



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 25-055

For business meeting on February 21, 2025

Title

Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

Report Type

Action Required

Effective Date

February 21, 2025

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

January 23, 2025

Recommended by

Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
Hon. Brian L. McCabe, Chair
Hon. Maurice Sanchez, Vice-Chair

Contact

Russell McGregor, 916-643-6988
russell.mcgregor@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

California faces a shortage of qualified American Sign Language (ASL) court interpreters and, at present, there is only one entity in the United States that tests for ASL court interpreter certification. The Court Interpreters Advisory Panel recommends approval of revised *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons* and an accompanying application form. The revisions will modernize the application process for program certification, support the recognition of additional ASL court interpreter testing entities as they become available, and maintain rigorous certification standards while expanding the pool of qualified interpreters.

Recommendation

The Court Interpreters Advisory Panel recommends that the Judicial Council, effective February 21, 2025:

1. Approve the revised *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons*; and

2. Approve the newly created *Application to the Judicial Council of California for Approval of ASL Court Interpreter Certification Program*.

The proposed revised guidelines are included as Attachment A, and the new application is included as Attachment B.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Evidence Code section 754(h)(1) states: “Before July 1, 1992, the Judicial Council shall conduct a study to establish the guidelines pursuant to which it shall determine which testing organizations, agencies, or educational institutions will be approved to administer tests for certification of court interpreters for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing.” The council first adopted the *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons (Guidelines)* on February 21, 1992. The *Guidelines* were last revised in 2023, effective January 1, 2024, when the council approved a temporary exemption to adherence to the *Guidelines*.¹

On April 24, 1998, the council approved two entities for the certification of interpreters for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals: the California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf (CCASD) and the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (RID). CCASD discontinued testing in 2006, and the council removed it as an approved entity that same year. As a result, RID became the sole entity authorized by the council to certify ASL court interpreters.

RID, a national certifying body of sign language interpreters, offered the Specialist Certificate: Legal (SC:L), which demonstrated specialized knowledge of legal settings and greater familiarity with language used in the legal system.² However, on January 1, 2016, the RID board of directors imposed a moratorium on the SC:L certification and ceased testing for the SC:L.³

Although the Judicial Council continues to recognize SC:L holders for inclusion on the council’s Master List of Certified and Registered Court Interpreters, no new SC:L credentials have been awarded since 2016, which has significantly reduced the available pool of qualified ASL court interpreters.⁴

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: New Requirements for American Sign Language Court Interpreters* (Oct. 27, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12443593&GUID=86D50238-F331-4F4E-BBA7-A91D30995599>.

² The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (<https://rid.org/>) is a leading organization in best practices and professional development for ASL interpreting services. Its mission is to establish national standards of quality for interpreters and transliterators.

³ More information on the moratorium is available at <https://rid.org/about/certifications-under-moratorium/>.

⁴ The Master List is an online database maintained by the Judicial Council’s Language Access Services Program. It allows courts, attorneys, and members of the public to search for court certified, registered, and enrolled interpreters who are in good standing with the Judicial Council. See <https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/court-interpreters-resources/search-interpreter>.

To address this gap, the Judicial Council approved temporary revisions to the *Guidelines* effective January 1, 2024, granting a four-year exemption to recognize other states' qualified testing programs.⁵ Under this exemption, the Texas Board for Evaluation of Interpreters (BEI) was approved as an accepted testing entity for ASL court interpreters for a minimum of four years. At present, the Texas BEI remains the only testing entity in the United States that tests for ASL court interpreter certification. Additionally, Judicial Council directed CIAP to revise the *Guidelines* and develop a recommendation for an approval process for ASL court interpreter certification programs that reflects the current interpreter marketplace and testing and certification landscape.

Analysis/Rationale

California continues to face a shortage of qualified ASL court interpreters, even as ASL remains one of the most frequently requested languages in state courts. As of 2020, ASL was the third most requested language in the state, yet the current pool of interpreters cannot meet the growing demand. The *2020 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study* underscores the importance of addressing this shortage to ensure effective language access for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals.⁶

The revised *Guidelines* and new application provide California with the flexibility to recognize a broader range of certifying agencies as they become available. This flexibility allows the state to quickly adapt to changes in the interpreter certification landscape while expanding its pool of qualified interpreters. By removing unnecessary procedural barriers and modernizing the language, the updates encourage participation from certifying organizations beyond California without compromising the high standards necessary for court proceedings.

Rigorous certification standards for testing entities will be maintained by requiring the provider to provide links to publicly available documents or specific program information that can be evaluated to verify that the testing entity meets minimum requirements for recognition of an ASL court interpreter testing program (e.g., exam content and description, testing procedures, application and scoring processes, complaint processes, and continuing education requirements). Providers will continue to be required to have deaf or hard-of-hearing individuals, including ASL court interpreters, on the test evaluation panel, ensuring input from certified interpreters and deaf individuals with the necessary knowledge and experience.

Specific revisions include:

- Replacement of all instances of “shall” with “must” to modernize the language and clarify mandatory requirements.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., *supra* note 1.

⁶ See *2020 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study* (March 2020), <https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2023-07/2020-language-need-and-interpreter-use-study-report-to-the-legislature.pdf>.

- Removal of unreasonable expectations on noncontracted organizations, including requirements for nondiscrimination statements in every announcement and the mandatory provision of lists to the council of certified court interpreters and community organizations and contacts that can serve as resources to the court.
- Broadening the applicability of the guidelines by revising or removing California-specific requirements, such as evaluation panel composition and statewide testing accessibility.
- Requiring that the provider’s ASL court interpreter certification exam cover the modes of interpretation commonly required in court proceedings: simultaneous, consecutive, and sight translation, aligning the testing criteria with practical certification requirements to reflect current standards and expectations.

Policy implications

The revised *Guidelines* and new application will allow the Judicial Council to recognize a broader range of certifying organizations, including those outside California. This change enables the council to address the shortage of qualified ASL court interpreters and meet the increasing demand for language access services.

The *Guidelines* and application will also ensure that certifying organizations meet rigorous standards while allowing flexibility to adapt to changes in the interpreter certification landscape. This approach supports the council’s ability to provide consistent and reliable language access services for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals in California courts.

Comments

This proposal was circulated for public comment from October 17 to November 26, 2024. Two comments were received: one from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County and one from the Superior Court of Orange County.

The Superior Court of Los Angeles County expressed agreement with the proposal if modified, suggesting the addition of ethnicity to the list of nondiscrimination protections, requiring certifying agencies to include the Judicial Council’s *Court Interpreter Professional Standards and Ethics* guidelines in their curriculum, and mandating that certifying agencies report disciplinary actions to the Judicial Council. CIAP agreed to include ethnicity as a protected classification but did not adopt the curriculum or reporting requirements, as certifying agencies are external, noncontracted entities. CIAP noted that the Judicial Council has existing requirements for ethics training and compliance for ASL court interpreters, which address the commenter’s concerns.

The Superior Court of Orange County expressed full support for the proposal. The court highlighted that the streamlined application process and clarified requirements should expand the pool of available ASL interpreters as more testing providers become available. This anticipated increase could reduce the number of case continuances caused by interpreter shortages.

A chart with the full text of the comments and CIAP’s responses is attached at pages 6–10.

Alternatives considered

The Judicial Council directed CIAP to revise the *Guidelines* and develop a recommendation for an approval process for an ASL court interpreter certification program that reflects the current interpreter marketplace and testing and certification landscape. No alternatives were considered.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The proposed revisions to the *Guidelines* and the new application will impose no cost to the courts or the Judicial Council. Staff resources required for the Language Access Implementation Unit to implement them will be minimal.

Attachments and Links

1. Chart of comments, at pages 6–10
2. Attachment A: *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons*
3. Attachment B: *Application to the Judicial Council of California for Approval of ASL Court Interpreter Certification Program*

ITC SP24-09

Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Superior Court of Los Angeles County by Robert Oftring, Director of Communications & Legislative Affairs	AM	<p>The following comments are representative of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, and do not represent or promote the viewpoint of any particular officer or employee.</p> <p>In response to the Judicial Council of California’s “ITC SP24-09: Court Interpreters: Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons,” the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Court), agrees with proposal if the listed modifications below are incorporated.</p> <p>The Court believes the proposal appropriately addresses the stated purpose. Courts need additional certification opportunities for American Sign Language Interpreters. The only approved certification entity in California is the Texas Office of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services Board for Evaluation of Interpreters (BEI) and it is only temporarily approved. This proposal seeks to expand the number of available ASL court interpreters for Courts by increasing the eligible entities that may be approved by Judicial Council to provide California ASL interpreter certifications.</p> <p>While the proposal removes the requirements for the composition of the evaluating board to include a majority of persons who are deaf or hard of hearing and a member of the state bar or judicial officer, the guidelines still require input from certified ASL interpreters and persons who are deaf of hard of hearing for the evaluating</p>	<p>CIAP thanks the Superior Court of Los Angeles County for its comment.</p> <p>The committee discussed the suggestion to require certifying agencies to communicate disciplinary</p>

ITC SP24-09

Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>process. There should be a requirement to communicate discipline or revocations from the various approved programs to the JCC, and JCC’s Court Interpreter Program should communicate changes of certifications for Interpreters to CA Courts. Requiring the certifying agency to also offer a public complaint process related to certification review could cause gaps in communication as to certification status if these complaints do not first get submitted through the JCC’s existing program. The Court also has questions on the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should sections 1B and 2A include ethnicity in the list of protected classifications against discrimination for programs certifying interpreters for California? • Under 2E for the program requirements, should certification curriculum also include general review and understanding of the Court Interpreter Professional Standards and Ethics guidelines published by the JCC? <p>The Court believes the proposed application process streamlines and simplifies the approval procedure for certifying organizations while maintaining high standards. Removing the diversity of location for testing requirements for each program could also increase the number of eligible programs.</p> <p>Currently the Court spends up to \$950 for a full day of an Independent Contractor’s rate due to a shortage in certified ASL interpreters (\$332-</p>	<p>actions or certification revocations to the Judicial Council. While CIAP recognizes the importance of transparency, such requirements cannot be imposed on independent, non-contracted entities. Effective January 1, 2024, all ASL court interpreters must attest to being in good standing each year under the annual court interpreter renewal and compliance process. The committee encourages CIP to engage in collaboration and information-sharing between certifying agencies and the Judicial Council whenever feasible.</p> <p>Regarding the inclusion of ethnicity in sections 1B and 2A, the committee agrees with this suggestion and has incorporated it into the amendments being recommended for adoption. This change aligns with the Judicial Council’s goals for access, fairness, diversity, and inclusion.</p> <p>Regarding section 2E for program requirements, the committee discussed the suggestion to include a review of the council’s <i>Court Interpreter Professional Standards and Ethics</i> guidelines in the certification curriculum but does not recommend this addition. Effective January 1, 2024, all new ASL court interpreters on the Judicial Council Master List, similar to spoken language interpreters, must take the required ethics course within their first two years, as well as an ethics refresher courts every subsequent two years. As certifying agencies are external entities not contracted with California courts, the Judicial Council does not have the authority to mandate curriculum requirements. However, the committee encourages certifying organizations to align their</p>

ITC SP24-09

Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>\$950 full day; \$166-\$450 half day). This Court’s Language Access Services division has found that with some pushback we are often able to bring down rates when negotiating if the interpreter knows the market is getting flooded with more interpreters being able to provide the service. For example, when we first started to utilize Spanish Independent Contractors there were rates as high as \$600 for a full day and now, we are able to contract for rates much closer to the JCC rate.</p> <p>If there are more certifying agencies, this could result in the potential to increase ASL certified interpreters. Another issue we would like to request consideration for is the common request by the ASL interpreter for a CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter) when they determine the deaf or hard-of-hearing litigant does not know ASL.</p>	<p>training programs with the highest standards of professionalism and ethics.</p> <p>The comment regarding the common request for a Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI) when an ASL interpreter determines that a litigant does not know ASL is noted. The committee finds the comment unclear in its current form and is unable to provide a specific response at this time. Further clarification would be necessary to address this issue fully. At present, the council does not include CDI interpreters on the Master List unless they also hold a legal certification. Persons may search for a CDI through the public RID database.</p>
2.	Superior Court of Orange County by Alma Guzman, Language Access Services Manager	A	<p><i>Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?</i></p> <p>Yes, the proposal addresses the stated purpose by removing unreasonable expectations and applying the <i>Guidelines</i> to a broader range of certifying bodies. Although the Texas BEI is the only testing entity in the US for ASL court</p>	<p>CIAP thanks the Superior Court of Orange County for its comment. The committee appreciates the court’s support for the proposed revisions and its acknowledgment of the importance of streamlining the application process while maintaining high standards for ASL court interpreter certification.</p>

ITC SP24-09

Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>interpreter certification, the revisions facilitate the application process for other entities that might enter the testing landscape for ASL court interpreters.</p> <p><i>Are the proposed revisions to the Guidelines sufficient to ensure flexibility and responsiveness in approving new certifying agencies while maintaining high standards for ASL court interpreter certification?</i></p> <p>Yes, the proposed revisions do not diminish the requirements to maintain high standards for certification testing and test content. Removing the requirement related to working with a relay interpreter is reasonable as most cases do not involve relay interpreters.</p> <p><i>Does the proposed application process streamline and simplify the approval procedure for certifying organizations while maintaining high standards?</i></p> <p>Yes, the application process has been streamlined by removing three unnecessary requirements, and by revising the remaining two requirements to be clearer and more concise.</p>	

ITC SP24-09

Court Interpreters: Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p><i>Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.</i></p> <p>There are no operational impacts that would create specific cost savings. The only perceivable cost savings would derive from having available a more robust pool of ASL interpreters that may result in a reduction in the number of continuances due to unavailability of qualified ASL interpreters.</p> <p><i>Will the proposal expand the availability of qualified ASL court interpreters to serve limited-English-proficient court users?</i></p> <p>Yes, this proposal should increase the pool of available ASL interpreters.</p> <p><u>General Comments</u> None</p>	



Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

February 21, 2025



Judicial Council of California

Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons

Preamble

Evidence Code section 754 requires that in any civil or criminal action—including any action involving a traffic or other infraction, juvenile court proceeding, proceeding to determine the mental competency of a person, or administrative hearing where a party or witness is a deaf or hard-of-hearing person and that person is present and participating—the proceeding shall be interpreted in a language that the deaf or hard-of-hearing person understands by a qualified interpreter appointed by the court or other appropriate authority. A “qualified interpreter” is defined as “an interpreter who has been certified as competent to interpret court proceedings by a testing organization, agency, or educational institution approved by the Judicial Council as qualified to administer tests to court interpreters for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing.” (Evid. Code, § 754(f).)

Evidence Code section 754 further requires the Judicial Council to establish guidelines under which it will determine which testing organizations, agencies, or educational institutions will be approved to administer tests and certify court interpreters for deaf and hard-of-hearing persons and provides that an initial approval of testing entities shall occur before July 1, 1992. The Judicial Council, therefore, establishes the following guidelines.

In these guidelines, the term “certified court interpreter” is used to mean a sign language interpreter who is certified to interpret in court proceedings. “Certifying organization” refers to the entity under whose auspices the evaluation of applicant interpreters is conducted. “Evaluating panel/board” refers to the persons who rate the applicant interpreters. Oral interpreting, services to hard-of-hearing individuals such as assistive listening devices, interpreting for deaf/blind individuals, and other forms of communicative assistance to persons with hearing disabilities are not covered by these guidelines.

Guidelines

1. Structure and Administration of Evaluating Panels/Boards

- A. The evaluating panel/board and its processes must be administratively independent of the certifying organization in the testing and certification of individual applicants—that is, the panel/board must be free of influence from any external sources on decisions affecting the test results and certification of interpreters.
- B. The certifying organization, in all its processes, must have a non-discrimination policy that ensures no discrimination among applicants for certification as to age, sex, race,

ethnicity, religion, national origin, disability, sexual orientation, or marital status. The certifying organization must provide for access and reasonable accommodation to the testing process for persons with disabilities.

- C. The certifying organization must possess the knowledge and experience necessary to conduct the testing and certification of court interpreters.
- D. The certifying organization must have a formal procedure for the selection of evaluating panel/board members. That procedure must include input from certified interpreters and deaf individuals who possess the knowledge and experience required for that purpose.
- E. The certifying organization must have formal procedures for training of evaluating panel/board members to ensure the consistency of their evaluation over time.
- F. The certifying organization must hold testing at reasonable cost to the applicant interpreter and with sufficient frequency to ensure that there is reasonable opportunity for individuals to be tested and certified.
- G. The certifying process must have and maintain:
 - 1. Competence-based standards of performance;
 - 2. A clear process for determining the pass-fail standard for certification and cutoff scores on tests; and
 - 3. An established procedure for the regular and timely review and adjustment of these standards of performance, utilizing input from interpreters, deaf and hard-of-hearing persons, court personnel, and research sources.
- H. The certifying organization must maintain the confidentiality and integrity of the testing process, including test materials, scoring information, and other sensitive information. The certifying organization must have a procedure to regularly update, rotate, reformulate, or alter test materials to guarantee that the confidentiality of test items, tapes, scripts, and other materials is protected and that the materials are new to those applicants who are being tested.
- I. On completion of testing, the certifying organization must issue to qualified interpreters a certificate that clearly identifies the interpreter as certified to interpret in court by this organization and the period of time covered by the certification.
- J. The certifying organization must maintain a list of those interpreters who are certified to interpret in court proceedings and must keep this list up to date.
- K. The certifying organization must have an established and reasonable procedure for assuring the continued competency of certified court interpreters through periodic assessment or other means. Such a certification maintenance process must include efforts by the certifying organization to enhance continued competence of the individual.

If continuing education is used as a means of ensuring continued competency, the certifying organization may not require interpreters to enroll in its own education or training program.

- M. The certifying organization must promptly report certification results to applicants.
- N. The certifying organization must have and publicize the existence of a reasonable grievance and appeal process for certification applicants who question the certification or testing process, test results, or eligibility for testing.
- O. The certifying organization must have and publicize the existence of a reasonable complaint process for the public to use in addressing discipline of those holding certificates, including revocation of certification for conduct that clearly indicates incompetence, unethical behavior, and physical or mental impairment affecting performance.

2. Certification Testing and Test Content

- A. The certification process, including tests and testing procedure, must be objective, fair, and free of test bias (including, but not limited to, bias as to age, sex, race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, culture, or class).
- B. The certification process, including tests and testing procedure, must be directly based on the knowledge and skills needed to function as an interpreter in court proceedings.
- C. Tests and testing processes must be standardized and nondiscriminatory and must be shown to be both reliable and valid (particularly relative to the certified court interpreter's subsequent ability to perform in court proceedings) under generally accepted procedures for establishing the validity and reliability of tests.
- D. The certifying organization must clearly state, and publish in a manner reasonably certain to provide adequate notice to applicants, the certification and testing criteria and the requirements used to certify court interpreters, including information about the competencies required, the level of competency required, and how these competencies are determined.
- E. The certifying process must be comprehensive in testing for all aspects of the court interpreting process, including:
 - 1. Interpretation competency, which includes:
 - a. Consecutive interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, and sight translation;
 - b. American Sign Language competency;
 - c. English language competency; and

- d. Competency in interpreting language and terminology common to court proceedings;
 2. Understanding of social, cultural, and linguistic aspects of the local, state, and national communities of deaf people;
 3. The role and function of court interpreters, including court etiquette;
 4. The various court proceedings that commonly and frequently require use of an interpreter or interpreters; and
 5. A code of conduct and professional ethics.
- F. If, in addition to testing for the above, a certifying organization establishes education and training requirements that an interpreter must have before certification (such as a high school diploma or college degree), there must be a direct correlation between these requirements and an interpreter's ability to perform in court proceedings. A certifying organization may not require an interpreter to take its own education or training program as a prerequisite to testing or certification.

3. Application to the Judicial Council for Approval to Certify Court Interpreters and Maintenance of Standing

- A. The certifying organization must submit a completed application to the Judicial Council to document compliance with these guidelines at four-year intervals after initial approval.
- B. The certifying organization must notify the Judicial Council if it plans to suspend or discontinue testing, either permanently or temporarily.
- C. The Judicial Council may suspend or revoke its approval of a certifying organization or place conditions on continued approval, if such action is deemed necessary to ensure the quality and/or integrity of court interpreting or this approval process.

4. Exemptions in Critical or Unusual Circumstances

- A. Effective January 1, 2024, the council approved allowing for exemptions for adherence to these guidelines in critical or unusual circumstances for a period of four years to assure that certified ASL court interpreters are available to provide services in California. This allowance may include recognition of another state's testing program, provided that the council can verify that the testing entity is qualified to administer tests to court interpreters for the deaf or hard-of-hearing.¹

¹ On November 17, 2023, the council approved a four-year exemption, effective January 1, 2024, to ensure certified ASL court interpreters are available in California. This includes recognizing the Texas Office of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services (DHHS) Board for Evaluation of Interpreters (BEI) as an approved testing entity for a temporary period. For more details, refer to the [Judicial Council Report](#).

Application to the Judicial Council of California for Approval of ASL Court Interpreter Certification Program

Instructions: Please provide information about your American Sign Language (ASL) court interpreter certification program. Each section below includes questions designed to ensure your program meets the guidelines set by the Judicial Council of California. Provide detailed responses and include links to supporting documentation where indicated. You can access the full ASL Certification Guidelines [here](#).

Section A: Contact Information

1. Name of the certifying organization: _____
2. Contact details (including phone number, email address, and mailing address):

Section B: Background

1. When did the certifying organization begin testing for the ASL court interpreter certification? (Year) _____
2. Does the certifying organization have documented processes for both the development and administration of the ASL court interpreter certification exam, as well as for the selection and training of exam raters? (Yes/No) _____
 - o Provide links to the documented processes for exam development and administration, and for rater selection and training (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

3. Does the certifying organization have a public registry of persons with the ASL court interpreter certification? (Yes/No) _____
 - o Provide a link to the public registry (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

Section C: Fairness and Nondiscrimination

1. Does the certifying organization provide reasonable accommodation to the testing process for persons with disabilities? (Yes/No) _____
 - o Provide details or a link to the accommodation policy (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

2. Is the certification process, including the exam, objective, fair, and nondiscriminatory? (Yes/No) _____
3. Does the certifying organization have a nondiscrimination policy? (Yes/No)

- Provide a link to the nondiscrimination policy (If unavailable, write “N/A”):

Note: The nondiscrimination policy should ensure no discrimination based on age, sex, race, religion, ethnicity, national origin, disability, sexual orientation, or marital status.

4. Does the certifying organization have procedures to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of the exam materials and scores? (Yes/No) _____
 - Provide a link to the confidentiality and integrity procedures (if unavailable, write “N/A”): _____
5. Does the certifying organization have a grievance and appeal process for certification applicants who question the certification or testing process, test results, or eligibility for testing? (Yes/No) _____
 - Provide a link to the grievance and appeal process (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

Section D: Exam Information

1. Does the certifying organization provide publicly available information about the certification process, including exam dates, registration, content, format, scoring, and appeal processes? (Yes/No) _____
 - Provide a link to this information (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

2. Does the exam cover the following criteria? (See below.) (Yes/No) _____
 - Provide a link to this information (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

Criteria Covered:

- (1) Interpretation competency, which includes:
 - (a) Consecutive interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, and sight translation
 - (b) American Sign Language competency
 - (c) English language competency
 - (d) Competency in interpreting language and terminology common to court proceedings
- (2) Understanding of social, cultural, and linguistic aspects of the local, state, and national communities of deaf people
- (3) The role and function of court interpreters, including court etiquette

- (4) The various court proceedings that commonly and frequently require use of an interpreter or interpreters
- (5) A code of conduct and professional ethics

Section E: Certification Maintenance and Complaints

- 1. Does the certifying organization have a certification maintenance process, including continuing education requirements and fees? (Yes/No) _____
 - o Provide a link to the certification maintenance process (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

- 2. Does the certifying organization have and publicize a reasonable complaint process for the public to use in addressing discipline of those holding certificates? (Yes/No)

 - o Provide a link to the complaint process (if unavailable, write “N/A”):

Section F: Declaration

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature: _____

Print Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____