



## **HF 3294 MRID Survey Responses**

HF3294 survey responses

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
Yes	It is critical that a minimum standard for interpreting work be recognized and upheld by all interpreting organizations. It is also important for individuals providing services to be known by those receiving services and competent and able. A minimum standard encourages professionals to always improve themselves and their skills.	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Coda
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes	Greater MN interpreting positions have been filled with under qualified and rarely supervised signers that impact the Deaf community	Yes	Hearing
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes	I appreciate the added notes of staying nonpartial and not interjecting.	No	Hearing
Yes	I find it hard to give a straight yes or no for support. Yes, I think that we should expect and hold ourselves to high standards but I can understand that it may be looked at as another expense when we already belong to a group that should be supporting us and holding us to those standards. For those of us working in an educational setting, having a "license" may make it easier for us to garner respect in the fact that we will then be part of the "licensed" staff.	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes	Protect consumers, and interpreters. Safeguard for both consumers and interpreters. I don't trust business, companies, non-profits, etc... they say they have an "interpreters " actually they get someone who claim knew sign language but knew only alphabets or took asl level or learn from book only or learn from church. Those people are fraud and harm to consumers and not provide real an interpreters jobs.	No	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes	Licensure is very important to have so that D/HH/DB consumers are getting the very best interpreting of information possible.	Yes	Hearing
Yes	It is a good start	No	Deaf
Yes	As a Deaf consumer and parent of Deaf and hard of hearing consumers in rural MN I see the need for this bill as it is written.	Yes	Coda, Deaf
Yes	Interpreter licensure is a mark of a standard of practice that is recognized by the state similar to doctor licensure. It will raise Interpreting to the level of Professional within the State instead of just a helper.	Yes	Hearing, Parent of deaf and hard-of-hearing children
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes	There should be no recognition of RID or NAD interpreting licensure. Just the state of Minnesota. Contact me for more information at [email redacted].	No	Deaf
Yes	Strongly support this bill!	No	Deaf
Yes	I'm concerned that the Board would have a lot of power. They seem to have the power to decide everything related to interpreter licensure in this bill. This bill leaves the question of what interpreting tests would be accepted to be considered licensed wide open. I'm concerned that as an older person, I would need to take a new test, even though I will be retiring in a few years.	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
Yes	Deaf community has for a long time deserves consistency in quality interpretations especially during crucial situations.	Yes	Deaf
Yes	If Interpreters truly cared about their profession and their consumers getting the best possible then there's no reason to resist licensure.	Yes	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Deaf
Yes	It sounds like a bill that will help ensure that all of MN interpreters know what they need to in order to respect a deaf consumers language needs. Having so many members of varying levels is beneficial in my mind. Especially the fact that there need to be deaf members deciding if they want these interpreters to be working for them or not.	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes	I support the idea of requiring a license, but also am concerned about rural areas where there are not a lot of interpreters available	No	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes	Very please to see EIPA as pathway to licensure :) given chaos of RID. Im curious what does licensure mean exactly? I understand tracking of interpreters for quality assurance, but beyond that what will it accomplish?	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes	I appreciate that the NIC will be a supplement for the licensure examination	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes	It would be nice to see consequences for agencies who hire interpreters who are not licensed. For example the state of Arizona imposes a \$2000 fine to any agency who hires or sends an unqualified or not licensed interpreter.	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Hearing
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes	It's longtime overdue! A good bill for everyone, deaf and interpreters	No	Deaf
Yes		No	Deaf
Yes	No, but make sure there are organizations involving the bill.	Yes	Deaf
Yes		No	Hearing
Yes	I believe this bill will increase the number of working qualified interpreters in our state. I do not see language that explains who/what will be evaluating an interpreter 's skills that are required for state licensure. I do not see language that protects established stakeholder entities from undue paperwork related to clarifying acceptable licensure or credentials with established partners.	No	Hearing
Yes	Obviously our profession Has let down the Deaf community by not monitoring yourselves. I think it is sad but time for a licensing of Interpreters.	No	Hearing
Yes	The bill indicate sound rationale for licensure proposal but one concern I have is 7 designated positions on the board. I feel we may see partially favorable decision if we go with current designated positions serve on the board. How will we be assured of selectes people on the board will provide impartial decisions?	No	Deaf
Yes		No	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
Yes	Hearing interpreters have NO business having ANY say in the licensure bill. NONE. They can up and quit their jobs any time they like; we can't just take off our deafness and go around being hearing when we get tired of it. it is OUR hospital rooms, OUR births, OUR deaths, OUR jobs, OUR lives, most affected by how interpreters are regulated and screened. History has shown us time and time again that when hearing people and abled people take charge or are involved in such efforts, the legislation (and guidelines, policies, etc) BENEFIT THEM, NOT US. The ADA is a perfect example of how ultimately, the law was designed to serve capitalist ideas of productivity and not about true access for disabled people. Hearing people need to get in their lane and only have ONE line to say "We support what deaf people think is best for them. We will do what they think is appropriate and necessary/" That's It. More Professional Development? Yessir. What are we whining about when we have only 80 hours required over FOUR YEARS? The RID code of ethics is a JOKE and its CPC ethical reporting practices are designed to protect interpreters, not deaf people! Interpreters are self-serving-deaf people want to serve the COMMUNITY. I'm FURIOUS the MRID is allowing hearing people to have a single word of say here- allyship none!	Yes	Deaf
Yes	The only better alternative to this would be if MRID managed the certification process here in state. The situation at a national level is completely disconnected with the expectations here in our great state.	Yes	Hearing
Yes	I am first and foremost in support of the Minnesota Deaf community. If this bill will challenge us to heighten our standards to provide the best possible communication access, then I support the bill. If this bill will ultimately contribute to the progression of the professionalization of interpreting, that would be a fantastic bonus. If this bill leaves us a few dollars poorer each year due to application/renewal fees, and if it makes us a lot busier because some interpreters don't make the cut, so be it. I only want to see the Deaf community receive the quality access that they deserve.	Yes	Hearing
Yes		Yes	Hearing, Coda
Yes	I had filled out the survey earlier saying I was opposed to this new bill, but after reading the emails that have been coming through and giving this more thought, I have changed my mind. I think, if the Deaf community sees this as a need and it will improve their experience working with interpreters then I think we need to do it. As long as the Deaf/HH/DeafBlind and interpreter communities have a say on who will serve on the board for this licensure.	Yes	Coda
No		Yes	Hearing
No	Why did they basically copy and paste the CPC into the bill language? Seems very short. I also disagree with their definitions of Interpreting and Transliteration. Seems that whoever wrote this did not consult with the greater D/HOH and Interpreter communities of MN.	No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	Interpreter Referral Agencies need to be included. Including referral agencies is part of a national discussion and MN needs to be at the forefront. Holding agencies responsible and not just individual interpreters will provide more support and safety for consumers.	Yes	Hearing
No	This will be hugely expensive to develop an assessment tool by the state. This is a redundant board to the RID. All of its functions are already provided under RID. It's just more paperwork for no purpose. What purpose does this serve? What problem is this addressing? I would be happy to testify at a hearing in opposition.	No	Hearing
No	This seems like a tax and a burden on those already certified by a national certified body and pay annual dues to our state and national organizations. There are no additional benefits or protections that i see that the requirement provides. We already have national registry requirements for Continuing Education, tracking, etc. I understand this may provide a way for those NOT certified to work in the state until they can get certified.	Yes	Hearing
No	Licensure will not solve the problems that currently plague our field. I will never support a bill for licensure.	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	I may support this with more information. If MRID has not been at the table on this (again), that is a concern. It's not clear to me why this bill repeats the spirit and tenets of the CPC... and how the licensure board will determine if an interpreter is within compliance or not.	Yes	Hearing
No	I have mixed feelings about the purpose of the bill, and would like more information about why this is needed. Is the current system broke and in need of fixing? Or is it based on the opinions of a minority of consumers that don't reflect the overall feelings of the d/Deaf community at large? What would a license system achieve?	Yes	Hearing
No	There should be more representation of qualified interpreters on the Board.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	<p>Under the current bill language, most certified ASL Interpreters would be granted licensure via NAD, RID, and the other nationally recognized certifying bodies. In effect, it seems this is a redundancy that just collects \$60 per interpreter to work in Minnesota - similar to Wisconsin.</p> <p>Its unclear as to certifying aspect to this bill (ie, an entity to certify new, pre-certified interpreters), if this was more clear, I would be more on-board, but as written, this licensure bill seems ineffective and hollow in addressing the needs of the community as a whole. I would prefer to see richer proposal for how the board/certifying entity will function to test/certify pre-certified interpreters, as well as which specialties they will include in the 'specialty licensure' (like legal.)</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	It may help increase the salaries for educational interpreters. It may lead to interpreters leaving the field. They could become Tier 1 teachers of DHH, which like the interpreter field, has a shortage.	No	Hearing
No	<p>This bill uses a lot of subjective language that is going to be difficult to interpret or enforce. If you ask ten different people, you will get ten different answers to define the terms "impartial demeanor", "professional appearance", "visually distracting", "appropriate to the setting", "ethical behaviour", and "integrity.</p> <p>It seems like this bill is saying that this body will define these terms once and for all. But how can they do this when these things change with the clients, and the interpreting situation? What works perfectly in one situation may not work in another. Even if we look at one term, "professional appearance," will this body define what is acceptable for every possible combination of interpreting situations and set of clients? That just doesn't seem possible.</p> <p>My second complaint is that this bill doesn't offer any way to fix problems. This bill does not empower this body to do anything at all about any violations of the rules it sets. This bill forms a body that can (a) collect money and (b) try to define what terms mean... but that's it. Nothing else. What if someone feels like an interpreter does not meet the standards for a "professional appearance"? What can this body do about it? According to this bill, they can't do anything. This bill has no teeth - it offers no way to enforce the rules or terms of the body it seeks to create.</p> <p>My third complaint is that this bill offers no way for new interpreters to enter the profession. Where does this bill think professional interpreters come from? Are they just hatched one day, with their NIC in-hand, fully fluent in ASL and with all the interpreting skills they need? No, of course not. When a graduate of an interpreter training program begins interpreting, it can take them years to acquire all the skills they need. I have heard 7 to 10 years is not uncommon. If this bill is passed, these new, uncertified interpreters would be outlaws. If this bill is ever gets "teeth" then these new interpreters could be fined out of existence. The flow of professional interpreters would dry-up.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	I am not sure what the point of it is. Our state has laws already to ensure certification (at least in the k-12 setting)	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	This is just another expense for interpreters along with another hoop to jump through. Jobs are already not being filled due to a shortage of interpreters in the field. More interpreters WILL leave the field, these are the veterans we look to as mentors. This legislation will cause a period of time where D/HH consumers will not have services because interpreters are scrambling to become eligible "to work ". National certification, BEI, and EIPA are already out there as determiners of qualified interpreter, there is absolutely NO need for more!	No	Hearing
No	This is redundant. Interpreters in MN already require the most stringent certification process in the U.S. Why create a new system? If you feel that enhancements need to happen, then work collaboratively with MRID and MADC to improve the existing system.	Yes	Hearing
No	There are still vague portions to this bill (ie who is included as transliterators? Is cued speech still a part of this?) Also, it seems we (the interpreting community) was not involved.	Yes	Hearing
No	Government need not get involved. They don't have a good track record.	Yes	Coda
No	The bill seems redundant. We already have certification with requires adherence to the code of ethics.	Yes	Hearing, Sibling of a Deaf adult
No	Too long of a provisional period. Should be up to 2 years max. Any state license must acknowledge RID with no other stipulations. Ethical behavior should follow RID CPC, no need to recreate standards. There is no regulation for agencies, interns or mentees.	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	1) Some of the language is incorrect, such as the definition of "transliteration." 2) There is no explanation as to what the issue, problem or concern the license will address or correct. 3) The reciprocity with other state license is vague and incomplete. 4) The HF talks about required competencies but does not identify what the competencies should be. 5) It also mentions examination of these competencies and appears to leave it to the state to develop a new testing system. It has been documented by RID and NAD that interpreter test developed from scratch can cost as much as \$1,500,000 and test redevelopment of a known test system can cost \$500,000. Is Minnesota willing to invest the \$1,500,000 for new test development and commit \$500,000 to revised test development every 3 - 5 years?	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>The board only includes one hearing interpreter to represent the interests of hundreds of interpreters across the state.</p> <p>The temporary license requires the supervision of a licensed interpreter. There is no system set up for this kind of mentorship and supervision, and would require unpaid work from licensed mentors. Also the term supervision is not defined. Does that mean weekly communication? Meeting in person? Active mentorship and observation?</p> <p>The first board appointed will have immense power in terms of setting licensure standards and details not included in the bill.</p> <p>The \$60 cost is a barrier for students, and students of color who already face other barriers for entrance into our field.</p> <p>And, the main concern I have: What problem will this solve? How many instances of unqualified interpreters, such as "signers" without training, provide services in MN happen per year? Does that warrant an entire state system and additional time and money spent for interpreters whose wages have stagnated for the past 10 years?</p> <p>And finally, where is the support from the deaf community about this bill. It seems to be the work of Sonny and Sonny alone, and if he's worked with others, he has not been transparent about it. His actions do not at all show willingness to work with interpreters prior to introducing a bill that impacts us.</p> <p>The original bill as read in 2019 stated that one punishment the board could sanction an interpreter with was a misdemeanor charge. Will the first board implement that serious of an option? There are too many questions without answers.</p>	Yes	Coda
No	It is going to cause a shortage of Inteptrters!	Yes	Hearing
No	I do not believe one person represents an entire community. Especially since said person is NOT in our profession. Professional licensure is just that. It is very clear to me that the author of this bill has his own agenda and is not interested in working with the community to do what is BEST for our state. This is the second time this bill has been purposed without the knowledge and support of the community/professional Interpreters. The opinion/suggestions at the town hall meeting, setting up an adhoc committee, NAD's input have all been very intentionally ignored. I find this to be reprehensible and inexcusable.	No	Hearing
No	We already have a licensing agency called the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. Passing this bill will be in conflict with our preexisting requirements and will ultimately deter people from entering the field of interpreting.	No	Hearing
No	The Board needs to include members related to the education of deaf children. An educational interpreter or a representative from a district, program, or school serving children who are Deaf, DeafBlind, or hard of hearing must be included and will offer a different perspective than other interpreters, adult consumers, or businesses that frequently use interpreting services.	Yes	Hearing
No	How are the people chosen? What are their requirements and credentials beyond what is listed?	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	Why do we need state licensure? I am unclear as to the end goal. We already need certification to work how is having a state license change what we already do?	Yes	Hearing
No	This bill was deliberately conceived without any community involvement. Facts suggest the language of the bill will create a systematic barrier within the interpreting industry in Minnesota that will lead to a drop of communication access quality. I will not submit to or tolerate tyrannical behavior.	Yes	Deaf

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	How is this different from the NIC license interpreters already have? Seems like just more money interpreters have to pay every year.	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>1. In Section 4 (b) RID and NAD when written out are shown with capitol letters, why isn't the EIPA?</p> <p>2. Section 4(c) in the area that talks about professional appearance: I think it should be more specific than just "not visually distracting and appropriate to the setting". This is too vague and allows for too many interpretations. We would like to think that professional interpreters will make good decisions, but with the new trends of multi-colored hair, visible tattoos, facial piercings, and many places of employment becoming more and more casual, I have seen too many interpreters that do not follow the guidelines for professional appearance and attire when it is not specifically stated. There should be more specific examples given so that interpreters can be held to a higher standard and complaints could be filed if they are not following those guidelines.</p> <p>3. In Section 8 the amendment: Should it really refer to the consumer as "disabled person"??</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	Sounds good on the surface but will cause interpreter shortages. People don't avail themselves of the systems already in place. More bureaucracy does not make for better service.	Yes	Hearing
No	I am disappointed there is a bill being proposed on behalf of the entire community, I for one do not support this the way it is.	No	Deaf
No	<p>OPPOSE: Still don't know the reason WHY licensure is being pursued. Sonny has never sat down with the interpreting community to think through this. His answer to a fictitious problem is just licensure. Licensure isn't going to solve the problem in greater Minnesota, in fact, it will make it worse.</p> <p>OPPOSE: As Certified interpreters we already have to have 80 hours of CEUs to keep our certification. So this board will come up with some additional training on top of RID?</p> <p>OPPOSE: One hearing interpreter on this board is ridiculous.</p> <p>OPPOSE: \$60 and \$30 (late fee) is excessive. WI is \$40 for 2 YEARS.</p> <p>The problem of unqualified interpreters must be handled in the ITPs. They have to stop graduating students that can't sign. They have to drill it into student heads that they shouldn't take work for which they are unqualified. Students have to wake up and stop charging rates that are not comparable to their skills. ITPs have to get that through to them. Everyone comes out of college with debt - it won't be made up within a year or two.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>Opposed to what they want the make up of the Board to be.</p> <p>Opposed to \$60/yr and \$30/LATE FEE. Other states have 2-year renewal and late fees are a fraction of what is being proposed.</p> <p>Opposed to having the board investigate continuing education in order to keep the licensure.</p> <p>Opposed to taking an exam for the licensure. Other states do not require this. If it is an Interpreter Training Program being selected I think that would be fine. However, having a student on the board could be detrimental to our field in this aspect.</p> <p>Need more representation of Certified Hearing Interpreters or Certified Coda Interpreters. It is Deaf heavy.</p> <p>Deaf individuals do not like others to make decisions for them. It is obvious there is exclusion happening here.</p>	Yes	Coda

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	This bill is redundant. We already have a governing body, RID. RID's Code of Conduct covers everything, from what I can see, that is already covered under RID. Why would we, certified interpreters, need to go through another testing and governing system? How would we be guaranteed an impartial board. From what I see in my 20 plus years of interpreting in this community I find it hard to believe that a fair and impartial board could be found. Honestly, if this bill passes into legislation I would seriously consider leaving the profession. I do not believe that this bill will make any difference in whatever Sonny and others feel is wrong with the currant system. I do not support this bill.	Yes	Hearing
No	Section 6 (Temporary Licenses) has too many high impact consequences that need to be flushed out more thoroughly. I may support this type of bill in the future, but with intensive planning and input from more parties.	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>I would like more information about how this was constructed/thought of. For example, Where did the make up of the board come from? What do other states do? Did the authors talk to other licensure boards to see what worked and what didn't from their point of view? I am thinking specifically of the board and it's make up...where did that come from? I am not necessarily against it, but I would like to see how other states' boards run.</p> <p>I remember something from the Town Hall that made sense to me...make the law simple, and then put the complexities in regulations. That way if the complexities need to change, it is easier than changing the law. Again, the make-up of the board is pretty specific...it feels really specific to be written into law.</p> <p>I am in favor of the MRID group that was just convened to do some work researching how licensure is handled other places. I would like to see that report so we can make sure we are doing something this big by making sure we see all perspectives. I am not against licensure at all—I just want to make sure we are doing this correctly.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	I support the idea of having a diverse board to represent the community. I do appreciate the licensure being created but we will need to clarify what this testing would look like and what are the qualifications for the board. How can we define the training period, how can we educate newer interpreters and what does that in-between licensed and un-licensed period look like.	Yes	Hearing
No	I feel like it will only limit the availability of Interpreting. Will this require all VRI interpreters to have MN license? That is already a huge barrier in providing VRI services for WI Deaf. Even if the interpreter is outstate, they can only interpret if they have each state's licensure...yuck. What will licensure improve? except to have a yearly fee? If Deaf people feel like they have had poor interpreters in the past, were they certified? often times yes, therefore that same poor interpreter will be licensed just as easily and will still be practicing, nothing will have changed.	No	Hearing
No	While this is an improvement from the bill last year I still don't think it addresses everything it needs to. I do not support a bill that focuses on the interpreters as the issue instead of the companies who are hiring unqualified "signers" instead of trained, certified or qualified interpreters when they should.	No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	there is already a national certification, there is no need for state licensure	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	Many reasons for not supporting it. The make up of the board does not make sense. Rather than identifying types of individuals, the law should identify the type of expertise that is needed for board members. As written, what guarantees any of these people will have deep knowledge of the interpreting profession to be able to make decisions about suspending or revoking licenses and imposing supervisory or probationary conditions for reinstating licenses? What expertise will the board have to establish alternatives to examination requirements, and create specialty licenses and professional conduct guidelines? Why is a large employer or business person on the board but not, for example, a medical services provider or government agency or Greater MN purchaser of interpreting services? The \$60 per person licensing fee seems unrealistically low considering how much work the board has to do.	Yes	Hearing
No	While I support the idea of raising the standards for ASL interpreters and having a system with checks and balances, I think this adds one more hoop for interpreters to jump through. We already have a shortage of interpreters, I'm afraid this will make it worse. Isn't there some way to partner with MN RID or RID to establish a checks and balances system to ensure a high quality of interpreting services?	No	Coda
No	I have been an NIC certified interpreter for over 12 years and a medical interpreter for over 6 years. I have already sat for a National Exam. I pay my RID dues yearly as well as maintain my CEUs as required by my certification. Placing more costs, CEUs, tests and expectations is overwhelming and will ultimately decrease the interest for students considering this profession. It will decrease the already small pool of "already qualified " interpreters which will negatively effect MN 's Deaf, HH, and DeafBlind consumers. I vote NO.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	I do not believe that the Board of 7 people is well balanced - one DB person, one CDI or DI, and one individual/employer that represents a business that generates a high volume of interpreter requests because it gives too much power imbalance and potential for abuse.	Yes	Deaf
No	"Nothing about us without us."	Yes	Hearing
No	This bill wasn 't created with participation by MADC or MRID.	Yes	Hard-of-hearing
No	MN can do better than licensure to gain better results!	Yes	Hearing
No	This is NOT good for our deaf friends and family!	No	Hearing
No	How are individuals who do not test well or pass the exam supposed to continue to improve their skills without being able to work or practice in the community?	Yes	Prefer not to answer
No	I think this should be discussed by the MRID licensure board and the community in general for a longer period of time before submitting legislation. If we are going to move forward with licensure, I'd like it to be together in agreement rather than hurriedly by a select few people.	No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	It will cause a shortage with Interpreters then causing the wage of Interpreters to go up! Already difficult to find Interpreters in outstate!	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>1) Sec. 1c: Why is this under the Dept. of Health?</p> <p>2) Sec.1e: "Interpreting" between a person using sign language and print?</p> <p>3) Sec. 1g: "Transliterating" is not "from one language into another".</p> <p>4) Sec. 2(3): Is "one individual representing a large employer or business that generates a high volume of interpreter requests" meaning an interpreting referral company (not clear)?</p> <p>5) Sec. 6: Temporary licensure. Will the temp licensed interpreter be responsible for paying for the time of the supervising licensed interpreter? If so, this will not be financially feasible for anyone to practice under a temporary license.</p> <p>6) According to 546.42, this licensure will apply to only interpreters for "disabled persons" as defined under this section. Will this then not apply to interpreting services for persons who identify as a member of a "socio-linguistic minority"?</p> <p>7) If we are licensed by the State of Minnesota and only work in Minnesota, do we have to maintain RID/NAD certification as well?</p> <p>8) Is this the entire bill that would become law? There seems to be a lack of thorough information. This can't be all there is for something that will have so much impact on our profession and our lives!</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>I do not see what problem this law would solve. I think licensure could simply be that interpreters need to be currently certified by RID, NAD or BEI in order to work for pay in Minnesota. Setting up a Board seems a very expensive solution and it would be very difficult to determine the rules or procedures for how to grant or revoke licensure. It is not clear why this would be under the Dept of Health. I do not see any penalties if someone interpreted without being licensed.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>I don't believe it is necessary when we have the RID certification system in place.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>This bill circumvents actions taken by MADC and MRID to gather consumer, community, and professional input into interpreter licensure. MRID has taken action to form a Deaf/hearing adhoc committee to research potential licensure. Introduction of this bill right now appears to be an attempt to unfairly avoid input from stakeholders.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>Who will be part of this committee to license? Will it be fair? Will it be neutral? How will training occur for committee members?</p>	Yes	Deaf
No	<p>This will be detrimental to the Deaf, DeafBlind, and hard of hearing communities that utilize interpreting services. It will cause a lack of interpreting resources in not just the twin cities but in greater Minnesota at disproportionate numbers. The fact is that utilizing the current market based approach of having so called "no lists " is effective in most circumstances and leads to the eventual dismissal or resignation of unethical, unqualified interpreters. Having a law in place to regulate interpreters will result in a lack of already scarce resources and not improve the quality of services offered.</p> <p>I find it incredulous that more stakeholders have not been involved in this process and that it has, by all appearances, been the work of a single individual that does not even represent a segment of the community or as a whole.</p> <p>Furthermore this regulation would add another barrier to those just emerging in the profession with aspirations of being involved and serving the community of which many of us enjoy, love, and look upon with admiration.</p>	Yes	Coda

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>I attended the Interpreter Town Hall meeting via Zoom and I strongly disagree with this bill.</p> <p>I believe most interpreters in my state are skilled professionals who take pride in the work they do. The mistakes we make are not intentional. Many of us will work harder to do better.</p> <p>Certified interpreters:  We put a lot of time and money into our profession.  We pay at least once (often times more than once) to take the RID/NAD National Certification exam.  We pay an annual membership fee of \$160.00-\$200.00. A number of interpreters pay additional fees to work out of state.  We pay \$37.00 (\$35+\$2 for processing fee) to our local chapter, MRID.  We pay hundreds of dollars or more to keep our certification active by completing 80 hours every four years of professional development (CEU's). Interpreters who don't live near the Twin Cities will pay more to learn.  And now, you are suggesting we pay \$60.00 annually for a license that may not resolve the issues Sonny has presented to us?</p> <p>Certified interpreters:  I believe most interpreters in my state who are RID/NAD certified adhere to our national organization's Code of Professional Conduct (CPC).  RID has an oversight committee. There are procedures they follow for grievances. Consumers can file a complaint. Certified interpreters pay for this service.  We should not have to pay an additional amount (\$60.00) of money on top of what we're already paying.</p> <p>I know there are reliable interpreter referral agencies in MN. They care about their customers and expect the interpreters who contracted with them to provide excellent service. They encourage feedback via direct approach, interpreter evaluation or an email.  Unfortunately, there are many service providers in MN (interpreter referral agencies and other) who are negligent in providing qualified interpreters to their customers.  It is my understanding Sonny's concerns are more with the interpreter referral agencies who hire pre-certified/non-certified interpreters without first being evaluated.  Agencies need regulations.  This bill does not focus on the agencies responsibilities.</p> <p>I also understand Sonny is concerned pre-certified and non-certified interpreters do not have to follow RID/NAD's Code of Professional Conduct/ethics and there is no recourse for the consumer(s) to take if they need to file a complaint. This too concerns me.  A long time ago the state was our interpreter referral agent. If agencies don't care who they hire or take no responsibility for the services rendered then they too should be penalized.</p> <p>This bill is too detailed. I don't understand how this license will solve the problems Sonny has mentioned.</p> <p>This bill is not supportive of certified, pre-certified or non-certified interpreters. There is a serious shortage of interpreters in MN. If this bill passes and becomes law then certified, qualified interpreters wouldn't be able to provide needed services and burn out would be high.</p> <p>I don't agree with how Sonny went about this. Yes, he told us all he was tired of being a second class citizen but I thought we were going to try to work together.</p>	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	This will cause a huge shortage of educational interpreters and is not focused on the needs of the students. I understand how this would be helpful with freelance interpreters. Greater Minnesota already struggles to get educational interpreters - please do not make it more difficult!!	No	Hearing
No	<p>With more thought and education, I might be able to support licensure for interpreters. I do understand that the current grievance process with RID is difficult and puts the onus of filing on the individual and the reviewers are not generally local individuals that understand the MN Deaf community and interpreters serving said community. And I can see how having local control could provide a more positive outcome for Deaf individuals.</p> <p>The first problem in my eyes is the fact that it will be under the Department of Health. I understand that many licenses are overseen by the Department of Health, but it would seem a more natural fit for this to be under the auspices of the Department of Human Services which already has the Commission for Deaf, DeafBlind, and Hard of Hearing and thus some understanding of the community being served.</p> <p>I also understand that laws are written intentionally vague so as to be flexible enough to be enacted without needing to return to the Legislature repeatedly for clarification. However, this is written in a way as to allow the first board to set rules and stipulations. That seems like a lot of power in seven governor appointed individuals. Will people apply and then be vetted? Who will be doing the vetting?</p> <p>Finally, part of the bill calls for supervision of temporarily licensed interpreters-- currently there is no structures in place to do this type of oversight. Will the licensing board be creating this type of position? Will anyone be able to call themselves a supervisor? As with the K12 certified interpreter requirement, many districts find themselves in a bind when their uncertified interpreters are not certified and need supervision. I have also heard of districts that have continued to use interpreters but reclassified them as either paras or non-essential personnel. (Which may be the reason the K12 bill is also up for modification.)</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	There is enough oversight in place currently	Yes	Hearing
No	I wish Sonny would have worked with MRID MADC MDBA MBDA first	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>Section 2 (a) 3 what is an example of a large employer? a VRS company or school district or corporation?</p> <p>Section 4 (a) does annually refer to "adopt rules" or to the actual license</p> <p>Section 5 (a) \$60 seems high</p> <p>Section 6 what does it mean for a person with a temporary license to be "under the direct supervision" of a licensed interpreter? In the room, weekly meeting other??</p>	Yes	Hearing, Deaf sibling
No	I don't support it as yet because it is unclear to me if I, as a long-time Certified NAD III Interpreter, who has taken steps to remain certified through collecting CEU's , etc., will be required to test again, or to pay several required fees to attain state licensure or what! I think if it could be made clear to me that I would NOT be required to re-test under a current system of testing i may be more willing to accept the legislation. Also, if fees prove to be collectively high, I may not support this. I mean, I'm not paid enough through only Educational Interpreting to pay for so many different fees that may add up to a lot of money!	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	Yet one more fee in addition to paying to renew certification every year. Is the \$60 fee annual? Make it every 5 years and I might be okay with it but I don't see the need for licensure when we are already paying to maintain certification.	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>In my area; the Deaf community is still lacking qualified interpreters. Especially in the Free-lance realm.</p> <p>I feel this is going to eliminate many seasoned interpreters who have worked professionally in this field, following the Code of Conduct, taking certification tests that already have been mandated to work in many areas of the State. I feel (including myself) ; these folks are not going to "jump through the hoops" to prove their skills again: hence the State will loose many already needed professionals. This bill seems like a duplicate of what RID already has in place. We already have proven ourselves to be professionals, by becoming certified thru RID and CEU"S requirements.</p> <p>What other profession continues to mandate that their profession must re-test to show their skills when they have been in the field for 30 + years?</p>	No	Hearing
No	<p>We already have all of this with RID. RID may have issues but re-inventing the wheel IS NOT the answer. This is not necessary. All interpreters will work together better following the National Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. If we need to fix something let us all work with RID to improve the needs that have been noted to bring this Bill forward. Do not reinvent the wheel!</p>	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing, Coda
No	<p>In section 2, I would like to see that changed to have two instructors of an interpreting program instead of one. They are trained to evaluate interpreters, and would be more beneficial than someone who is untrained. Sections 2.8, and 2.10 currently state using individuals who use Interpreting services. What are their qualifications? There should be something in both sections 2.8, and 2.10 that clarifies how these individuals are qualified to evaluate an interpreter. Just because someone receives services does not make him or her qualified to evaluate the entire interpreting process.</p>	No	Hearing
No	<p>I would like more information about how the members of the board will be chosen. How do we pick a specific candidate from an ITP and from which ITP? How do we pick an individual from a business with a high volume of interpreting requests at the same time making sure that individual is qualified to evaluate interpreters and the services that are provided? If interpreters don't pass the first time, how many attempts are allowed for the interpreter to pass the evaluation? Why is it being housed under the Department of Health? Are the board positions paid positions and if so, where is the funding coming from (is that considered "operations" coming from the \$60 dues)? If it isn't a paid position, will we truly get qualified candidates to be present on the board for such important decisions? What is the professional organization that will recommend the two interpreters to serve on the board? MRID? And if so, how will they make that decision- by community vote? MRID board vote? What will the effects of this licensure be on rural interpreting and Deaf communities? Keeping in mind that RID is in the process of developing the new NIC exam, what benefit is it to have a separate MN license? Are we reinventing the wheel when professional and ethical standards are already in place for our profession? One section that feels unclear is Sec 4. B. 1. If the member is certified through RID, does that mean they automatically receive MN licensure with because this alternative will be approved? I see that the board MAY do that but what criteria are they basing that decision on? Previous experience with the interpreter? And that does that show bias from the board towards specific interpreters? Will only the board members be involved in developing the MN licensure exam or will there by a community RFP for that? What does direct supervision look like for interpreters with a temporary license? Which interpreters will be trained (or paid) to provide that supervision? How will that work in confidential or HIPPA compliant environments? Currently it is difficult to get even interns into these settings, let alone an interpreter with a temporary license. I would like to see more information about a board handling MN specific grievances and I would like to see a code of ethics for the individuals serving on the board.</p>	No	Hearing
No	Need to include BEI and licensure shouldn't be tied to certification	Yes	Deaf

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	I have a lot of concerns with this bill and how it will incorporate things the the preexisting k-12 laws, already certified interpreters, and more. I feel like this bill has shown up out of nowhere without much discussion on the reasoning behind it or how it will include the systems that are already in place.	No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing, Coda
No		Yes	Deaf
No		No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	I think there is already a shortage of interpreters in Minnesota anyway so I don't believe adding more barriers is the answer. I understand that there needs to be a standard but only allowing 3 years for a temporary license seems drastic to me.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	This license seems redundant. Requirements for certification already exist within agencies and Education. Why do we have to jump through another hoop and pay another annual fee?? Unless this state license becomes the across the board "certification " for free lance and Education I do not support it.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	I respect the idea of having the idea of having the state accountable for interpreting services, but at the same time we need to trust the RID structure as a whole. I struggle with the idea of throwing state money into the DHHS when the structure as a whole is questionable when it relates to any financial decision and projects. We as a community need to go through the steps established by RID to ensure proper and ethical interpreting services. States across the US have tried establishing "boards " for their interpreting and transliterating services and in the end it has hurt the deaf community and the career as a whole.	No	Coda
No	I do not agree with the need to have an additional license besides RID/NAD/NIC certification to allow me to interpret in this state.	Yes	Hearing
No	The bill is less thorough than the current process. It will reduce the number of interpreters negatively affecting access for the deaf community. It could assure less qualified interpreters are hired and better qualified interpreters pushed out	Yes	Coda
No	Too many license fees and CEU requirements that make keeping licenses up to date full of busy work and different deadlines. If it follows RID CEU requirents and doesn't add any new filing procedures then that would be fine. I pay almost \$300/ year in renewals for current licenses and have various CEU requirements for all of them along with getting continuously updated RID transcripts, uploading and emailing and sending letters of approval all over the country to maintain licenses and going to expensive workshops to satisfy distinct requirement and now we add MN license fees and additional requirements??? I am all for requiring Interpreter to be nationally or an equivalency of certification to demonstrate skills and ethics but I don't want yet one more hoop and beurocratic red tape to be piled on an already strained system. Also don't like that religious interpeting i deliberately written out of the protections for certified interpreters. Just because one person doesn't value religion doesn't mean those services shouldn't require a qualified interpreter. That is an area that is filled with underqualified people and is not equal and fair access. It should be protected as well.	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	Address the K12 law	No	Hearing
No	not sure why it's needed if we already have a certification process in place	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Coda
No		Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>Only one hearing interpreter? No.</p> <p>Waste of money and time to set up a Board to do the same thing as certification. Just another way to not be direct and not confront the interpreter for taking a job they shouldn 't have taken in the first place.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>I do not feel this is possible for me to pay. I am solely responsible for 80 expensive CEU's per 4 year cycle to uphold my national certificate with RID. I also am required to pay per year to maintain this with RID</p> <p>My school district only pays me for 171 school days per calendar school year!! No holidays, and snow daysust use my "sick time".I do not have short term disability, and only have long term disability after missing 90 school days, then on the 91 school day I would qualify. This bill is OVERKILL, while I am a professional, I am pinching pennies in my budget as is. This bill should be an EITHER OR SITUATION. EITHER IM NATIONALLY CERTIFIED TO INTERPRET, OR MN STATE LICENSE.</p>	No	Hearing
No	State licensure is unnecessary when we adhere to the national standard.	Yes	Hearing
No	I am lost on why this is even happening. I don't understand the purpose behind the bill or how it will benefit the community as a whole.	No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	<p>How will this hold businesses accountable for hiring an actual licensed interpreter? Most interpreters who follow the RID CPC and get certified and continue in certification maintenance. How will it get the uncertified "signers" to comply? In our area, we are seeing local businesses turn to colleges and ask for students in the ASL class to come volunteer their time or get someone's friend who used to know sign language to come and interpret for a small stipend. The businesses are large enough to have to comply with the ADA but don't. Also, the school district is changing IEP's to say "language facilitator" so they can skirt around hiring interpreters either certified or provisionally licensed. Will this law help mitigate this practice or add to the disparity of the practice of changing what is needed to avoid the law? Why cut out religious interpreting and not protect that specialized area that also requires skills and knowledge to convey meaning accurately? That seems to discriminate on people who are involved in religious practices.</p> <p>I want interpreters to be required to be certified and meet standards for ethics and skill. I want better communication access for Deaf people but I don't understand how making another law to bill the interpreters who are already part of RID, MRID and more to pay for one more thing.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	I believe that this bill will not actually address the problem that it 's attempting to fix. Also, the fees proposed are grossly inadequate to provide the level of funding required to do the work, so who will pay for it?	Yes	Hearing
No	I have seen this block access to services in Wisconsin that could have been provided by qualified people.	Yes	Hearing
No	Agencies need to start being responsible for the placement of terps. l'ers get certified under RID. We do not need another!	Yes	Hearing
No	We have plenty of tests - hold agencies accountable for the l'ers they place on the assignments	No	Hard-of-hearing
No	Very confusing for businesses and organizations to understand the difference between a lisc. and certified interpreter. We don't need anymore confusion out there!!!! Hold agencies responsible for the quality of interpreters that they hire!!!!	Yes	Deaf
No	I see licensure as a benefit to the state in that they get to collect a fee.. I do not see a valid reason for establishing a licensure board to review, enforce and penalize interpreters. Our national organization, RID, already provides certification testing. We already pay dues and fees to RID and MRID. We agree to adhere to the Code of Professional Conduct. we study and earn CEUs. MRID and RID should be the ones who hear grievances and hold their members to ethical and professional standards. I would rather see partnership between MRID and MADC to act when necessary.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	I think there needs to be a revamp of everything. I am not about paying more and more for licensure and testing for certification. There needs to be more support for recent grads and new interpreters and for the community as a whole. The system is broken and instead of adding more barriers we should be trying to support and heal.	No	Hearing
No	States are finding this does not help with the accountability the Deaf community seems to be looking for. I believe there are other ways to create accountability that would be more effective. Secondly, who will be creating this test? If our national certification entity struggles with creating a test that appropriately reviews interpreters I have a lot of doubt about some board who it is not their skill set and expertise to do so. Creating a standardized test is difficult and a lot goes into it. Third, there are already steep barriers to entry which causes a lot of interpreters from moving into the profession. Many give up before they start. Of my graduating class only 3 became interpreters because of the barrier. I suspect we have an aging population of interpreters who are nearing retirement and many will not choose to continue. Lastly, with the beginning of work from home VRS and VRI the barrier that licensure creates will limit companies operating business in Minnesota. I work in this field and the company chooses to not operate in states with licensure because VRI and VRS obviously crosses state lines. How would this be managed? If we employ someone from CA to interpret for someone in MN what would ensure businesses can operate in this manner? What it seems people want mostly and would be more effective than a test that will more than likely not be standardized is current business practices that have largely missed the Deaf community because businesses have not established this unlike the rest of society. Deaf people need a platform to have this. Not more barriers that will undoubtedly make it more difficult to get skilled interpreters. While good intentions are here, it misses the mark entirely. At a time when states are choosing to stop the practice because it doesn't work or add value to the profession, interpreters do not earn a lot and don't have benefits at all why would we choose that route to make it more of a challenge. You'd be better off requiring certification in the education system. If you want contacts at the states who have licensure or want to connect please let me know. I suspect the only way interpreters and the Deaf community will be able to go through this process in a positive, connected way, will be if it's clear it's understood what the intent of licensure is and propose solutions that will work for all. Please let me know if it would be helpful to chat!	Yes	Hearing
No	Who is on this board? Do interpreters have the opportunity to vote who is on the board?	Yes	Hearing, Coda
No		No	Hearing
No	I am nationally certified and don't feel that I should have to take another test. If my NIC advanced could be used to qualify with out taking the test I am okay with that and just paying a yearly fee to show that I am still certified. I have already demonstrated that I am qualified and skilled.	Yes	Hearing
No	Do not like this bill	No	Deaf
No		No	Hearing
No	The law seems to have been written to support having one specific member of the deaf community to be on the board and making decision regarding all interpreter and their livelihood. We really don't need more testing and continuing education than we already have set up thru RID. This law is suppose to help the deaf community but how does it help the interpreting community?	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	I think language added to give flexibility to the board in regards to the temporary license and the 4 year limit. As interpreters we have experience unforeseen situations ex. RID certification moratorium. The language should state that the board if needed should be able to extend the 4 year requirement if needed. How is the Education k-12 bill going to fit into this new law? The k-12 bill is not mentioned and it should be. Will there be a special license for k-12 interpreters because the k-12 bill is stricter than this new law	No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	I do NOT trust the chosen 'board of experts' There is already a certification process in place, why continue to take money from interpreters every year!!!!	No	Coda
No	Feels like there are a lot of unknowns in this proposal, why??? STOP making things so complicated!!!!	Yes	Coda
No	Use of word MAY accept other certifications	Yes	Hearing
No	The definition of Transliterator does not include a Cued English Transliterator. Would these people be affected by this ruling?	No	Hearing
No	I don't believe state licensure is needed. We already have national certification. Proposed board members would be appointed by someone with no knowledge of ASL and interpreting	Yes	Hearing
No	Adds redundancy. Also not a fan of a committee of non legal experts deciding on criminal issues.	No	Coda
No	Do not agree	Yes	Hearing
No	Licensure is not necessary!	Yes	Hearing
No	Licensure is another ridiculous, expensive plethora of red tape that interpreters will have to endure, for absolutely no benefit to them or the community. It 's another way to fleece interpreters of their hard earned and rarely kept incomes, while unnecessarily policing them with colleagues known to be petty, vindictive, and uneducated.	Yes	Hearing
No	We do not need more oversee from anymore organizations that provide little benefit for the actual Interpreters.	No	Hearing
No	Definitions need work. Ex "transliterating " under the definitions section. I support licensure, but in order to make an effective bill, community should be consulted in advance. It seems the author has not engaged the MRID.	Yes	Hearing
No	I am 100 percent opposed to this bill as it stands. I believe it could cause harm to increasing Interpreter diversity and also take control away from practitioners as a body of MN interpreters as it seems very punitive and could be cost prohibitive. I also don't believe this bill would solve the problems the Deaf community would like to fix.	Yes	Hearing, Coda
No	Licensure will affect the deaf community and interpreters in different ways in different parts of the state. More research and care needs to be put in to determine the if licensure will solve the problems it is intended to solve and the minimize the negative impacts on the various communities it would effect.	Yes	Hearing
No	If a licensure bill has already been passed in to law without our input or worse yet, knowledge then trusting that this bill will be just and transparent is a no starter. If this bill is already focusing on putting a board together to oversee the licensing process then I won't be trusting 7 people to make this work. This is not being transparent to either parties. If I'm incorrect and have misunderstood this bill, then that too is very telling.	Yes	Hearing
No	I'm uncomfortable with the lack of policy definition and the sheer power dynamic that will be appropriated to 7 unknown board members. I am also uncomfortable with the "disability" language in the current version.	Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	Why are only 7 people going to be responsible for creating the rules for licensure?	No	Hearing
No	I believe if an interpreter has already become certified, especially under the new NIC test, that they have already proved themselves to be a qualified interpreter. As you know the new NIC test has been a struggle for many people to pass as of late. There is no reason for them to show again that they are a qualified interpreter.	Yes	Hearing
No	I have concerns about this additional licensure. It appears that the NIC is not considered a credible test if the state is going to require all nationally certified individuals to take yet another test. What happens if they have the NIC but fail the state licensure? How are we to know how the state licensure holds up to the national version? It would also cause a lot of issues for people who live just outside the border by having to obtain the additional certification. It concerns me that such a small group of individuals (board members) decide the lives of so many people in and around the state.	No	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No		No	Hearing
No	why??????? Are our other certifications not enough????	No	Hearing
No	We already struggle to have a reasonable testing certification process on the national level. Paying another fee and jumping more hoops does not make better interpreters or improve service.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No	This bill does not recognize BEI certification.	Yes	Coda
No	This needs to be community created, not just come from one person. Also, the bill as written would negatively impact the deafblind community.	Yes	Hearing
No	I left Michigan because of the additional expenses incurred due to the change in rules and regulations for licensure of Interpreters and the fact that the rate of pay did not change in response to the increased expenses to get and maintain licensure	Yes	Hard-of-hearing
No	Putting the power to chose who works as an interpreter in MN in the hands of a few individuals will stifle an industry that already struggles to fulfill the needs for interpreter services.	No	Hearing
No	It is too vague. I would like to see the rules established before the bill is passed. Right now it is not included.	No	Hearing
No	I'm not sure why licensure needed in addition the RID certification? What's the reason behind the Bill's proposed? What does having a license do for the profession?	Yes	Hearing
No	Currently I find the bill confussing as it is currently written. So for that matter I can not support the bill.	No	Hearing
No	I don't understand why this is under the dept of health. Also, I don't like that MRID and MADC weren't involved in writing it.	Yes	Hearing
No	If there is no grandfather clause for any who are certified with experience, keeping ceus current, then I cannot support it.	No	Hearing
No	What problems will this solve that could not be solved using systems that are already in place? I think in general, there is low awareness about interpreting outside of our profession and the Deaf community. When hearing consumers ask about the training entailed, they typically express shock at the initial and ongoing requirements. Perhaps an awareness/ public service campaign about the training, education and ongoing education that is involved? Plus a mechanism established that would require entities to hire certified interpreters, not merely "signers " or ASL students, and a punishment if they don't. From my understanding, this seems to be a greater issue in outstate MN than in the metro area. I am not seeing a benefit to this legislation as written. I am concerned about additional requirements being tacked on, which may force experienced, certified interpreters out of the field at the thought of dealing with even more requirements. Let 's first do what we can to make sure certified interpreters are being hired for assignments, not just people who know some sign language and are not affiliated or credentialed by a national oversight organization (e.g., RID or NAD)	Yes	Hearing
No	I am not sure how the bill solves a problem. Our problem is not enough certified interpreters so adding licensure doesn 't solve that. I agree a complaint system might be nice, but I suspect most behaviors that would be complained about would not rise to an ethical violation.	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>There is no clear position on interpreters who are working in the field but not yet certified. The temporary license sounds like it may help bridge the gap so that those waiting for certification can still work, however many certifications are limited right now. New tests and platforms have not been fully-fledged and the timeline is ever-changing. What happens to those working interpreters (hearing and Deaf) if the certification test they need to pass and gain licensure is not available or takes longer than the 4 years of a temporary license? Also, how do current ITP students fit into this? Would they be required to have a temporary license before starting their internship while still in school? What happens to those students after they graduate? Many interpreting agencies only offer summer internship-type programs. When those summer "internships" are complete, can they continue working? Will they be supported as stated in the bill, with a mentor who is licensed? There seems to be a lot of missing information about working interpreters who are limited to working within the confines of the certification systems that often extend timelines and take months to respond if they have passed their certification tests or not. Additionally, the cost and continuing education hours seem redundant of what is already in place through RID. What would be the benefit of paying membership and having CEU's through the state of MN? It seems that it is just an extra cost and time commitment when interpreters are already paying memberships and gathering CEU's for RID.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	As a certified member I see it as a redundancy.	Yes	Hearing
No	Unnecessary extra work and fees. Why is this needed at this time?	Yes	Coda
No	<p>Sometimes I use non-certified interpreters because they are still working towards certification and they need a safe place to gain experience. They should not be penalized because the current system for certification is horrible under RID. EIPA is not very good for the kinds of interpreters I use daily.</p> <p>Our agency uses non-certified people everyday who provide job coaching and occupational communication specialist services to help people obtain, retain and advance in employment. Often times, the participants we work with have requested those individuals to provide communication or language facilitation with them. These people are providing a valuable service to our community, and this includes those who work as SSPs or Interveners and are not certified. I am just concerned about the impact on these types of employees who do use ASL, but are not "interpreters".</p> <p>I think some valuable perspectives are missing on the board makeup-what about employers who hire interpreters? Schools who hire interpreters? CODAs? Deaf professionals vs Deaf grassroots?</p> <p>I think this bill was introduced way too soon, and should have involved the community first to provide a united front with legislators. They hate it when groups are divided on an issue.</p> <p>I do recommend looking at other states and their experiences with licensure. We need to understand the purpose for licensure, and where the fees will go. I am not comfortable with this falling under the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Department of Health. Why pick them?</p> <p>I am sure I will have more thoughts later, but this is enough for today.</p>	No	Deaf
No	I know other interpreters in different states who say requiring this extra license has been a huge pain in the rear, and many interpreters moved out of state to avoid the licensure rules and regulations.	Yes	Hearing
No		No	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>While I understand many details are to be worked out during the rules making process, I believe we need broader stakeholder input before the bill is voted on, including input from the constituencies represented by MADC and MRID. I am concerned there is no mention of interpreter agencies and their responsibilities for sending out interpreters who are qualified for the event and who meet the criteria required for different settings. We all know of instances, including recent instances in education where the QA Law has been on the books for years, when interpreter referral agencies send unqualified interpreters to communication events. Agencies must be accountable to clients as well, and this type of bill is an opportunity to make that happen.</p> <p>Thank you for all your advocacy and work!</p>	No	Hearing
No	<p>I'm a little concerned about the wording of the bill. I understand that bills tend to be more vague as it creates the opportunity of expansion and clarification through the board as it is not easy to change a bill. However, I feel this is too vague and lends itself to a board who could possibly have too much power or control within our community. I find it odd that it specifies a dues amount yet it mentions nothing about punitive action, what the options are or how they will be enforced. It seems that it is trying to compound power in one place with minimal boundaries set within the bill itself.</p> <p>I also find it disconcerting that the governor decides who to appoint to the board, an individual who has very little knowledge of our profession. There are minimal requirements set as to whom can serve on the board, with no term limits or means of how to go about the removal of a board member who may not be doing a service to our community.</p> <p>Another concern I have are the stipulations for temporary licensing for those working toward certification. I think that 4 years is difficult for some and that the recent history of our NIC tests has been tumultuous at best. I feel I am a good interpreter and it still took me 3 and a half years to pass the NIC. I think that this could make it harder for new graduates to work on their skills and improve their work to get them to the level needed to pass the NIC or work independently. I think that it is unreasonable to expect certified/licensed interpreters to be responsible (supervise) pre certs/temporary license holders. I think that we may potentially see interpreters begin to refuse to work with temporary license holders making it more difficult for them to get work. I think that this may result in a greater interpreter shortage since it will increase the likelihood of new graduates making it to certification and remaining in the field. I feel that our pre certs and recent graduates need more support and I'm worried that the bill as written will have the opposite effect.</p> <p>I have nothing to say but I would like to see community cooperation and input and I would like to see more specific information as to the reasons to implement it and why it is being proposed so adamantly without community cooperation.</p> <p>I feel frustrated that even with the community working together towards approaching this issue and gathering information this bill is still being pushed forward without input from the community at large. It makes me unsure of the motives behind pushing this bill forward without waiting for community input. I would imagine that working together could provide and put forth a stronger bill that has community support as opposed to pushing through a bill without the input of the local community it would affect that could have potential unforeseen negative impacts to just get it done.</p>	Yes	Hearing
No	<p>If certified the CEU's should be enough!! I don't have extra time and money for an un need licensure! We are NOT brain surgeons we are interpreters.</p>	Yes	Hearing

Do you support the bill as written?	Please share any thoughts you have regarding the bill.	MRID member	Demographics
No	<p>I want to start by saying that 'm in full support of this law.</p> <p>I question why 3.27 through 4.2. "Impartial", "fairly", "respectfully", "professional appearance", these are all words that are arguably opinions. Yes, they are important details but do they need to be written into a law? Wouldn't these points be better to be worked into the rules set by the board?</p> <p>There is no mention of education requirements such as a training program whether it be 6 weeks or 4 years. I get it that leaves out interpreters who have been interpreting for 30+ years and have never attended an Interpreter training program or any college (Like for a CDI) at all. There could be some kind of grandfathering rule, like accumulated hours of work. I feel that leaving this out leaves the door open for people who want to get a license and who maybe can pass a basic screening assessment. There are those out there that get an ASL Certificate and are proficient signers who want to be interpreters and call themselves interpreters, doing the work of an interpreter but did not actually go through an interpreter training program, these are not the 30+ year interpreters I'm talking about, these folks are popping up recently.</p> <p>What happened to the penalties? I thought I read in the first draft that if someone was interpreting with out a license that a penalty would be charged. What is going to stop people from interpreting without a license if there isn't a penalty? Such as an audiologist interpreting even though they have repeatedly been asked to stop. What makes them want to stop? Agencies and companies or businesses and those hiring interpreters should also be held accountable.</p> <p>I feel like I have other thoughts about this but they are escaping me at this moment.</p> <p>Thanks!!</p>	No	Hearing
No	Greater detail and clarity is needed.	No	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing
No		Yes	Hearing, Coda
No		No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No		No	Hearing
No	If we do this board- there shouldn 't be any consumers on it. Only certified working deaf and hearing interpreters. Look at other licensing boards- there 's no patients or consumers on theirs. Ours should be no different. We can 't want to be treated like doctors and lawyers for somethings (like getting a license) and not others (like who 's on our boards). All or nothing.	Yes	Hearing
No	We do not need more individuals overseeing Certified, Professional, working adults.	No	Hearing, Coda
No		Yes	Hearing