

# **Report on Interpretation and Translation Services in Commonwealth Administrative Agencies**



**The Pennsylvania Interbranch Commission  
for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness  
Interpreter Services Committee  
August 15, 2007**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	1
ABOUT THE AUTHOR .....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
SUMMARY OF AVAILABILITY OF SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION SERVICES..	6
SURVEY RESULTS	
A. Agencies Conducting Hearing Or Intake Functions - Tables 1 and 2.....	7
B. Frequency Of Need For Non-English Document Translation And Oral And Sign Interpretation Services - Tables 3 through 5 .....	7
C. Agency Spending On Translation/Interpretation Services - Tables 6 through 6(f) .....	8
D. Agency Funding Sources - Tables 7 through 7(b) .....	10
E. Agency Statistical Recordkeeping - Tables 8 and 8(a).....	10
F. Most Frequently Needed Translation Or Interpretation Services - Tables 9 through 9(c) .....	11
G. Use Of Translation And Interpretation Technology - Tables 10 through 11 .....	11
H. Agency Interpreter Policies - Tables 12 and 12 (a).....	12
I. Punctuality And Quality Of Translators And Interpreters - Tables 13 through 14(a).	12
J. Methods Of Obtaining Translator And Interpreter Services - Tables 15 through 17..	13
K. Interagency Collaboration On Translation And Interpretation Services - Tables 18 and 18 (a).....	14
L. Translator Or Interpreter Qualifications Requirements - Tables 19 and 19(a) .....	15
M. Training Provided By Agencies to Translation And Interpretation Service- Providers - Tables 20 and 21 .....	16
N. Training Provided By Agencies to Administrative Judges Or Hearing Officers - Table 22.....	17
O. Public And Advance Notification Mechanisms - Table 23 through 25 .....	18
COMPARISON OF FINDINGS OF SUPREME COURT STUDY WITH THOSE OF INTERBRANCH COMMISSION SURVEY.....	23
CONCLUSION.....	25
APPENDICES.....	26
A. The Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness Agency Translation and Interpretation Services Survey Instrument .....	26
B. Tables for Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness Survey on Commonwealth Agency Interpreter and Translation Services Use .....	34

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness<sup>1</sup> extends its deep gratitude to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the Pennsylvania Legislature for their continuing and unflagging support. This survey was undertaken under the leadership of Chief Justice Ralph J. Cappy who served as the first Chair of the Commission, and was funded by the Legislature whose members have worked cooperatively with the Commission on its many initiatives since its inception.

The Commission also thanks the administrative agencies to whom the surveys were directed for providing prompt and complete responses. They are responsible for the 100% response rate to the survey and for the credibility that response rate lends to the survey results.

The members of the Interpreters Service Committee and the Commission staff deserve special commendation, as well, for their diligence and resourcefulness in guiding this project to its successful completion. Two Committee members in particular, Nora Winkelman, Executive Deputy General Counsel for Legislative Affairs, and the Honorable Pedro Cortes, Secretary of the Commonwealth, provided invaluable assistance to the committee in overseeing the distribution and collection of the survey responses.

Finally, and of particular importance, the Commission must thank and acknowledge the outstanding work of Dr. Jeffery Ulmer, an Associate Professor of Sociology and Crime, Law and Justice at Penn State University, who both designed the survey and interpreted the results of the completed surveys. The Commission is indebted to him for the knowledge and expertise he brought to this project.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania appointed a Committee in 1999 to study whether gender or racial bias influenced the operation of the justice system in Pennsylvania. In 2003, the Committee completed its study and submitted a 550-page report to the Court with its findings and recommendations. Chapter one of the Committee's Final Report contains the findings and recommendations on the need for translation and interpretation services in Pennsylvania. The current Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness was established for the purpose of implementing the recommendations in the Supreme Court Committee's Final Report. The instant survey and report was produced by the Interpreters Service Committee of the Interbranch Commission in furtherance of the recommendations in chapter one of the Final Report.

## Interpreter Services Committee

The Honorable Ida K. Chen, Chair  
The Honorable Pedro A. Cortés  
Lazar Kleit  
Jennifer Ann Wise, Esquire

## Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness

Burrell Brown, Esq., Chair

Cathy Bissoon, Esq.  
Helen E. Casale, Esq.  
The Honorable Ida K. Chen  
Samuel T. Cooper, Esq.  
The Honorable Pedro A. Cortés  
Jacqueline D'Angelo, Esq.  
Khadija T. Diggs, Esq.  
The Honorable Elizabeth Doyle  
Lazar H. Kleit  
The Honorable Ted V. Kondrich  
The Honorable Maureen Lally-Green  
Roberta D. Liebenberg, Esq.

Lynn Marks, Esq.  
Lucille Marsh, Esq.  
Gladys Miller-Russell  
Burton D. Morris, Esq.  
The Honorable Jane Clare Orie  
Nathan C. Pringle, Jr., Esq.  
The Honorable Doris A. Smith-Ribner  
Kathleen D. Wilkinson, Esq.  
Nora Winkelman, Esq.  
Jennifer Ann Wise, Esq.  
Samuel S. Yun, Esq.

## Staff of the Interbranch Commission

Lisette M. McCormick, Esq., Executive Director  
Christine M. Mawhinney, Paralegal  
Glen S. Downey, Intern  
Rebecca Olds, Intern  
Andrew Flechtner, Intern

## ***About the Author of the Study ...***

### ***Jeffery Todd Ulmer, Ph.D***

This survey was designed and analyzed by Dr. Jeffery Todd Ulmer, Associate Professor of Sociology and Crime, Law, and Justice at The Pennsylvania State University in University Park, PA. Dr. Ulmer obtained his B.A. from Susquehanna University, and his M.A. and Ph.D. from The Pennsylvania State University.

Immediately after earning his doctorate in 1993, Dr. Ulmer moved to Purdue University where he spent six years as an Assistant Professor of Sociology. He returned to Penn State in 2000, where he has remained to the present. With his colleague, Professor John Kramer, he conducted research on racial, ethnic, and gender disparity in Pennsylvania sentencing for the Pennsylvania Supreme Court Committee on Racial and Gender Bias in the Justice System in 2003.

In addition, Dr. Ulmer has published 27 social science journal articles on courts and sentencing, along with various other topics in Criminology and Sociology. He is the author of *Social Worlds of Sentencing: Court Communities Under Sentencing Guidelines* (1997, State University of New York Press). He is also co-author (with Darrell Steffensmeier) of *Confessions of a Dying Thief: Understanding Criminal Careers and Illegal Enterprise* (2005, Aldine Transaction Publishers), which won the American Society of Criminology's Michael J. Hindelang Book Award.

## INTRODUCTION

The Interpreter Services Committee of the Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness devoted much of its first year of operation to conducting a review of the status of interpretation and translation services throughout Pennsylvania's justice system by meeting with various government agencies and individuals, among other efforts.<sup>2</sup> The Committee also determined that as a part of that effort, it would seek information about the availability of interpretation and translation services in state administrative proceedings. To assist in this effort, the Committee engaged the services of Dr. Jeffery Ulmer, Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at The Pennsylvania State University, to design a survey to obtain that data from all Pennsylvania administrative agencies. The survey was completed in June of 2006 and distributed later that month under the auspices of the Governor's Office of General Counsel.<sup>3</sup> In total, 42 surveys were distributed and 42 were returned to the Committee, for a 100% response rate. The Committee intends to use the information obtained from the survey as a means of identifying best practices among the agencies for providing language interpretation services.

This report describes the results of the survey on the use of translation and sign and non-English interpretation services by agencies in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The survey questionnaire appears at the end of this report as an Appendix, along with the coding of the variables in the resulting dataset.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Interbranch Commission produced its first Annual Report in June 2005. For more information on other initiatives of the Commission, see the Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial and Ethnic Fairness 2005 Annual Report at [www.courts.state.pa.us/index/interbranchforfairness/](http://www.courts.state.pa.us/index/interbranchforfairness/).

<sup>3</sup> At the time that the survey results were produced, Senate Bill 669 had been passed by the full Senate. On November 20, 2006 Governor Ed Rendell signed the bill into law, now known as Act 172 of 2006.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Surveys were distributed to 42 Commonwealth agencies, with a 100% response rate.
- Twenty-four (57%) of the 42 agencies surveyed conduct hearings or intake functions for the public and use translation or interpretation service to some degree.
- Of those 24 agencies, most have a significant need for those services, with some agencies requiring oral interpretation services as many as two or more times per day.
- Most of those agencies spend relatively small amounts on such services but five “heavy users” spend well over \$100,000 for them.
- Spanish is the most commonly needed translation or interpretation service, followed by American Sign Language (ASL), Vietnamese, Russian, Chinese, Korean, Cambodian, “Asian Languages,” French, Swahili, and Arabic.
- Most agencies (71%) that use translation/interpretation services use telephonic translation or interpretation services, though some use computer translation programs that print or broadcast non-English translations. Other reported methods of obtaining those services include assigning one of the agency’s full-time interpreters, calling an interpreter services agency, choosing from a list of interpreters in a state contract, and relying on parties to provide their own interpreters.
- One quarter of the agencies that use translation/interpretation services require written certification of translator/interpreter qualifications; the remainder either impose no requirements or use government contracts with providers as quality control.
- 42% of those agencies have policies for the use of translators or interpreters.
- Almost two-thirds of agencies that use translation/interpretation services collaborate in obtaining those services, with 12% reporting “a great deal” of collaboration.
- Most (71%) agencies that use the services do not provide training to translation or interpretation service-providers, or to administrative judges or hearing officers.
- Most (63%) agencies that provide translation or interpretation services have methods of informing the public of their availability, including posting signs or notices with this information in multiple languages and providing pre-hearing notices containing the information.

### EXEMPLARY PRACTICES

One agency provides training on confidentiality requirements and office practices to its providers of translation and interpretation services.

Two-thirds of agencies have advance notification mechanisms for clients to provide information of their need for translation or interpretation services, including telephone numbers to request services and postcards or publications on how to obtain accommodations.

Five agencies have full-time interpreters on staff.

One agency provides administrative judges and hearing officers with basic trainings, periodic refresher training and random federal quality appraisals on the use of translation and interpretation services.

## **SUMMARY OF AVAILABILITY OF SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION SERVICES**

- **Frequency of Need for Sign Interpretation Services**  
Of the 42 agencies surveyed, 24 conduct hearings and/or intake functions and use translation/interpretation services to some degree. Table 5 of the survey indicates that of those 24 agencies, 54% never need sign language interpretation, while 31% need it one to five times per year.
- **Agency Spending on Sign Interpretation Services**  
Of the 24 agencies that conduct hearings and/or intake functions, most spend relatively small amounts on translation/interpretation services but five spend well over \$100,000 for them. Table (f) of the survey shows that the top spending agency (\$545,000 per year) requires document translation once a month, oral interpretation six times a year, but sign interpretation more than five times a day. Another spends over \$168,000 and requires oral interpretation services once a day and sign interpretation services once a month.
- **Agency Statistical Recordkeeping**  
Table 8(a) of the survey shows that among the few agencies that maintain statistics on translation/interpretation services, three agencies do so for sign language services.
- **Most Frequently Needed Translation or Interpretation Services**  
Table 9 of the survey indicates that sign language is the second most frequently needed translation or interpretation service among the agencies surveyed.
- **Use of Translation and Interpretation Technology**  
Table 10(b) of the survey shows that four agencies (about 17%) use computer programs that print English on-screen for hearing-impaired people.
- **Agency Translator/Interpreter Policies**  
Tables 12 and 12(a) of the survey show that 42% of the agencies have policies for the use of translators or interpreters (including sign) and that there are no appreciable differences among agency branch offices in how the policies are implemented.
- **Punctuality and Quality of Translators and Interpreters**  
Table 14 of the survey indicates that 41% of the responding agencies agree or strongly agree that the sign interpreters they use are punctual, and about 18% are undecided. Identical results characterize Table 14(a), where the same proportions of respondents agree or strongly agree that sign interpreters meet the agency's quality expectations, and the same proportion are undecided.
- **Public and Advance Notification Mechanisms**  
Most agencies have mechanisms for clients to provide advance notice of their need for translation or interpretation services, including sign language. Tables 24 and 25 of the survey indicate that these mechanisms include a telephone number to call to request the service, or a postcard or publication with information on how to obtain an accommodation. Most agencies also have methods of informing the public of the availability of translation or interpretation services, such as posting signs or notices with information in multiple languages and providing pre-hearing notices containing that information.

## **SURVEY RESULTS**

### ***A. AGENCIES CONDUCTING HEARING OR INTAKE FUNCTIONS***

*The vast majority of state administrative agencies conduct hearings or intake functions involving the public, thereby requiring access to translation or interpretation services.*

Tables 1 and 2 show the number of agencies that conduct hearings or other intake functions. The hearings or intake functions conducted by these agencies throughout the state present situations of contact with the public, and this public contact makes it more likely that agencies will have need of translation services. As the tables show, 73% of agencies hold hearings of some kind, and 33% have other intake functions that involve contact with clients.

Several columns are listed in each of the subsequent tables. The column labeled “frequency” indicates the number of agencies falling in a category or responding a certain way (i.e., the row labels). The column “percent” shows the overall percent of the 42 total responding agencies that fall in a certain category. The “percent of applicable cases” column, which is most often the focus of the discussion below, is the percent of the cases that actually hold hearings or intake functions, and/or use translation services to some degree (this is explained in more detail below). The “cumulative percent” column simply shows the summation of the “percent of applicable cases” column, and confirms that the rows sum up to 100%.

### ***B. FREQUENCY OF NEED FOR NON-ENGLISH DOCUMENT TRANSLATION AND ORAL AND SIGN INTERPRETATION SERVICES***

*The frequency of need for non-English document translation, and oral and sign interpretation services varies considerably from agency to agency. With regard to document interpretation services, while most agencies never require such services, 31% require them one to five times per year, and 5.6% require them once or more per day. With regard to oral interpretation services, 36% of agencies never require such services, 25% require them one to five times per year, and 14% require them two or more times per day, and 11% require them once per month.*

*54% of agencies never need sign language interpretation, while 31% need it one to five times per year.*

**Tables 3-5**, and subsequent tables, focus on those agencies that answer in the affirmative to either conducting hearings or conducting intake functions. The most relevant statistics for these agencies are shown under the column, “percent of applicable cases,” and italicized. The tables show the frequency with which agencies need various kinds of translation services.

According to **Table 3**, about 47% of agencies never require document translation services, while about 31% of agencies require such services one to five times per year. On the other hand, only two agencies, or 5.6%, require document translation once or more times a day. The rest of the agencies fall between these extremes.

In **Table 4**, 36% of agencies never require oral interpretation services for non-English languages. Requiring such services one to five times a year are nine agencies (25%), and about 11% of agencies require such services once a month. Five agencies, or about 14%, require non-English oral interpretation two or more times a day.

**Table 5** shows that 54% of agencies never need sign language interpretation, while 31% need it one to five times per year. One agency requires sign interpretation once a month, and another requires sign interpretation more than five times a day.

### ***C. AGENCY SPENDING ON TRANSLATION/INTERPRETATION SERVICES***

*Of the 42 agencies surveyed, 24 conduct hearings and/or intake functions and use translation/interpretation services to some degree. Of the 24 agencies, most spend relatively small amounts on such services but five spend well over \$100,000 for them. The top agencies spend \$545,000 and \$169,700 respectively, and are, as one would surmise, the agencies with the most frequent need for such services. Another agency, however, requires translation and interpretation services frequently but spends relatively little on them.*

**Tables 6 and 6(a)-(c)** describe the amount of money agencies spend and expect to spend on translation services. These tables, and all subsequent tables and statistics referred to in this

report, focus on only the agencies who reported that they conduct hearings and/or intake functions, and only those agencies who report never needing sign, oral interpretation, or document translation services. Eighteen agencies do not hold hearings and/or conduct intake functions and indicate that they never use translation or interpretation services. 24 agencies hold hearings and/or conduct intake functions, and use interpretation services to some degree. The “percent of applicable cases” columns in the tables, which are italicized, refer to these translation service-using agencies.

**Tables 6(a) and 6(b)** show a wide range of spending on translation and interpretation services. Many agencies spend what might be considered relatively negligible amounts. Five agencies spend well over \$100,000. **Table 6(b)** (anticipated spending for the present fiscal year) closely resembles **Table 6(a)** (spending in the last fiscal year). A significant number of agencies will spend relatively small amounts, while a handful of “heavy users” will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars. The ten agencies that spent the most money in the past fiscal year are listed in **Table 6(c)**.

**Tables 6(d) and 6(e)** show cross-tabulations of the association between the spending on translator or interpreter services by agencies, and agency needs for document translation [**Table 6(d)**], oral [**Table 6(e)**], and sign translation [**Table 6(f)**]. There is a tendency for spending and need to go together; that is, the agencies that spend the most money tend to have at least one heavy translation or interpretation need. The top spending agency requires document translation once a month, oral interpretation six times a year, but sign interpretation more than five times a day. The next agency in terms of capital expenditures requires document translation two to five times a day and oral interpretation more than five times a day, and spends over \$169,000. Another spends over \$168,000 and requires oral interpretation services once a day and sign

interpretation services once a month. While one agency spends over \$138,000 and requires document translation two to three times a month and oral interpretation more than five times a day, another spends relatively little (\$25,000), yet requires document translation once a month and oral interpretation two to five times a day. Finally, another agency requires translation and interpretation services often but spends relatively little on them. According to this agency's survey answers and written comments, this lack of expenditures is apparently because the agency often relies on trusted fellow inmates or family members to interpret for inmates in hearings.

#### ***D. AGENCY FUNDING SOURCES***

***There is considerable variation in agency funding sources for translation and interpretation services. The most common include “general government operations funds”, “state appropriations” and “general revenue.”***

**Tables 7 and 7(a)-(b)** reveal the first three funding sources mentioned by agencies. Survey respondents could list multiple funding sources, and no one lists more than three. **Table 7** shows the first-mentioned funding source, **Table 7(a)** the second, and **Table 7(b)** the third. The funding sources vary widely and appear to be somewhat idiosyncratic to each agency. However, commonly mentioned sources include variations on “general government operations funds,” “state appropriations,” or “general revenue.”

#### ***E. AGENCY STATISTICAL RECORDKEEPING***

***Few agencies maintain statistics on translation, sign or interpretation services.***

**Tables 8 and 8(a)** show whether agencies maintain statistics on non-English language translation or sign services. Few agencies maintain statistics for either service—five agencies maintain statistics for translation and interpretation services and three agencies maintain them for

sign services. Spontaneously provided written comments on the surveys indicate that when statistics are kept, the source is billing records.

#### ***F. MOST FREQUENTLY NEEDED TRANSLATION OR INTERPRETATION SERVICES***

***Spanish is the language requiring the most translation or interpretation services, followed by sign language, Vietnamese, Russian and Chinese.***

**Tables 9 and 9(a)-(c)** show the most frequently needed translation or interpretation services, including sign. **Table 9** shows the first-mentioned service needed, **Table 9(a)** the second mentioned, and so forth. The overall most frequently mentioned translation or interpretation service needed is Spanish, mentioned a total of 21 times, including 13 times (31%) as the first mentioned. Sign interpretation is second with thirteen overall mentions and seven first mentions. Third and fourth most frequent are Vietnamese and Russian. Vietnamese receives one first mention but five second mentions. Russian receives two first mentions, a second mention, and four third mentions. Chinese is also mentioned five times overall, and Korean, Cambodian, and “Asian languages” receive six overall mentions together. French receives two third mentions, Swahili receives one second mention, and Arabic receives one third mention. Clearly, significant varieties of translation and interpretation services are needed throughout the agencies.

#### ***G. USE OF TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION TECHNOLOGY***

***Almost 71% of the services-using agencies use telephonic translation services. 8% use computer programs that print documents in non-English languages.***

**Tables 10 and 10(a)-(c)** show the frequency of use of translation or interpretation services technologies. **Table 10** shows 17 agencies, or almost 71% of the applicable services-using agencies, use telephonic translation or interpretation services. **Table 10(a)** shows two

agencies, or about 8%, use computer programs that print documents in non-English languages. **Table 10(b)** shows that only one agency uses computer programs that printed on-screen non-English translations, but four agencies (about 17%) used such programs that print English on-screen for hearing-impaired people.

**Table 11** shows other translation or interpretation technologies the agencies mentioned as being used. Two agencies mentioned that they use computer programs for the vision-impaired; one agency stated that it maintains pre-prepared document stencils in commonly needed languages for use when needed, and one agency said it uses/provides documents in Spanish on a website.

#### ***H. AGENCY TRANSLATOR/INTERPRETER POLICIES***

***42% of the agencies have policies for the use of translators or interpreters (including sign) and there are no appreciable differences among agency branch offices in how the policies are implemented.***

**Tables 12 and 12(a)** refer to any written policies the agencies have for the use of translators or interpreters. Ten agencies, or about 42%, say that they do have such policies, but all of the agencies state that there is no variation between offices in the agencies in how the written policies acknowledged in Table 12 are implemented.

#### ***I. PUNCTUALITY AND QUALITY OF TRANSLATORS AND INTERPRETERS***

***Most agencies report that their translators and interpreters meet their performance expectations and are punctual.***

**Tables 13-13(a) through 14-14(a)** assess the perceived punctuality and quality of translators and interpreters used by the agencies. When presented with the question, “Overall, the non-English interpreters we use are punctual,” 47% of the valid responses agree, and 29% strongly agree. Approximately 24% are undecided, and seven agencies did not answer. In

response to the question, “Overall, the non-English interpreters we use meet our expectations of quality,” 52% agree and approximately 32% strongly agree; approximately 5% disagree, approximately 11% are undecided, and five agencies did not answer. **Tables 14 and 14(a)** ask the same questions for sign interpreters used by the agencies, and comparatively fewer agencies’ respondents answered these questions, perhaps because, as shown in Table 5, many agencies do not have substantial sign interpreter needs. In **Table 14**, 41% agree or strongly agree, respectively, that the sign interpreters they use are punctual, and about 18% are undecided. Identical results characterize **Table 14(a)**, where the same proportions of respondents agree or strongly agree that sign interpreters meet the agency’s quality expectations, and the same proportion are undecided.

#### ***J. METHODS OF OBTAINING TRANSLATOR AND INTERPRETER SERVICES***

*Notably, five agencies report “assigning one of [their] ‘full-time’ interpreters’ as their method of obtaining translator or interpreter services. Other agencies report using a variety of methods to obtain such services, including calling an interpreter services agency, calling a telephonic interpreter services line, choosing from a list of interpreters in a state contract, and relying on parties to provide their own interpreters. Among those in the last category, most place no restrictions on who could interpret in this way.*

**Tables 15 and 15(a)-(c)** show the various ways that agencies report obtaining translator or interpreter services. **Table 15** shows the first way mentioned; **Table 15(a)** the second mentioned; and so forth. No agency mentions more than four ways of obtaining services. The most frequent first mention is “call an interpreter services agency,” mentioned first 11 times (approximately 46%), and mentioned 14 times overall. **This was followed by “assign(ing) one of the agency’s full time interpreters,” which is first-mentioned five times (approximately 21%).** Among the second-mentioned ways of obtaining services (excluding the “none listed” category), “call a telephonic interpreter services line” is most common, with seven second-

mentions (and 12 overall mentions). Among third mentions, relying on parties to provide their own interpreters is mentioned three times, and mentioned overall six times. “Pick one from a qualified list of freelance interpreters” is listed overall four times.

**Table 16** shows other ways not listed on the survey form that agencies report obtaining services. Agencies mention “Department of General Services (DGS) contract”, “state contract” or other similar references to state contracts five times, and mention using agency staff with fluency in a needed language in an ad hoc way to provide services four times.

The survey asks, if the respondent checked “rely on parties to provide their own interpreters” as a way of obtaining interpreter services, whether there are any restrictions on who can be used in this way. **Table 17** shows the results. Of the seven agencies relying on clients to provide their own interpreters, only two place any restrictions on who could interpret in this way. One agency elaborates: “Family and friends are not permitted to act as interpreters except in unusual circumstances.” On the other hand, another agency writes, “Concerns (about parties’ own interpreters) are overlooked so that we can develop a record in the case.” Similarly, another agency states: “These interpreters are usually family members or friends of clients being investigated and the interview is conducted at their residence.

#### ***K. INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION ON TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION SERVICES***

***Very few agencies report collaborating with other agencies in obtaining translation or interpretation services or in providing training to service-providers.***

**Tables 18 and 18(a)** describe the amount of reported interagency collaboration in obtaining translation or interpretation services and in training those who provide those services. **Table 18** addresses responses to the question, “To what extent does your agency collaborate with other agencies in obtaining interpreter services?” Three agencies, or approximately 13% of the

valid responses, say “a great deal,” while four (approximately 17%) say “a moderate amount.” Eight agencies, or 33%, say that they collaborate in obtaining services “a small amount,” and nine agencies (approximately 38%) say they collaborate not at all. In **Table 18(a)**, very few agencies report that they collaborate with other agencies in training those providing interpreter services. Two agencies (approximately 9% of valid cases) say they collaborate “a small amount,” two are undecided, and 19 agencies (approximately 83%) report no collaboration at all. Discussing inter-agency collaboration, one agency says:

“A Mandarin Chinese interpreter was utilized for a hearing...When the need for an interpreter for this hearing was determined, the legal office reached out to other state agencies as well as [division of our own office] for guidance. Another agency that holds many hearings suggested ‘Language Services Associates.’”

#### ***L. TRANSLATOR OR INTERPRETER QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS***

***One quarter of the agencies require written certification of qualifications of those providing translation or interpretation services and another quarter impose no requirements on providers. The majority of the remaining half of the agencies uses government contracts with providers as quality control for translators or interpreters.***

The survey asked respondents what agencies require from translators and interpreters and asked them to choose as many answers as applied from among several fixed categories of answers. The survey then asked them to specify other requirements not covered by the pre-set categories as applicable. **Tables 19 and 19(a)** describe the results. In **Table 19**, half of the 24 valid responses list “other” requirements, one quarter list no requirements, and one quarter list “written certification of their qualifications” as a requirement of those providing interpreter services.

**Table 19(a)** lists the several particular open-ended responses agencies provided. In 31 cases, the question was either not applicable (i.e., the 18 agencies that did not have hearings/intake functions or did not use translation or interpretation services) or else no other requirements were listed (13 cases). If there is a common theme in the “other” responses, it is related to the use of DGS or government contracts to serve as quality control for translators and interpreters. Five agencies state: “DGS contract serves as quality control,” “language line contract covers qualifications,” “rely on Commonwealth screening (through contracts),” “should be on DGS contract 9985-30 list,” or “statewide DGS contract CN00014316.” One agency writes that, “Interpreters must state qualifications on the record.” Another agency states:

“(Interpreters) must be certified to provide the service and cannot have a conflict of interest. ASL interpreters must be registered with the Office of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Contractors for language services must assure qualifications of their interpreters.”

#### ***M. TRAINING PROVIDED BY AGENCIES TO TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION SERVICE-PROVIDERS***

*Notably, the survey found that one agency provides translation or interpretation service-providers with guidance about confidentiality requirements and office practices. The remainder of agencies gives neither general nor ethics training to translation and interpretation service-providers.*

**Table 20** shows that most agencies do not provide agency-specific training to translation or interpretation services-providers in commonly encountered situations. Three-quarters of the applicable agencies state that they do not provide such training, while one quarter say they do. Similarly, **Table 21** shows that half of the applicable agencies (12) report no steps taken to educate translators or interpreters about ethical obligations to the agencies and clients. Five agencies, or approximately 21%, report holding “in-house orientation, briefing, or training” for

interpreters about ethical obligations. **One agency volunteers that it provides translation and interpretation service-providers with guidance about confidentiality requirements and office practices.**

Seven agencies list efforts regarding translator or interpreter ethics training other than those listed in the survey question's categories. For example, one specifies that, "We follow instructions or directions under the DGS contract #9985-30. We swear-in interpreters under oath that they will translate accurately and to the best of their ability." Similarly, another agency requires "Swearing in—Interpreter Oath, HIPAA Business Associate Agreement," and another states that they swear-in interpreters at the time of interviews. Another agency states, "Confidentiality of the interview is stressed to the interpreter at the time of the service." In an apparent reference to sign interpreters, one agency states, "The Disability Services Coordinator communicates specifics of case to Agency and Interpreter in advance, and [communicates] confidentiality issues." Others agencies list "other" efforts but did not specify what those other efforts were.

#### ***N. TRAINING PROVIDED BY AGENCIES TO ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES OR HEARING OFFICERS***

***Notably, one agency provides basic training, periodic refresher training and random federal quality appraisals to administrative judges and hearing officers regarding the use of translators or interpreters. Most of the remainder of the agencies (71%) does not provide such training to judges or hearing officers.***

The survey asked if agencies provide judges or hearing officers with guidance regarding the use of translators or interpreters. **Table 22** shows that approximately 29% (seven) of the applicable agencies do so, while approximately 71% (17) do not. Several agencies provided written comments on this question as well:

- “[Judges] are instructed to meet with interpreters before the hearing, discuss their needs with them, and to accommodate their requests.”
- “We apply internal procedures that apply to securing interpreters from the DGS contract #9985-30.”
- “The agency arranges for interpreter services for all its hearings before its administrative law judges and hearing examiners.”
- “Annual Limited English Proficiency training; [guidance on] our written policy, and [we] also address any issues that arise in the interim through management meetings and then sharing information with staff.”
- “The Disability Services Coordinator communicates with the hearing officers regarding specifics of case and addresses anticipated concerns.”
- **“Basic training, periodic refresher training, and random federal quality appraisals.”**

#### ***O. PUBLIC AND ADVANCE NOTIFICATION MECHANISMS***

*Most agencies have mechanisms for clients to provide advance notice of their need for translation or interpretation services.<sup>4</sup> These include a telephone number to call to request the service, or a postcard or publication with information on how to obtain an accommodation. Most agencies also have methods of informing the public of the availability of translation or interpretation services, such as posting signs or notices with this information in multiple languages and providing pre-hearing notices containing that information.*

**Table 23** shows the degree to which agencies provide mechanisms for clients to notify the agency in advance that they need translation or interpretation services. Approximately two-thirds of applicable agencies do have mechanisms for such advance notice, while about one-third do not. Some respondents specify their methods of advance notice:

---

<sup>4</sup> The purpose of providing such a mechanism for clients with a need for translation or interpretation services is to prevent delays in hearings that occur when such clients appear for hearings without translators or interpreters, causing agencies to postpone the hearing in order to arrange for such services.

- “Applicants are given a telephone number to call to request the service and provide the language needed or to inform the Office that a family member will be interpreting in the case of the hearing-impaired.”
- “We provide notification that if an accommodation is needed and how to go about requesting an accommodation.”
- “All publications and hearing notices ask if special accommodations are required.”
- “Via DC-135A inmate’s request to staff members or, for misconduct hearings, DC-141 Part II (A). Notification can be initiated by a staff member as well.”
- “As part of the appeal process, a party can request an interpreter; [parties can also request interpreters with] hearing scheduling response cards.”
- “They may submit a request in writing or by telephone including a 1-800 number.”
- “The mechanism is informal—usually client or jail notifies a parole agent, who then contacts the Disability Services Coordinator.”
- “Notices contain language advising individuals of what to do if interpreter services are needed. We also use Courtesy Cards in five basic languages...If another language is required, staff calls the Language Line.”
- “A postcard is included with hearing notices. Also included with decisions and hearing notices is a form in fifteen different languages.”
- “Not all programs do this, and how they do this varies. We are in the process of developing and implementing policies to provide notification where appropriate and bring a greater degree of uniformity to the mechanisms we employ.”

- “It is not necessary for customers to notify our agency in advance. If a limited English proficient customer contacts us we can connect them to Language Line Services or use a bilingual employee in our agency.”

**Tables 24 and 25** show the ways in which agencies inform prospective clients/members of the public that translation and interpretation services are available. The agencies could check as many as applied and could specify other ways not listed in the survey question’s pre-set categories. **Table 24** shows the first ways of informing mentioned by responders and **Table 25** shows the second (no agencies mentioned more than two ways). In **Table 24**, nine agencies, or approximately 38%, do not mention any ways they inform people of the availability of services. Nine others (approximately 38%) first mention that they post signs or notices with this information (presumably in multiple languages). Five agencies first mention that they allow for/invite pre-hearing notices of the need for services, and one agency first mentions community outreach efforts. In **Table 25**, three agencies mention “pre-hearing notices” second, and another mentions “community outreach efforts” second. Several responders also provide written comments on this issue:

- One agency mentioned that people are notified that services are available in their “Inmate Handbook and word of mouth.”
- Another stated that, “notice of availability of sign language interpreters in compliance with the ADA is provided in some publications.”
- Another stated that their online forms notify parties of the availability of interpreter services.

- “The Education and Outreach Program in the Office of Victim’s Services implemented an outreach effort to educate the non-English speaking public.”
- “Key printed materials are available in Spanish...Our handbook for customers says that interpreter services are available.”
- “This information is included in our marketing materials.”

The survey also provides several open-ended comments, especially in response to the final survey question, which ask the respondent to add any additional information they feel is pertinent to the Interbranch Commission:

- “It has generally been our experience that job applicants in need of interpretive services generally bring a friend with them or family member to assist them.”
- “Our most common need is to employ a sign language interpreter to assist in administering a civil service examination. We can and have gone several years in a row without receiving a single request for either a language or sign language interpreter to assist at an administrative hearing. The advent of computerized testing has reduced, but not entirely eliminated, the need for interpretive services during examinations.”
- “Most of the services that we utilize require that the interpreter be specialized in the legal field and pre-certified through the Commonwealth system. Most of our clients are offenders, and the setting (hearing, etc.) is usually ‘life altering.’ Therefore, the legal specialization requirement.”
- “The overwhelming majority of our cases involving interpreters are all citation cases involving cosmetologists (African hair braiders and Vietnamese nail salons), which are relatively minor and which we try to process fairly and expeditiously.”

- “The DGS Contract is the best source for securing these services and collaboration with other statewide agencies and services is helpful in developing LEP protocols.”
- “The Civil Service Commission will only certify that a candidate is orally proficient in Spanish. They will not certify that a candidate can read or write proficiently in Spanish.”

## **COMPARISON OF FINDINGS OF SUPREME COURT STUDY WITH THOSE OF INTERBRANCH COMMISSION SURVEY**

As a final step in evaluating the data obtained through this survey, the Interpreter Services Committee compared this data with that compiled by the Supreme Court Committee on Racial and Gender Bias in the Justice System in its Final Report. Chapter one of that report addressed the status of interpreter services within the justice system in Pennsylvania. Among its findings were the following:

- ◆ There has been a significant increase in immigrant, migrant and refugee populations in many Pennsylvania counties in the past twenty years. The 2000 Census estimates that more than 970,000 persons over the age of four in Pennsylvania speak a language other than English at home and that nearly 370,000 do not speak English “very well.”
- ◆ Pennsylvania has no statewide system for providing interpreter services in court proceedings.
- ◆ Pennsylvania has no system for certifying the competence of interpreters in any language.
- ◆ Some courts are allowing cases involving limited English proficient (LEP) parties, including criminal defendants, to proceed without interpreters.
- ◆ Some courts routinely allow untrained, non-professional individuals, including relatives and friends, to act as interpreters.
- ◆ Paid court interpreters are permitted to interpret without any demonstrated competency, especially when they are working under contract.
- ◆ The ability of the court system to determine facts and dispense justice is compromised by inadequate language services.
- ◆ The lack of standards in Pennsylvania for the use of interpreters and for determining interpreter competency compounds the problem of providing access to justice for LEP persons.

While the Interpreter Services Committee expected that the results from its survey could yield a different set of data due to the inherent differences in the operation of legal and administrative proceedings, we were surprised to find many similarities between the two systems in the need for and provision of translation and interpretation services among the agencies. They include the following:

- ◆ There is a significant need for interpreter services among the state administrative agencies. The survey found that 24 of the 42 agencies conduct hearings or intake functions that involve the public and use interpretation services to some degree. 25% of the agencies require interpretation services for their clients one to five times per year, and 14% require the services two or more times per day. Further, five of the agencies spend in excess of \$100,000 per year on such services.
- ◆ There is no standardized means of providing interpreter services to administrative agencies and very few agencies collaborate with other agencies in obtaining interpreter services.
- ◆ Almost one-third of the agencies with a need for interpreter services rely upon clients to provide their own interpreters and only two of these agencies place restrictions on who can interpret in this manner.
- ◆ There are no standards for interpreter qualifications required by administrative agencies. Only one-quarter of the agencies require written certification of qualifications of those providing interpreter services and another quarter impose no requirements on providers. The majority of the remaining half of the agencies uses government contracts with providers as quality control for interpreters.
- ◆ There is no common source of funding for such services and some of the agencies use general operation funds for the services.

Notably, the Interpreter Services Committee also found some exemplary practices among the agencies, including the following:

- Five agencies have “full-time” interpreters on staff.
- One agency provides training on confidentiality requirements and office practices to its providers of translation and interpretation services.
- Another agency provides administrative judges and hearing officers with basic training, periodic refresher training and random federal quality appraisals on the use of translation and interpretation services.

## **CONCLUSION**

The results from the survey conducted by the Interpreter Services Committee clearly demonstrate that while some of the Commonwealth's administrative agencies currently do an excellent job of providing interpretation services to its clients, many others could benefit from a sharing of the best practices utilized by these agencies. The Final Report of the Supreme Court Committee on Racial and Gender Bias contained numerous recommendations designed to address the deficiencies it found in the provision of translation and interpretation services within Pennsylvania's justice system. The Interpreter Service Committee believes that the Commonwealth agencies also would benefit from implementation of those recommendations.

Key among the report's recommendations was the establishment of a Language Services Office within the Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Courts to administer a statewide system of providing and certifying translators and interpreters in the various courts throughout the state. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has already implemented that recommendation by establishing an Interpreter Services Office within its administrative offices and hiring a director, Mr. Osvaldo Aviles, to develop the statewide system recommended by its Committee. Pennsylvania also has become a member of the State Court Interpreter Certification Consortium as a means of obtaining testing procedures for the certification of interpreters in Pennsylvania.

The Interbranch Commission is honored to present the data obtained through its survey of administrative agencies to all three branches of the state government for their use. We hope that our work will assist Pennsylvania in becoming a model among other states in providing the services necessary for all of its immigrant and hearing-impaired citizens to participate fully in our system of administration and justice.

## APPENDICIES

### A. The Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial, and Ethnic Fairness Agency Translation and Interpretation Services Survey Instrument

1) Does your agency conduct hearings?

  0   No

  1   Yes

**\* If the answer is “No” to the above question, does your agency conduct intake functions that require interaction with individuals with limited English proficiency or hearing impairment?**

  0   No

  1   Yes

**\* If the answer to both of these questions above is “No,” there is no need for you to fill out the rest of the survey. Thank you for your cooperation.**

2) On average, how often does your agency require non-English language interpreter services for documents?

  9   More than 5 times a day

  8   2-5 times a day

  7   Once a day

  6   2-4 times a week

  5   Once a week

  4   2-3 times a month

  3   Once a month

  2   6 times a year

  1   1-5 times a year

  0   Never

2a) On average, how often does your agency require non-English language interpreter services for oral interpretation?

9 More than 5 times a day

8 2-5 times a day

7 Once a day

6 2-4 times a week

5 Once a week

4 2-3 times a month

3 Once a month

2 6 times a year

1 1-5 times a year

0 Never

3) On average, how often does your agency require sign language interpreter services?

9 More than 5 times a day

8 2-5 times a day

7 Once a day

6 2-4 times a week

5 Once a week

4 2-3 times a month

3 Once a month

2 6 times a year

1 1-5 times a year

0 Never

**\* If the answer to all three of these questions above is “Never,” there is no need for you to fill out the rest of the survey. Thank you for your cooperation.**



8) What technologies does your agency use in providing interpreter or sign services? (Check all that apply)

\_\_\_ 1 if yes \_\_\_ Telephonic services

\_\_\_ 1 if yes \_\_\_ Computer programs that print documents in various languages

\_\_\_ 1 if yes \_\_\_ Computer programs that print on-screen translations in various languages

\_\_\_ 1 if yes \_\_\_ Computer programs that print English for hearing-impaired people

\_\_\_ 1 if yes \_\_\_ None

\_\_\_ Other (specify below)

\_\_\_ listed \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

9) Does your agency have written policies and procedures for the use of language and sign interpreters?

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_ No

If yes, please attach a copy of your agency's language and sign interpreter services policy.

9a) Are there differences between your various offices in how you implement written policies and procedures for the use of language and sign interpreters?

\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_ No

If "Yes," Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

10) Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

*Overall, the non-English language interpreters we use are punctual.*

Strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

*Overall, the non-English language interpreters we use meet our expectations of quality.*

strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

*Overall, the sign language interpreters we use are punctual.*

strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

*Overall, the sign language interpreters we use meet our expectations of quality.*

strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

11) When your agency needs interpreter services, how do you obtain them? Please check all that apply.

1 assign one of our full-time or part-time staff interpreters

2 pick one from our list of qualified freelance interpreters

3 call an interpreter services agency

4 call a telephonic interpreter services line

5 ask someone inside the agency for a referral

6 ask someone outside the agency for a referral

7 rely on parties to provide their own interpreters

8 other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**\* If you answered, “rely on parties to provide their own interpreters” above, are there any restrictions on who can provide interpretation?**

0 No

1 Yes (explain)

---

12) To what extent does your agency collaborate with other administrative agencies in the Commonwealth in obtaining interpreter services?

Not at all	A small amount	Undecided/ don't know	A moderate amount	A great deal
1	2	3	4	5

13) To what extent does your agency collaborate with other administrative agencies in the Commonwealth in the training/orientation of interpreters that you use?

Not at all	A small amount	Undecided/ don't know	A moderate amount	A great deal
1	2	3	4	5

14) Does your agency require any of the following from the interpreters you use? Check all that apply.

1 Written certification of their qualifications

2 Passing a qualifications test

3 Participation in continuing education/skills development relevant to interpreter services

Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

15) Does your agency provide the interpreters you use training regarding your agency's work and the situations you commonly encounter?

0 No

1 Yes

16) What steps does your agency take to educate the interpreters about their ethical obligations to your agency/department and their clients?

1 In-house orienting, briefing, and/or training sessions

2 Outside orienting, briefing, and/or training sessions paid for by the agency

3 Outside orienting, briefing, and/or training sessions not paid for by the agency

4 Written explanations or other documents about ethical responsibilities provided by your agency or department to each interpreter

5 None

Other \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

17) Does your agency provide guidance to administrative law judges or hearing officers regarding the use of non-English language interpreters or sign interpreters?

0 No       1 Yes

If yes, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

18) Does your agency provide a mechanism that allows clients/litigants to notify your agency in advance that they need interpreter services?

0 No       1 Yes

If yes, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

19) How does your agency make it known to litigants/clients that interpreter services are available? Please check all that apply:

1 Posted signs or notices

2 Pre-hearing notices

3 Community outreach efforts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

20) Finally, is there something important to your agency regarding language and/or sign interpreter services that we have not asked about, and that you would like us to know? Please use the space below.

**B. Tables for Interbranch Commission for Gender, Racial, and Ethnic Fairness Survey on Commonwealth Agency Interpreter and Translation Services Use**

**Table 1: Does Agency Conduct Hearings?**

	Frequency	Percent
No	11	26.2
Yes	31	73.8
Total	42	100.0

**Table 2: Does Agency Conduct Intake Functions?**

	Frequency	Percent
No	10	23.8
Yes	14	33.3
N/A	18	42.9
Total	42	100.0

**Table 3: How Often Does Agency Require Document Interpretation Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Never	17	40.5	47.2	47.2
1-5 times a year	11	26.0	30.6	77.8
6 times a year	1	2.0	2.8	80.6
Once a month	2	4.0	5.6	86.1
2-3 times a month	1	2.0	2.8	88.9
2-4 times a week	2	4.0	5.6	94.4
Once a day	1	2.0	2.8	97.2
2-5 times a day	1	2.0	2.8	100.0
Valid cases	36	86.0	100.0	
N/A	6	14.0		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 4: How Often Does Agency Require Non-English Oral Interpretation Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Never	13	31.0	36.1	36.1
1-5 times a year	9	21.4	25.0	61.1
6 times a year	2	4.0	5.6	66.7
Once a month	4	8.0	11.1	77.8
2-4 times a week	2	4.0	5.6	83.3
Once a day	1	2.0	2.8	86.1
2-5 times a day	2	4.0	5.6	91.7
More than 5 times a day	3	7.0	8.3	100.0
Valid cases	36	86.0	100.0	
N/A	6	14.0		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 5: How Often Does Agency Require Sign-language Interpretation Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Never	19	45.2	54.3	54.3
1-5 times a year	11	26.2	31.4	85.7
Once a month	3	7.1	8.6	94.3
2-4 times a week	1	2.4	2.9	97.1
More than 5 times a day	1	2.4	2.9	100.0
Valid cases	35	84.0	100.0	
N/A	7	16.0		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 6: Spending on Interpreter/Translation Services (in dollars)**

	Number of Cases	Minimum Spent	Maximum Spent	Average
How much did agency spend last fiscal year on interpreter services?	23	.00	545,000.00	46,397.30
How much will agency spend this fiscal year on interpreter services?	22	.00	580,000.00	58,627.45
Valid cases	22			

**Table 6a: How Much Did Agency Spend Last Fiscal Year on Translation Services—  
specific agency amounts**

Dollars	Frequency	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
.00	3	13.0	13.0
50.00	2	8.7	21.7
200.00	1	4.3	26.1
242.00	1	4.3	30.4
400.00	1	4.3	34.8
500.00	4	17.4	52.2
586.00	1	4.3	56.5
900.00	1	4.3	60.9
1,500.00	1	4.3	65.2
2,728.00	1	4.3	69.6
4,260.00	1	4.3	73.9
7,710.00	1	4.3	78.3
25,000.00	1	4.3	82.6
138,462.0	1	4.3	87.0
168,350.0	1	4.3	91.3
169,700.0	1	4.3	95.7
545,000.0	1	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	
N/A	19		
Total	42		

**Table 6b: How Much Will Agency Spend This Fiscal Year on Translation Services—specific agency amounts**

Dollars	Frequency	Percent of Applicable Cases	Cumulative Percent
Valid .00	2	9.1	9.1
50.00	2	9.1	18.2
400.00	1	4.5	22.7
500.00	4	18.2	40.9
900.00	1	4.5	45.5
1,345.00	1	4.5	50.0
1,500.00	1	4.5	54.5
2,728.00	1	4.5	59.1
4,412.00	1	4.5	63.6
6,000.00	1	4.5	68.2
8,374.00	1	4.5	72.7
8,900.00	1	4.5	77.3
30,000.00	1	4.5	81.8
176,357.0	1	4.5	86.4
205,288.0	1	4.5	90.9
261,500.0	1	4.5	95.5
580,000.0	1	4.5	100.0
Total	22	100.0	
N/A, not answer-ing	20		
Total	42		

**Table 6c: Ten Agencies Spending the Most Money on Translation Services**

Agency *(Agency Identity has been redacted in order to retain confidentiality.)	Total Spent in Last Fiscal Year
	\$ 545,000
	\$ 169,700
	\$ 168,350
	\$ 138,462
	\$ 25,000
	\$ 7,710
	\$ 4,260
	\$ 2,728
	\$ 1,500
	\$ 900

**Table 6d: The Relationship Between Agency Spending on Interpreter Services and How Often Agencies Require Document Interpretation Services**

		How Often Does Agency Require Document Interpretation Services						Total	
		Never	1-5 times a year	6 times a year	Once a month	2-3 times a month	2-4 times a week		2-5 times a day
How Much	\$ .00	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Did Agency	50.00	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Spend Last	200.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fiscal Year	242.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
on	400.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Interpreter	500.00	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Services	586.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	900.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	1,500.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	2,728.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	4,260.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	7,710.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	25,000.00	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	138,462.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	168,350.0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	169,700.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	545,000.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>

**Table 6e: The Relationship Between Agency Spending on Interpreter Services and How Often Agencies Require Oral Interpretation Services**

How Much Did Agency Spend Last Fiscal Year on Interpreter Services	How Often Does Agency Require Oral Interpretation Services								Total
	Never	1-5 times a year	6 times a year	Once a month	2-4 times a week	Once a day	2-5 times a day	More than five times a day	
\$ .00	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
50.00	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
200.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
242.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
400.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
500.00	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
586.00	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
900.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1,500.00	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2,728.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
4,260.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7,710.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
25,000.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
138,462.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
168,350.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
169,700.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
545,000.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>

**Table 6f: The Relationship Between Agency Spending on Interpreter Services and How Often Agencies Require Sign Interpretation Services**

		How Often Does Agency Require Sign Interpretation Services				Total
		Never	1-5 times a year	Once a month	More than 5 times a day	
How Much	\$ .00	2	1	0	0	3
Did Agency	50.00	0	1	0	0	1
Spend Last	200.00	1	0	0	0	1
Fiscal Year	242.00	1	0	0	0	1
on	400.00	0	1	0	0	1
Interpreter	500.00	1	2	1	0	4
Services	586.00	1	0	0	0	1
	900.00	0	1	0	0	1
	1,500.00	0	0	1	0	1
	2,728.00	0	1	0	0	1
	4,260.00	0	1	0	0	1
	7,710.00	0	1	0	0	1
	25,000.00	0	1	0	0	1
	138,462.0	1	0	0	0	1
	168,350.0	0	0	1	0	1
	169,700.0	0	1	0	0	1
	545,000.0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>

**Table 7: What is the Source of Funding for Language Interpreter/Sign Services (first source mentioned)?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A or none mentioned	19	45.2	45.2	45.2
Administrative budget	1	2.4	2.4	47.6
Agency motor license funds	1	2.4	2.4	50.0
Charged directly to state/federal appropriations	1	2.4	2.4	52.4
Cost center of the bureau requiring services	1	2.4	2.4	54.8
Federal funds for Case Services	1	2.4	2.4	57.1
General appropriation	1	2.4	2.4	59.5
General Funds	1	2.4	2.4	61.9
General government operations	1	2.4	2.4	64.3
General govt. operations from merit system	1	2.4	2.4	66.7
General govt. operations fund	1	2.4	2.4	69.0
General revenue	1	2.4	2.4	71.4
HR budget	1	2.4	2.4	73.8
Individual SCI budgets	1	2.4	2.4	76.2
Office of Victim's Services	1	2.4	2.4	78.6
Program budget	1	2.4	2.4	81.0

Purchase Order	1	2.4	2.4	83.3
Special fund agency	1	2.4	2.4	85.7
State funds- Appropriation 263	1	2.4	2.4	88.1
State funds	1	2.4	2.4	90.5
State general funds	1	2.4	2.4	92.9
UI Administrative Fund	1	2.4	2.4	95.2
UI Grant from Dept. of Labor	1	2.4	2.4	97.6
Utility assessments budget	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 7a: What is the Source of Funding for Language Interpreter/Sign Services (second source mentioned)?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Valid N/A or none listed	33	78.6	78.6	78.6
Banking fund	1	2.4	2.4	81.0
Billings to client agencies	1	2.4	2.4	83.3
Education and Outreach funds	1	2.4	2.4	85.7
Federal funds	1	2.4	2.4	88.1
General operating funds	1	2.4	2.4	90.5
Individual Bureau budgets	1	2.4	2.4	92.9
Other program funds	1	2.4	2.4	95.2
Telecommunication relay services fund	1	2.4	2.4	97.6
Visa	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 7b: What is the Source of Funding (third mention)?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Valid N/A or none listed	41	97.6	97.6	97.6
Victim's compensation assistance program funds	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 8: Does Agency Maintain Statistics on the Use of Language Translation Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	19	45.2	79.2	79.2
Yes	5	11.9	20.8	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 8a: Does Agency Maintain Stats on Use of Sign Interpretation Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	21	50.0	87.5	87.5
Yes	3	7.1	12.5	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 9: Most Frequently Needed Translation Service, First Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A	18	42.9	42.9	42.9
English	1	2.4	2.4	45.2
Russian	2	4.8	4.8	50.0
Sign	7	16.7	16.7	66.7
Spanish	13	31.0	31.0	97.6
Vietnamese	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 9a: Most Frequently Needed Translation Service, Second Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A or none mentioned	21	50.0	50.0	50.0
Chinese	1	2.4	2.4	52.4
Korean	1	2.4	2.4	54.8
non-English	1	2.4	2.4	57.1
Russian	1	2.4	2.4	59.5
Sign	4	9.5	9.5	69.0
Spanish	7	16.7	16.7	85.7
Swahili	1	2.4	2.4	88.1
Vietnamese	5	11.9	11.9	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 9b: Most Frequently Needed Translation Service, Third Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A or none mentioned	30	71.4	71.4	71.4
Arabic	1	2.4	2.4	73.8
Chinese	2	4.8	4.8	78.6
French	2	4.8	4.8	83.3
Russian	4	9.5	9.5	92.9
Sign	1	2.4	2.4	95.2
Spanish	1	2.4	2.4	97.6
Vietnamese	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 9c: Most Frequently Needed Translation Service, Fourth Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A or none mentioned	33	78.6	78.6	78.6
Asian languages	1	2.4	2.4	81.0
Cambodian	2	4.8	4.8	85.7
Chinese	2	4.8	4.8	90.5
Korean	2	4.8	4.8	95.2
Sign	1	2.4	2.4	97.6
Vietnamese	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 10: Use of Telephone Translation Services Technology**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	7	16.7	29.2	29.2
Yes	17	40.5	70.8	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 10a: Use of Computer Programs That Print Documents in Non-English Languages**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	22	52.4	91.7	91.7
Yes	2	4.8	8.3	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 10b: Use of Computer Programs that Print Onscreen Non-English Translations**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	23	54.8	95.8	95.8
Yes	1	2.4	4.2	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 10c: Use of Computer Programs that Print English Onscreen for Hearing Impaired People**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	20	47.6	83.3	83.3
Yes	4	9.5	16.7	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 11: Use of Other Translation Technology (list)**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A or none mentioned	38	90.5	90.5	90.5
Computer programs for the vision impaired	2	4.8	4.8	95.2
Purchased routine document stencils in many languages	1	2.4	2.4	97.6
Website documents in Spanish	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 12: Does the Agency Have Written Policies For the Use of Language and Sign Interpreters?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	14	33.3	58.3	58.3
Yes	10	23.8	41.7	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 12a: Is There Variation Between Offices in How Policies are Implemented**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	24	57.1	100.0	100.0
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 13: Responses to the Question, “Overall, the non-English language interpreters we use are punctual?”**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Undecided	4	9.5	23.5	23.5
Agree	8	19.0	47.1	70.6
Strongly Agree	5	11.9	29.4	100.0
Total	17	40.5	100.0	
N/A or no response	25	59.5		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 13a: Responses to the Question, “Overall, the non-English language interpreters we use meet our expectations of quality?”**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	2.4	5.3	5.3
Undecided	2	4.8	10.5	15.8
Agree	10	23.8	52.6	68.4
Strongly Agree	6	14.3	31.6	100.0
Total	19	45.2	100.0	
N/A or no response	23	54.8		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 14: Responses to the Question, “Overall, the sign language interpreters we use are punctual?”**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Undecided	3	7.1	17.6	17.6
Agree	7	16.7	41.2	58.8
Strongly Agree	7	16.7	41.2	100.0
Total	17	40.5	100.0	
N/A or no response	25	59.5		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 14a: Responses to the Question, “Overall, the sign language interpreters we use meet our expectations of quality?”**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Undecided	3	7.1	17.6	17.6
Agree	7	16.7	41.2	58.8
Strongly Agree	7	16.7	41.2	100.0
Total	17	40.5	100.0	
N/A or no response	25	59.5		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 15: How Do Agencies Obtain Interpreter Services? First Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Assign one of agency's full time interpreters	5	11.9	20.8	20.8
Pick one from list of qualified freelance interpreters	2	4.8	8.3	29.2
Call an interpreter services agency	11	26.2	45.8	75.0
Call a telephonic interpreter services line	3	7.1	12.5	87.5
Ask someone outside the agency for a referral	1	2.4	4.2	91.7
Rely on parties to provide their own interpreters	1	2.4	4.2	95.8
Other	1	2.4	4.2	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 15a: How Do Agencies Obtain Interpreter Services? Second Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
None listed	7	16.7	29.2	29.2
Pick one from list of qualified freelance interpreters	2	4.8	8.3	37.5
Call an interpreter services agency	1	2.4	4.2	41.7
Call a telephonic interpreter services line	7	16.7	29.2	70.8
Ask someone outside the agency for a referral	2	4.8	8.3	79.2
Rely on parties to provide their own interpreters	2	4.8	8.3	87.5
Other	3	7.1	12.5	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 15b: How Do Agencies Obtain Interpreter Services? Third Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
None listed	14	33.3	58.3	58.3
Call an interpreter services agency	2	4.8	8.3	66.7
Call a telephonic interpreter services line	1	2.4	4.2	70.8
Ask someone outside the agency for a referral	2	4.8	8.3	79.2
Rely on parties to provide their own interpreters	3	7.1	12.5	91.7
Other	2	4.8	8.3	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 15c: How Do Agencies Obtain Interpreter Services? Fourth Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
None listed	22	52.4	91.7	91.7
Call a telephonic interpreter services line	1	2.4	4.2	95.8
Other	1	2.4	4.2	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 16: Specified Other Ways of Obtaining Services**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A	32	76.2	76.2	76.2
DGS contract	2	4.8	4.8	81.0
DGS contract #9985-30	1	2.4	2.4	83.3
DGS contract CN00014316 for language services	1	2.4	2.4	85.7
SAP approved and those with specialty in legal field	1	2.4	2.4	88.1
Statewide contracts	1	2.4	2.4	90.5
Use staff with language fluency	4	9.5	9.5	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 17: Are There Restrictions on Who Can Provide Services if the Respondent Checked “Rely on parties to provide their own interpreters”?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	5	11.9	71.4	71.4
Yes	2	4.8	28.6	100.0
Total	7	16.7	100.0	
N/A	35	83.3		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 18: To What Extent Does Agency Collaborate With Other Agencies in Obtaining Interpreter Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Not at all	9	21.4	37.5	37.5
A small amount	8	19.0	33.3	70.8
A moderate amount	4	9.5	16.7	87.5
A great deal	3	7.1	12.5	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 18a: To What Extent Does Agency Collaborate With Other Agencies in Training Those Providing Interpreter Services?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Not at all	19	45.2	82.6	82.6
A small amount	2	4.8	8.7	91.3
Undecided	2	4.8	8.7	100.0
Total	23	54.8	100.0	
N/A	19	45.2		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 19: What Does Agency Require from Interpreters, Any Mentions**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
Nothing listed	6	14.3	25.0	25.0
Written certification of their qualifications	6	14.3	25.0	50.0
Other	12	26.1	50.0	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 19a: Other Agency Requirements from Interpreters--Specified**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
N/A or nothing listed	31	73.8	73.8	73.8
Acts in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act and PA Act 57	1	2.4	2.4	76.2
ASL interpreter must be registered with Office of the Deaf	1	2.4	2.4	78.6
Commonwealth approved/certified in legal field	1	2.4	2.4	81.0
Determined by contract agency	1	2.4	2.4	83.3
DGS contract serves as quality control	1	2.4	2.4	85.7
Language line contract covers qualifications	1	2.4	2.4	88.1
Must state qualifications on record at hearing	1	2.4	2.4	90.5
Rely on Commonwealth (contract) screening	1	2.4	2.4	92.9
Should be on DGS contract 9985-30 list	1	2.4	2.4	95.2
Statewide DGS contract CN00014316	1	2.4	2.4	97.6
We use a list provided by L&I	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
Total	42	100.0	100.0	

**Table 20: Does Agency Provide Agency-Specific Training for Commonly Encountered Situations?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	18	42.9	75.0	75.0
Yes	6	14.3	25.0	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 21: What Steps Does Agency Take to Educate the Interpreters They Use About Their Ethical Obligations to Agency and Clients?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
None mentioned	12	28.6	50.0	50.0
In-house orienting, briefing, or training	5	11.9	20.8	70.8
Other	7	16.6	29.2	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 22: Does Agency Provide Judges/Hearing Officers Guidance Regarding the Use of Non-English Language or Sign Interpreters?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	17	40.5	70.8	70.8
Yes	7	16.7	29.2	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 23: Does Agency Provide a Mechanism for Clients to Notify the Agency in Advance About Interpreter Needs?**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
No	8	19.0	33.3	33.3
Yes	16	38.1	66.7	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 24: How Does Agency Make It Known that Interpreter Services Are Available--First Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
None mentioned	9	21.4	37.5	37.5
Posted signs or notices	9	21.4	37.5	75.0
Pre-hearing notices	5	11.9	20.8	95.8
Community outreach efforts	1	2.4	4.2	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		

**Table 25: How Does Agency Make It Known that Interpreter Services Are Available—  
Second Mention**

	Frequency	Percent	<i>Percent of Applicable Cases</i>	Cumulative Percent
None mentioned	10	23.8	41.6	41.6
Pre-hearing notices	3	7.1	12.5	54.1
Community outreach efforts	1	2.3	4.1	58.1
Other	10	23.8	41.6	100.0
Total	24	57.1	100.0	
N/A	18	42.9		
Total	42	100.0		