dependencies <input type="checkbox"/> Constitutional Law

REQUIRED COMPONENTS
The session must address the following essential areas of information:

Substantive Knowledge	Administrative/Procedural	Skills, Attitudes & Beliefs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current executive orders regarding immigration enforcement Letter from Chief Justice Fairhurst to Homeland Security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completing judicial certification for U Visa for victims of crime Best practices for courthouse policies and procedures, including scheduling interpreters/posting dockets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to immigrant litigants Responding to victims of crimes such as domestic violence Ethical issues for courthouse interpreters when asked to interpret for ICE Access to justice for immigrant

SCJA Judicial Education Committee Session Proposal Form

Superior Court Judges' Spring Program

April 8-11, 2018

Campbell's Resort, Chelan, WA

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: September 1st to phil.zitzelman@courts.wa.gov

		victims of crime
--	--	------------------

RECOMMENDED FACULTY, INCLUDING CONTACT INFORMATION (tentative)

Grace Huang, Policy Director at Asian Pacific Institute on Gender Based Violence gjuang@api-gbv.org

Judge David Estudillo, Grant County destudillo@grantcountywa.gov

Milena Calderari-Waldron – Interpreter expert milenacw@live.com

SESSION DESCRIPTION: Describe the purpose of the session and key issues to be presented. Explain what judicial officers will learn in the course and how the information will apply to their work in the courts (*this information will be included in the program flyer as your session description*).

How are current executive orders and Homeland Security actions affecting courtrooms nationally and locally? What options do courts have if ICE agents are standing in the hallway prior to a domestic violence hearings? This presentation will review this complex and mobile area of law, with an emphasis on policies to increase access to the courts for crime victims.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Describe what participants will be able to do or say as a result of this session.

As a result of this session, participants will be able to:

1. Understand the current legal landscape of immigration enforcement in Washington State
2. Understand what a U Visa Certification is and why a Judicial Officer may be asked to sign one
3. Be prepared to assess and modify courthouse policies and procedures, including policies about scheduling interpreters, to increase access for immigrants, and specifically immigrant victims of crime

SCJA Judicial Education Committee Session Proposal Form

Superior Court Judges' Spring Program

April 8-11, 2018

Campbell's Resort, Chelan, WA

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: September 1st to phil.zitzelman@courts.wa.gov

FUNDAMENTALS COVERED: Describe the case law, best practices, or “nuts and bolts” that will be addressed during the session.

This session will cover:

- Judicial officer's role in U Visa Certification
- Courthouse policies on immigration enforcement
- Best practices for scheduling interpreters for immigrant litigants and posting dockets
- Ethical issues for courthouse interpreters when asked to interpret for ICE

PARTICIPANT RESOURCES: Describe the resources faculty will recommend participants reference when handling the key issues described in this session (*e.g., bench books, checklists, bench cards, websites, organizations, agencies, etc.*).

- Bench cards
- Domestic Violence Manual for Judges Appendix F – the Overlap Between State Law and Immigration Law
- Online resources

PROPOSED TEACHING METHODS AND ACTIVITIES: Describe how the session will be presented to actively engage the audience in the education (*e.g., small/large group discussion, hypotheticals, case study review, role play, lecturette, etc.*).

- I. Power point
- II. Hypotheticals
- III. Large group discussion
- IV. Responder questions

ANTICIPATED COST:

\$2,000 for faculty travel expenses and lodging

FUNDING RESOURCES:

Gender and Justice Commission, Minority and Justice Commission, Interpreter Commission.



Interpreter Commission- Education Committee
October 25, 2017 (12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.)
Teleconference

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Katrin Johnson
Eileen Farley
Lynne Lumsden
Fona Sugg
Linda Noble

AOC Staff:

Robert Lichtenberg
James Wells

Members Absent:

Francis Adewale

Meeting Called to Order

Previous meeting minutes approved without modification.

Upcoming Education Sessions

SCJA Conference

A proposal had been submitted to the Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA) and District and Municipal Court Judges Association (DMCJA) spring conferences. The proposal involves immigration and the rights of the LEP party. It is a joint proposal submitted in conjunction with the Minority and Justice and Gender and Justice Commissions. Some issues will be interpreter ethics, who's being asked to interpret in a courthouse, and immigrant victims of domestic violence or sexual assault. The panel will include an interpreter who will talk about best practices.

DMCMA Spring Conference

Ms. Kinlow was interested in having a presentation similar to the recent Fall Judicial conference at the District and Municipal Court Managers Association (DMCMA) conference. The presentation would be tailored to that audience. The conference would be in Chelan and Ms. Lumsden volunteered to help set it up.

LAP Trainings

The Committee discussed what kind of trainings would be useful for courts in the roll out of the new Language Access Plan (LAP). The trainings could be webinars, regional workshops, or conference sessions.

Sessions for spring conferences may be too late since the deadline for new LAP submission was the end of April. District and municipal courts sometimes have regional conferences early in the year.

In-person trainings may be a challenge since it can be difficult for court staff to attend. Webinars could be recorded and include documents and other resources that could be downloaded.

The Committee discussed what areas of the plan would be helpful to provide training on. Finding demographic information is frequently a challenge for courts. Each section of the template should be reviewed to help identify where help would be the most useful.

Interpreter Training

The Committee discussed what their role could be beyond judicial officers and court staff and if it should include interpreter training. There were concerns that including interpreter training may stretch the Committee too thin and that its focus should be on court training. The rules to allow for the creation of a sub-committee.

The Committee discussed some of the challenges in interpreter training. Many of the available trainings are webinars which repeat the same content. It is difficult to identify what the needs are for interpreters. The AOC could reach out to interpreters themselves to see what some priorities should be. There are companies that provide training, although these classes can be expensive. Some interpreter organizations also offer trainings, but since they are volunteer based they have limitations on time and money available to them.

Next Meeting

The Committee will reconvene after the Thanksgiving holiday to discuss trainings based on the Language Access Plan.



**59th Washington Judicial Conference
Session Evaluation**

**Interpreters 2.0: Language Access in Washington
Courts**

Sunday, September 17, 2017

Audience: 151 Evaluations: 55

Please check the appropriate box to indicate your evaluation of this course.

	YES	NO	NA
1. I gained important information.	96.36%	3.64%	3.64%
2. Substantive written materials (if provided) assisted my learning.	94.55%	5.45%	1.82%
3. The course was well organized/coordinated.	94.55%	5.45%	1.82%
4. The faculty engaged/involved me in meaningful activities.	78.18%	23.64%	16.36%

Please rate the faculty on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = poor; 5 = excellent)

	Overall Teaching Effectiveness	Made clear connection to the workplace	Well prepared and organized	Average Score
Judge Andrea L. Beal	4.57	4.83	4.75	4.72
Judge Theresa B. Doyle	4.30	4.75	4.61	4.55
Justice Steven C. González	4.44	4.75	4.58	4.59
Mr. Robert W. Lichtenberg	4.73	4.83	4.80	4.79

What aspect of the course did you find most valuable and why?

Comments:

- Very unique skits added to presentation and made it much more interesting.
- I already knew most of this, but good review and very important for newjudges.
- This was a great program for learning helpful tools to deal with an occasional issue-my rural court.
- Excellent.
- Bob Lichtenberg was excellent. I never know there were much nuances regarding emotions in interpretation.
- Understanding why Certified Deaf Interpreters may be needed as well as ASL. Thinking about how to make interpreter services available at counter as well as in hearings.
- Have never required nor been in court with ASL.
- Great presentation. Was expecting something dry and uninteresting. Was pleasantly surprised and was in awe throughout. Thanks.
- Details about deaf interpreters need for more of that.
- Excellent subject, great refresher.
- Lichtenberg!!
- Mr. Lichtenberg's information was fabulous.
- Demonstrations very interactive.

- Refresher of the law and reminder of how it applies and it is important.
- The handout and bench card most of the session mostly retired the materials.
- Bench card handout.
- Materials and bench card couldn't hear the skits.
- To low key, felt like just reading slides.
- This session should be presented at every conference.
- Very educational & engaging. Bob's presentation on diff/need of CDI and ASL was fantastic.
- Mr. Lichtenberg is always fascinating and his team did a great job.
- Good reminder of the barriers so many people have experienced to the feeling & reality of justice being accessible.
- Excellent.
- The whole things. The two vignettes were very enlighten. Each speaker was great and important information.
- Excellent materials & slides. Practical & attentive to many questions that came up. Bench card was excellent.
- Update bench card courtroom interpreting card.
- More time for questions was needed.
- Sign language information was very helpful.
- Interesting to see a proceeding conducted in ASL. The subtlety & expressive feeling translated was very nuanced.

The AOC endeavors to promote equality and impartiality in our courses. Please check the appropriate box below. Diversity issues (e.g. gender, race, culture, sexual orientation, religion, disability) were:

Not relevant to topic
3.64%

Relevant to course and addressed adequately
52.73%

Relevant to topics but not addressed adequately
3.64%

Other Comments:

- Mehrabians Communication Research says only 7% of the meaning is in words that are spoken (according to Ms. Barnes, the first speaker at this conference). How effective are telephonic interpreters if we actually lose 93% of the meaning with that method? This may merit further consideration/discussion.
- The last session by Bob Lichtenberg was very informative and important. The term CDI (certified deaf interpreter) was new to me. The history of how a deaf person acquires language vs. how a hearing person learned ASL was very interesting and thought provoking. Thank you.
- Needed time for questions i.e. what to do about certification of interpreters who is incompetent.
- Judge Doyle had a tough assignment working through the basic rules and laws. Had to make that interesting.

- Bob Lichtenberg was exceptional presenter and those who presented with him were as well. Very worthwhile. Thanks.
- Thinking about how to communicate effectively by avoiding expressions and big words applies in all contexts, not just with interpreters.
- The materials did not sync with the visual presentation. I also probably think switching of several presenters is distracting. Judge Doyle appears knowledgeable but her vocal presentation was very monotone. I find more “excited” presenters help my participation.
- Excellent. X3
- Good combination of written & experiential learning.

Instructions for Temporary Order for Protection and Notice of Hearing Instrucciones para una Orden de protección temporal y Notificación de audiencia

La presente es una Orden de protección temporal. En caso de estar firmada por el juez, esta orden:

- informará a la parte demandada las restricciones que se encuentran en vigor; y
- fijará la fecha para la próxima audiencia (audiencia completa).

El secretario archivará la orden original en el registro judicial público y distribuirá copias:

- a usted (copias certificadas sin costo);
- al agente del orden público, para su ingreso en la base de datos a nivel estatal;
- con fines de notificación a la parte demandada.

Consulte al secretario del tribunal antes de llenar la orden.

En algunos tribunales, el juez llena este formulario. En otros tribunales, se dispondrá que sea usted quien deba llenar el formulario. Por favor, consulte al respecto al secretario del tribunal.

- En caso de que se disponga que sea usted quien deba llenar la orden, siga las instrucciones que se incluyen a continuación.
- Puede resultar de utilidad pedirle al secretario del tribunal los servicios de un intercesor para que le ayude a llenar esta orden.

¡Escriba claramente en letra de molde! Utilice tinta azul o negra, solamente

(Página 1:)

- Escriba su nombre (nombre, inicial del segundo nombre y apellido) como la parte demandante, e indique su fecha de nacimiento donde dice "FDN".
- La persona de quien usted desea protegerse es la "parte demandada". Escriba el nombre de la parte demandada (nombre, inicial del segundo nombre y apellido) y fecha de nacimiento. En caso de que desconozca la fecha de nacimiento de la parte demandada, indique la edad de ésta.

Próxima audiencia:

El juez o el secretario del tribunal anotarán la fecha, hora y lugar de la próxima audiencia, en la primera página de la orden.

- Deberá asistir a esta audiencia para que la orden de protección siga en vigor.
- Si no asiste a esta audiencia, el tribunal desechará la petición y usted se quedará sin una orden que le proteja.
- Si la parte demandada no asiste a la audiencia y se le ha notificado un citatorio formal, aún así el tribunal podría concederle a usted una orden de protección.

Nombres de menores:

- **En caso de que no haya menores involucrados**, marque la casilla "No hay menores involucrados".
- **En caso de que haya menores involucrados**, indique el nombre (nombre, inicial del segundo nombre y apellido) y la edad de cada menor involucrado en este caso.
- Si tiene usted alguna pregunta acerca de la seguridad de sus niños, solicite los servicios de un intercesor para que le ayuden a llenar esta sección.

Rasgos identificatorios de la parte demandada:

- Describa el aspecto físico de la parte demandada: sexo, raza, color de cabello, estatura, peso, color de ojos.
- Describa las características particulares de la parte demandada, tales como lunares, cicatrices o tatuajes.
- Marque la casilla para indicar si la parte demandada tiene acceso a armas.

Páginas 1 y 2:

Disposiciones de protección:

- Marque las mismas casillas que marcó en la Solicitud.
- En cada disposición asegúrese de identificar las personas y lugares que han de ser protegidos.
- Recuerde: Usted tiene el derecho de mantener confidencial su dirección residencial. Si usted quiere mantener confidencial su dirección, deberá proveer una dirección en donde recibir los documentos legales.

Página 3:

La Orden de entrega de armas se gestionará por separado

Marque esta casilla si ha pedido al tribunal una orden temporal para requerir que el demandado entregue armas de fuego y otras armas peligrosas.

Si usted marcó esta casilla, traiga también la *Orden de entrega de armas emitida sin notificación*, formulario Todos los casos 02.030 para que el tribunal lo complete.

Registro de datos en el Centro de información del crimen de Washington (WACIC)

Esta orden se ingresará en una base de datos a nivel estatal que se utiliza con fines del orden público de forma tal que cualquier funcionario del estado pueda tener conocimiento de la misma. Escriba en letra de molde el nombre del organismo que tiene jurisdicción en el lugar donde usted reside.

- Si su domicilio se encuentra fuera de los límites de la ciudad, indique el alguacil (sheriff) del condado.

- Si su domicilio se encuentra dentro de los límites de la ciudad, indique la policía de la ciudad.

Notificación

Esta orden, cualquier orden de entrega de armas y la petición deben ser entregadas a la parte demandada. La parte demandada debe estar informada acerca de cuáles son las disposiciones de restricciones que se encuentran vigentes y cuándo se celebrará la audiencia. Para la notificación de la orden, usted puede optar por:

- un agente del orden público;
- un profesional contratado para la notificación del proceso;
- otra persona de 18 años o más, que no sea parte de este caso.

Si usted quiere que el agente del orden público notifique la orden, debe nombrar el departamento de policía o alguacil correspondiente al lugar de residencia o trabajo de la parte demandada:

- Si el domicilio para notificaciones a la parte demandada se encuentra fuera de los límites de la ciudad, indique el alguacil del condado..
- Si el domicilio para notificaciones a la parte demandada se encuentra dentro de los límites de la ciudad, indique la policía de la ciudad.

Si usted está realizando arreglos privados para la notificación de la presente orden, marque esa casilla. Los arreglos privados incluyen:

- Un profesional contratado para la notificación del proceso;
- Otra persona de 18 años o más, que no sea parte de esta acción.

Necesitará indicar un domicilio en el cual pueda ubicarse a la parte demandada para la notificación. Este domicilio puede ser particular o laboral. Si usted desconoce el domicilio para notificaciones de la parte demandada, comuníquese con el secretario o el intercesor para obtener información.

Si no se puede realizar la entrega de notificación personal, el tribunal fijará otra fecha de audiencia y solicitará cualquiera de los siguientes:

- uno o más intentos de entrega de la notificación, o bien
- permitir la notificación por publicación o por correo postal.

El solicitante tiene la opción de seguir intentando con la notificación personal, aunque el tribunal no **requiera** esto más que en dos ocasiones. Si se fracasa en dos intentos de entregar la notificación de esta orden en persona, el tribunal debe permitir que se notifique por publicación o por correo.

Ayuda por parte de un agente del orden público:

El juez puede ordenar a un agente del orden público que le ayude en forma limitada, como ayudarlo a (marque la casilla que se aplique):

- volver a ocupar su casa,
- sacar sus efectos personales,
- traslado de la custodia de los niños, en ciertos casos,
- otra forma de ayuda, según se describa.

Firme el formulario:

El juez llenará la fecha y hora en que se expidió la orden y la firmará.

Firme al pie de la orden, en el espacio que dice, "Presentada por " y "Parte demandante".

Ver arriba para información sobre la notificación oficial.

Hoja de información de la autoridad policial (LEIS)

Usted debe completar la Hoja de información de la autoridad policial (LEIS) formulario WPF Todos los casos 01.0400. Este formulario es confidencial y no forma parte del archivo público del tribunal y no se entrega a la parte demandada.

- La autoridad policial lo utiliza para ubicar e identificar a la parte demandada cuando se le entregan los documentos.
- La autoridad policial también lo utiliza cuando ingresa la orden en una base de datos a nivel estatal.

Complete tanta información como le sea posible, especialmente primer nombre, inicial del segundo nombre, apellido(s) y fecha de nacimiento.

Si la parte demandada tiene una discapacidad, lesión cerebral, u otro impedimento, usted debe saber acerca de la ayuda especial que se le puede brindar cuando se da la notificación. Por ejemplo:

“El demandado tiene una lesión cerebral. Si se le apremia, se podría paralizar y no respondería con rapidez, o puede recurrir a la agresión verbal. Recuerde al demandado que se ponga en contacto con un amigo”.

“El demandado padece de diabetes y epilepsia y podría tener convulsiones al estresarse. El demandado no responde bien cuando se le apremia y necesitaría tiempo para obtener medicamentos y suministros”.

Si usted sabe que el demandado tiene armas de fuego u otras armas peligrosas asegúrese de especificar el tipo y cantidad.

Notice: You must complete this form in English.
(Atención: Usted debe llenar este formulario en inglés.)

<p>Court of Washington (Tribunal de Washington)</p> <p>For (Para)</p>	<p>No. (N°)</p> <p>Temporary Order for Protection and Notice of Hearing (TMORPRT) (Orden de protección temporal y Notificación de audiencia) (Clerk's Action Required) (Se requiere intervención del secretario)</p> <p>Next Hearing Date/Time: (Fecha y hora de la próxima audiencia)</p> <hr/> <p>At (En):</p> <hr/>						
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> Petitioner (Parte Demandante) </td> <td style="width: 40%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> DOB (FDN) </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"> vs. (contra) </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> Respondent (Parte Demandada) </td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"> DOB (FDN) </td> </tr> </table>	Petitioner (Parte Demandante)	DOB (FDN)	vs. (contra)		Respondent (Parte Demandada)	DOB (FDN)	
Petitioner (Parte Demandante)	DOB (FDN)						
vs. (contra)							
Respondent (Parte Demandada)	DOB (FDN)						

Names of minors (Nombres de los menores):

No minors Involved (No hay menores involucrados)

First (Nombre)	Middle (Seg. nombre)	Last (Apellido)	Age (Edad)
-------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	---------------

Caution: Access to weapons: yes no unknown

(Advertencia: Acceso a armas de fuego: [-] sí [-] no [-] se desconoce)

The court finds (El tribunal declara que):

The court has jurisdiction over the parties, the minors, and the subject matter. The respondent will be served notice of his or her opportunity to be heard at the scheduled hearing. RCW 26.50.070. For good cause shown, the court finds that an emergency exists and that a Temporary Protection Order should be issued without notice to the respondent to avoid irreparable harm or injury.

(El tribunal tiene jurisdicción sobre las partes, los menores y el caso. Se le dará notificación formal a la parte demandada de su oportunidad de ser escuchada durante la audiencia programada. RCW 26.50.070. Para que pueda haber un motivo justificado, se ha determinado que existe una emergencia y

Respondent Identifiers (Rasgos identificatorios de la parte demandada)

Sex (Sexo)	Race (Raza)	Hair (Cabello)
Height (Estatura)	Weight (Peso)	Eyes (Ojos)

Respondent's Distinguishing Features:

(Rasgos particulares de la parte demandada:)

que deberá emitirse una Orden de protección temporal, sin informar a la parte demandada a fin de evitar daños irreparables o lesiones.)

The court orders:
(El tribunal ordena:)

<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Respondent is restrained from causing petitioner physical harm, bodily injury, assault, including sexual assault, and from molesting, harassing, threatening, or stalking <input type="checkbox"/> petitioner <input type="checkbox"/> the minors named in the table above <input type="checkbox"/> these minors only: (Se prohíbe a la parte demandada que cause daño físico, lesiones corporales, agresiones, incluso agresiones sexuales, incluyendo hostigar, acosar, amenazar o acechar [-] a la parte demandante [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior [-] solamente los siguientes menores):</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. Respondent is restrained from harassing, following, keeping under physical or electronic surveillance, cyberstalking as defined in RCW 9.61.260, and using telephonic, audiovisual, or other electronic means to monitor the actions, locations, or wire or electronic communication of <input type="checkbox"/> petitioner <input type="checkbox"/> the minors named in the table above <input type="checkbox"/> only the minors listed below <input type="checkbox"/> members of the victim's household listed below <input type="checkbox"/> the victim's adult children listed below: (Se prohíbe a la parte demandada que hostigue, aceche, mantenga bajo vigilancia física o electrónica, ciberacecho como se define en RCW 9.61.260, y utilice medios telefónicos, audiovisuales u otros medios electrónicos para vigilar las acciones, ubicaciones, o la comunicación alámbrica o electrónica de [-] la parte demandante [-] los menores nombrados en la tabla de arriba [-] solo los menores que aparecen abajo [-] miembros de la unidad familiar de la víctima nombrados abajo [-] los hijos adultos de la víctima nombrados abajo)</p>

Additional no contact provisions are on the next page.

(En la página siguiente hay prohibiciones adicionales de contacto.)

The terms of this order shall be effective until:

(Los términos de la presente orden estarán en vigor hasta:)

The end of the hearing, noted above (El final de la audiencia señalada arriba)

<p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Respondent is restrained from coming near and from having any contact whatsoever, in person or through others, by phone, mail, or any means, directly or indirectly, except for mailing or service of process of court documents by a 3rd party or contact by respondent's lawyer(s) with <input type="checkbox"/> petitioner <input type="checkbox"/> the minors named in the table above <input type="checkbox"/> these minors only: (Se prohíbe a la parte demandada acercarse o establecer cualquier contacto, en persona o a través de otros, por teléfono, correo, o por cualquier otro medio, en forma directa o indirecta, salvo a los fines del envío por correo o la notificación de los documentos del proceso judicial por parte de un tercero o mediante el contacto por parte de el/los abogado(s) de la parte demandada con [-] la parte demandante [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior [-] solamente los siguientes menores):</p>

4. Respondent is **restrained** from going onto the grounds of or entering petitioner's
 residence workplace school; the day care or school of the minors named in
the table above these minors only:

*(Se **prohíbe** a la parte demandada estar en la propiedad o entrar en [-] la residencia de la parte demandante, su [-] lugar de trabajo, [-] la escuela; [-] guardería o escuela de [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior, [-] estos menores solamente):*

- Petitioner's address is confidential. Petitioner waives confidentiality of the address which is:

([-] El domicilio de la parte demandante es confidencial. [-] la parte demandante renuncia al derecho de mantener confidencial el siguiente domicilio):

- other (otros):

5. Petitioner shall have exclusive right to the residence petitioner and respondent share. The respondent shall immediately **vacate** the residence. The respondent may take respondent's personal clothing and respondent's tools of trade from the residence while a law enforcement officer is present. This address is confidential. Petitioner waives confidentiality of this address which is:

*(La parte demandante tendrá derecho exclusivo sobre la residencia que comparten la parte demandante y la parte demandada. La parte demandada deberá **desalojar** inmediatamente la residencia. La parte demandada podrá llevarse sus artículos de vestimenta personal y herramientas de trabajo de la residencia mientras se encuentre presente un agente del orden público. [-] Esta dirección es confidencial. [-] La parte demandante renuncia al derecho de mantener confidencial la siguiente dirección):*

6. Respondent is **prohibited** from knowingly coming within, or knowingly remaining within _____ (distance) of: petitioner's residence workplace school;
 the day care or school of the minors named in the table above these minors only:

*(Se **prohíbe** a la parte demandada acercarse intencionalmente o permanecer intencionalmente dentro de [____] (distancia) de: [-] la residencia [-] lugar de trabajo [-] escuela de la parte demandante; [-] la guardería o escuela de [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior [-] solamente los siguientes menores):*

- other (otros):

7. Petitioner shall have possession of essential personal belongings, including the following:
La parte demandante tendrá la posesión de los efectos personales esenciales, incluyendo los siguientes):

8. Petitioner is granted use of the following vehicle:

(Se concede a la parte demandante el uso del siguiente vehículo):

Year, Make & Model _____ License No. _____
(Año, marca y modelo) (Placa N°)

9. **Other (Otros):**

Protections for minors: (*Protección de menores:*)

10. Petitioner is **granted** the temporary care, custody, and control of the minors named in the table above these minors only:

(Se **concede** a la parte demandante el cuidado, custodia y control temporal de [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior [-] solamente los siguientes menores):

11. Respondent is **restrained** from interfering with petitioner's physical or legal custody of the minors named in the table above these minors only:

(Se **prohíbe** a la parte demandada interferir en la custodia física o legal a cargo de la parte demandante de [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior [-] solamente los siguientes menores):

12. Respondent is **restrained** from removing from the state the minors named in the table above these minors only:

(Se **prohíbe** a la parte demandada sacar del estado a [-] los menores identificados en el cuadro anterior [-] solamente los siguientes menores):

Surrender of Weapons Order filed separately (*Orden de entrega de armas gestionada por separado*)

The respondent must comply with the *Order to Surrender Weapons Issued Without Notice* filed separately, which requires the respondent to surrender any firearms and other dangerous weapons.

(La parte demandada debe cumplir con la Orden de entrega de armas emitida sin notificación archivada por separado, la cual requiere que la parte demandada entregue cualesquiera armas de fuego y otras armas peligrosas.)

The court finds that irreparable injury could result if the order to surrender weapons is not issued. (*El tribunal determina que si no se emite la orden de entregar armas podrían ocurrir lesiones irreparables.*)

The respondent is directed to appear and show cause why this temporary order should not be made effective for one year or more and why the court should not order the relief requested by the petitioner or other relief which may include electronic monitoring, payment of costs, and treatment.

(Se le ordena a la parte demandada que comparezca y que exponga las causas por las que esta orden no deba tener vigencia por un año o más, y por qué no debe el tribunal ordenar la protección judicial solicitada por la parte demandante u otra protección que podría incluir la monitorización electrónica, pago de costos y tratamiento.)

Failure to Appear at the Hearing May Result in the Court Granting Such Relief. The Next Hearing Date is Shown on Page One.

(El tribunal podría conceder dicha protección si no asiste a la audiencia. La fecha de la próxima audiencia se muestra en la página uno.)

Warnings to Respondent: A violation of provisions 1 through 6 of this order with actual notice of its terms is a criminal offense under chapter 26.50 RCW and will subject you to arrest. If the violation of the protection order involves travel across a state line or the boundary of a tribal jurisdiction, or involves conduct within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, which includes tribal lands, you may be subject to criminal prosecution in federal court under 18 U.S.C. § 2261, 2261A, or 2262.

(Advertencias a la parte demandada: La violación de las disposiciones 1 a 6 de la presente orden, ante la efectiva notificación de sus términos, constituye un delito penal en virtud del capítulo 26.50 RCW y usted estará sujeto a arresto. Si la violación de la orden de protección implica viajar más allá de los límites del estado o de una jurisdicción tribal, o implica una conducta dentro de la jurisdicción especial marítima y territorial de los Estados Unidos, la cual incluye las tierras tribales, usted podría estar sujeto a una acción penal ante los tribunales federales en virtud de 18 U.S.C. §§ 2261, 2261A, o 2262.)

A violation of provisions 1 through 6 of this order is a gross misdemeanor unless one of the following conditions apply: Any assault that is a violation of this order and that does not amount to assault in the first degree or second degree under RCW 9A.36.011 or 9A.36.021 is a class C felony. Any conduct in violation of this order that is reckless and creates a substantial risk of death or serious physical injury to another person is a class C felony. Also, a violation of this order is a class C felony if you have at least two previous convictions for violating a protection order issued under Titles 7, 10, 26 or 74 RCW.

(La violación de las disposiciones 1 a 6 de la presente orden constituye un delito menor grave a menos que se aplique una de las siguientes condiciones: Cualquier agresión que constituya una violación de esta orden y que no encuadre como agresión de primer o segundo grado en virtud de RCW 9A.36.011 o 9A.36.021 constituye un delito mayor clase C. Toda conducta que viole la presente orden que implique imprudencia y que conlleve un riesgo considerable de muerte o lesiones corporales graves para otra persona constituye un delito mayor clase C. Asimismo, toda violación de la presente orden constituye un delito mayor clase C si usted tiene al menos dos condenas previas por violar una orden de protección emitidas en virtud de los Títulos 7, 10, 26 o 74 RCW.)

If the court issues a final protection order, and your relationship to the petitioner is that of spouse or former spouse, parent of a common child, or former or current cohabitant as intimate partner, including current or former registered domestic partner, you may not possess a firearm or ammunition for as long as that final protection order is in effect. 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8). A violation of this federal firearms law carries a maximum possible penalty of 10 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine. An exception exists for law enforcement officers and military personnel when carrying department/government-issued firearms. 18 U.S.C. § 925(a)(1). If you are convicted of an offense of domestic violence, you will be forbidden for life from possessing a firearm or ammunition. 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(9); RCW 9.41.040.

(Si el tribunal emite una orden final de protección y su relación con la parte demandante sea la de cónyuge o ex cónyuge, padre/madre de un hijo en común, o cohabitante o ex cohabitante como pareja, incluyendo la pareja de hecho inscrita actual o anterior, usted no podrá poseer armas o municiones mientras la orden final de protección se encuentre vigente. 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8). La violación de esta ley federal de portación de armas conllevará una pena máxima de 10 años de prisión y una multa de US\$ 250,000. Existe una excepción para los agentes del orden público y el personal militar cuando porten armas autorizadas por el departamento/gobierno. 18 U.S.C. §

925(a)(1).) Si usted es condenado por un delito de violencia familiar, se le prohibirá de por vida poseer armas o municiones. 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(9); RCW 9.41.040.)

You Can Be Arrested Even if the Person or Persons Who Obtained the Order Invite or Allow You to Violate the Order's Prohibitions. You have the sole responsibility to avoid or refrain from violating the order's provisions. Only the court can change the order upon written application.

(Usted puede ser arrestado incluso si la Persona o Personas que obtuvieron la orden lo invitan o le permiten violar las prohibiciones de la orden. Usted es el único responsable por evitar violar o abstenerse de violar las disposiciones de la orden. Solamente el tribunal puede cambiar la orden ante una solicitud por escrito.)

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2265, a court in any of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any United States territory, and any tribal land within the United States shall accord full faith and credit to the order.

(De conformidad con 18 U.S.C. § 2265, un tribunal de cualquiera de los 50 estados, el Distrito de Columbia, Puerto Rico, cualquier territorio de los Estados Unidos, y cualquier tierra tribal dentro de los Estados Unidos deberá conceder plena fe y crédito a la orden.)

Warning: A person may be guilty of custodial interference in the second degree if they violate provisions 10, 11, or 12.

(Advertencia: Una persona puede ser culpable de interferir en la custodia en el segundo grado si viola las disposiciones 10, 11, o 12.

Washington Crime Information Center (WACIC) Data Entry

(Centro de información del crimen de Washington (WACIC) Registro de datos)

It is further ordered that the clerk of the court shall forward a copy of this order on or before the next judicial day to _____ County Sheriff's Office Police Department **Where Petitioner Lives** which shall enter it into WACIC.

*(Se ordena asimismo al secretario del tribunal enviar una copia de la presente orden el siguiente día hábil judicial o con anterioridad al mismo a [____] [-] la Oficina del Alguacil del Condado [-] el Departamento de Policía del lugar **donde vive la parte demandante**, el cual deberá ingresarla en el WACIC)*

Service (Notificación)

The clerk of the court shall also forward a copy of this order on or before the next judicial day to _____ County Sheriff's Office

Police Department **Where Respondent Lives** which shall personally serve the respondent with a copy of this order and shall promptly complete and return to this court proof of service.

*(El secretario del tribunal deberá enviar una copia de esta orden el siguiente día hábil judicial o con anterioridad al mismo a [____] [-] la Oficina del Alguacil del Condado [-] el Departamento de Policía del lugar **donde vive la parte demandada**, el cual deberá notificar personalmente a la parte demandada la copia de la presente orden y deberá llenar y devolver a la mayor brevedad posible la prueba de notificación a este tribunal.)*

Petitioner has made private arrangements for service of this order.

(La parte demandante ha hecho arreglos privados para la notificación de esta orden.)

Law Enforcement Assistance (Ayuda de las autoridades policiales)

- Law enforcement shall assist petitioner in obtaining:
(Un agente del orden público deberá ayudar a la parte demandante en la obtención de):
- Possession of petitioner's residence personal belongings located at: the shared residence
 respondent's residence other: _____
([] la posesión de [-] la residencia de la parte demandante [-] los efectos personales de la parte demandante que se encuentran en: [-] la residencia en común [-] la residencia de la parte demandada
[-] otros: [__].)
 - Custody of the above-named minors, including taking physical custody for delivery to petitioner (if applicable).
(la custodia de los menores identificados anteriormente, incluso la custodia física para entregárselos a la parte demandante (si se aplica).)
 - Other (Otros): _____.

Dated: _____ at _____ a.m./p.m. _____
(Fecha) (a las) (am./p.m.) **Judge/Commissioner (Juez/Comisionado)**

Presented by ((Presentada por):

Signature of Petitioner / Lawyer WSBA NO. Print Name
(Firma de la parte demandante/Abogado) No. WSBA Escriba en letra de molde el nombre

**Petitioner or petitioner's lawyer must complete a Law Enforcement Information Sheet (LEIS).
(El demandante o su abogado deben llenar una Hoja de Información (LEIS) para Orden Público.)**

Feedback on Translated Forms

The primary barrier I foresee, and that we do see currently, is that important information can be lost when using a language line to go back and forth about information that will be written on the DVPO, and the survivor not having the opportunity to express themselves in their own language. Additionally, for survivors who do not access supportive services, competing the form in English could be a huge barrier. They may be able to read the form and complete in their own language, but having it translated for them may be a barrier to accessing protection.

- Director of SafeChoice, Vancouver, WA

Are people allowed to actually file in these languages?

- Superior Court Administrator

I quickly viewed the Spanish language version and mentioned it to my clerk (who is fluent in Spanish). She raised a meaningful question. What language will the summary of facts be written in and if it is written in Spanish, how will a non Spanish speaking person know what the allegations are. Food for thought.

Terrific! I hope you are doing a press release and outreach to leaders in these communities.

APPROVAL CRITERIA FOR LANGUAGE ACCESS PLANS

TO: All Washington trial courts

PURPOSE: To assist courts in the development of a written language access plan, as required by RCW 2.43.090. Below is a set of criteria that the Interpreter Commission will be looking for when assessing each court's language access plan.

Pursuant to RCW 2.43.090, each court's language assistance plan must include provisions addressing the following:

- Procedures to identify and assess the language needs of non-English-speaking persons using the court system;
- Procedures for the appointment of interpreters as required under RCW 2.43.030. Such procedures shall not require the non-English speaking person to make the arrangements for the interpreter to appear in court;
- Procedures for notifying court users of the right to and availability of interpreter services. Such information shall be prominently displayed in the courthouse in the five foreign languages that census data indicates are predominate in the jurisdiction;
- A process for providing timely communication with non-English speakers by all court employees who have regular contact with the public and meaningful access to court services, including access to services provided by the clerk's office;
- Procedures for evaluating the need for translation of written materials, prioritizing those translation needs, and translating the highest priority materials. These procedures should take into account the frequency of use of forms by the language group, and the cost of orally interpreting the forms;
- A process for requiring and providing training to judges, court clerks, and other court staff on the requirements of the language assistance plan and how to effectively access and work with interpreters; and
- A process for ongoing evaluation of the language assistance plan and monitoring of the implementation of the language assistance plan.