

**SUMMARY OF MEETING 6**

Welcome and agenda review ..... Anita Maguire  
 Call attention to the community agreements..... Anita Maguire  
 Share preferred options and reasoning for preferences..... Participants  
 Review content for the final report and next steps ..... Malia Wallace-Mello  
 Conclusion ..... Malia Wallace-Mello

**Meeting 6 Participants**

Tara Bostock	Carrie Huie-Pascua	Jennifer Price
Milena Calderari-Waldron	Jarrold Irvin	Joana Ramos
Vicky Chan	Cristina Labra	Cindy Roat
Faye Chien	Trish Lamb	Elsie Rodriguez-Paz
Helen Eby	Eliana Lobo	Zenaida “Z” Rojas
Rep. Carolyn Elick	Ruiqin Miao, PhD	María Sigüenza
Rep. Darya Farivar	Leroy Mould	Yvonne Simpson
Zugey García	Natalya Mytareva	Elena Vasiliev
Luisa Gracia	Gustavo Negrete	Yun-Mei Wang Wilborn
Aranzazu Granrose	Hugo Nuñez	James Wells
Carolina Gutierrez	Olga Okhapkina	Michael Woo
Lynora Hirata	Casey Peplow	Antoinette Wynne
Larysa House		

**Meeting 6 DSHS Support Staff**

Benjamin Lee, Zoom Host  
 Anita Maguire, Main Room Facilitator  
 Malia Wallace-Mello, Project Manager

## WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

The Main Room Facilitator introduced herself and the Zoom Host. She then gave a quick recap of the agenda.

## COMMUNITY AGREEMENTS

The Main Room Facilitator held space for self-review of the [Community Agreements](#) established during the first meeting:

- Respect each other in action and speech.
- Stay present.
- Listen with an open mind.
- Arrive prepared and ready to engage.
- Consider your thoughts before speaking.
- Honesty in all communication.
- Contribute from your lived experience.
- Clarify to avoid assumptions.
- Plain speak as much as possible.
- Avoid acronyms and complications.
- Ask questions out of curiosity.
- Use specific and, whenever possible, share brief examples for clarity.
- Be open to different cultural and linguistic modes of expression.
- Respectful disagreement is ok.

Participants were thanked for accepting these agreements and for holding themselves accountable to them as the group works together to develop understanding and propose recommendations.

## SHARE PREFERRED OPTIONS AND REASONING FOR PREFERENCES

In preparation for this meeting, participants were asked to review the Draft Options for State of Washington Medical Interpreter Testing and Certification and come prepared to discuss which programs work best for Washington State and to vote on the options by ranking them. Because this was a working document, the draft options ended up getting revised several times before the vote.

On September 19, during Meeting 5 of the work group, [Version 1](#) of the Draft Options document was shared with participants. After receiving participant feedback following that meeting, the working document was updated and a link to [Version 2](#) of the Draft Options was emailed to participants on September 20. Following feedback from state agencies, the document was again updated, and a link to [Version 3](#) was emailed to participants on September 22. It was this version that was generally commented on during Meeting 6. (Following participant feedback during Meeting 6, the document was updated again. [Version 4](#) of the options is what participants used to vote on.)

During the meeting, each participant was given the opportunity to share their preferred options and reasoning for their preferences with the entire group. Some participants chose to pass when their name was called. Others shared their opinion on a range of topics, including the options and the process.

The following table shows the status, response, and/or comments from each participant:

Full Name	Status/Response/Comments
Fatma Abdinasir	Absent
Farhiyo Ahmed	Absent
Anita Ahumada	Absent
Angela Araque	Absent
Gabrielle Bachmeier	Absent
Liz Baxter	Absent
Lorna Bien	Absent
Tara Bostock	Pass – To share time for other participants; raising awareness and certification for indigenous languages  “What will replace the ‘blanks’ or ‘No’s’ in the table, i.e. under Test Prep Training?”
DSHS; Ruiqin Miao, PhD	Dr. Ruiqin Miao of DSHS response to Tara: “Thank you for raising this question. As we know this work group is only several months and we have to submit a report based on that timeline. These options are a very general vision. These are specific details to consider further, once the Legislature will select the general options that serve Washington State best.”
Milena Calderari-Waldron	Pass – To reach consensus with Interpreters United (WFSE) Interpreter’s United (Labor Union)  “I want to understand that the process of voting is correct. DSHS solicited draft recommendations from the work group participants, posted on the website, and in parallel, DSHS drafted it’s own recommendations. Is this correct?”
DSHS; Ruiqin Miao, PhD	Dr. Ruiqin Miao of DSHS response to Milena: “Thank you for Union’s input and suggested recommendations, that we received yesterday, that this was too late to incorporate into the Options Table posed on the website for today. The Union’s input will certainly be included in the report to the Legislature.”
Gwendolyn Cash-James, EdD	Absent
Vicky Chan	Option 1 – Convenient certifying body for interpreter certification with focus on test and certify

## Language Access Work Group

Notes from

### Meeting 6 Main Room

October 3, 2023

Full Name	Status/Response/Comments
Faye Chien	Pass
Carolyn Cole, Esq.	Absent
Nadia Damchii	Absent
Jessie DeWoody	Absent
Helen Eby	Pass – Stated a need to reach consensus with fellow Interpreters United (WFSE) members. Addressed that the option for DSHS to continue medical interpreter testing was missing from the options table.
Rep. Carolyn Eslick	Pass
Rep. Darya Farivar	Pass
Marguerite Friedlander, Esq.	Absent
Sherri Fujita	Absent
JoAnna Gaffney	Absent
Zugey García	Option 2 – L&I for partnerships. Requested clarification regarding the timeline for the report and tally of poll results. The Project Manager confirmed the timeline and the process.
Jon Gould	Absent
Luisa Gracia	Pass - Addressed that the option for DSHS to continue medical interpreter testing was missing from the options table.
Aranzazu Granrose	Pass
Tony Griego	Absent
Carolina Gutierrez	Pass
Lynora Hirata	Option 5 – To confer with team
Larysa House	Pass – To confer with team/colleagues
Carrie Huie-Pascua	Pass – To confer with team/colleagues
Agata Ianturina	Absent
Jarrold Irvin	Option 4 – Support and to confer with the team
Teddy Kemirembe	Absent
Cristina Labra	Option 5 – Most comprehensive, though unrealistic while most ideal. Option 1 – Most realistic, but not ideal. Pass – To confer with team
Trisha Lamb	Option 2 – L&I partnerships
Shelby Lambdin	Absent
Elena Langdon	Absent
Emily Lardner, EdD	Absent
KaraLynn, PhD	Absent
Eliana Lobo	Pass – Abstain on basis of consensus not reached. Open to working with community colleges

## Language Access Work Group

Notes from

### Meeting 6 Main Room

October 3, 2023

Full Name	Status/Response/Comments
	<p>“Personally, I would recommend Option 1 that include partnering with community colleges. Considering partnering, would work with one class through multiple college venues, simultaneously online. To qualify and justify the courses, needing a cross platform solution to maintain seats and the class.</p>
<p>Ruiqin Miao, PhD</p>	<p>Pass – To confer with DSHS Team</p> <p>Throughout the discussion, Dr. Miao replied to participants’ comments. Please see her replies to comments throughout this table. Additionally, when she was called on to provide input on the options, Dr. Miao took some time to address questions from participants.</p> <p>Dr. Miao stated that she would pass on sharing her opinions for the options, but shared her primary position that a solution generally be based on a system of testing that is efficient, sustainable, and has quality tests (well developed, reliable, and approved) through national third-party providers and community colleges.</p> <p>In response to an observation that the recommendation to the legislature should include the option for DSHS to restart its medical interpreter testing program, Dr. Miao said that using medical interpreter testing is neither sustainable nor efficient. Certifying interpreters with seriously outdated, 30-year-old tests would not result in being confident of the quality.</p> <p>If DSHS continues with manual testing, there would be a long wait for a spot. There are well established professional entities that maintain and update, through both online and remote testing systems, that can do this. In-person testing is not efficient.</p> <p>According to the fiscal note from Senate Bill 5304, it costs the state a lot of money to redevelop valid and reliable medical interpreter tests for the whole state. Whether through community colleges or third-party providers, if we can ensure that the testing system is convenient for candidates, to address the increasing needs of the State, it will be a good goal for Washington State.</p>
<p>Leroy Mould</p>	<p>Pass</p>

Full Name	Status/Response/Comments
Natalya Mytareva	Abstain. Option 1 – Representing CCHI; an efficient pathway to assess competency of interpreters regardless of training. Option 4 – Connecting with partners to create CE training
Fidelie Nawaj	Absent
Gustavo Negrete	Abstain – Representing NBCMI
Hugo Nuñez	Option 2
Olga Okhapkina	Option 1 – Need opportunities for partnership
Casey Peplow	Pass
Lauren Platt	Absent
Christina Pourarien	Absent
Theresa Powell	Absent
Jennifer Price	Pass
Joana Ramos	Pass – Representing WASCLA; to recommend interim solutions and convey observations
Cindy Roat	Option 1 – Caveat; Option 1.5+  “I am concerned about the difference between people who are getting certified now and those who are trying to maintain their certification. Some options may work really well for one, but not address the other. I want to make sure the Legislature take this into account. What would you recommend, when ranking these options and should I include in my comments?”
DSHS; Ruiqin Miao, PhD	Dr. Miao of DSHS response to Cindy: “To maintain DSHS certification – These options are for testing to certify going forward, with currently certified interpreters in the State. No matter what Washington State decides, DSHS will ensure a smooth transition of data to a new testing entity or if DSHS continues to maintain the roster in Gateway.”
Glorivette Rodriguez	Absent
Elsie Rodriguez Paz	Option 1 – Option 1.5+ Resume testing that qualify interpreters to provide patient care and involve community colleges that is sustainable. Option 5 – Ideal but unrealistic, a system that involves Community Colleges
John Rogers	Absent
Zenaida ‘Z’ Rojas	Option 2 – Diversity of CC’s. Authentically communicating cultural humility and quality of interpretation
Matteo Rutherford	Absent
Elena Safaraints	Absent

## Language Access Work Group

Notes from

### Meeting 6 Main Room

October 3, 2023

Full Name	Status/Response/Comments
Sen. Rebecca Saldaña	Absent
Roy Salonga	Absent
Manny Santiago	Absent
María Sigüenza	Option – Noted that an ideally, testing is pulled out of DSHS and housed in a state centralized office. Testing to be more democratic with greater needs, in its own entity. She took issue with not including DSHS to continue medical interpreter testing in the options table and suggested a minority report be included.
Yvonne Simpson	Pass – Stating a position of support for national certification. Made a note of concern for how current DSHS certification and certified interpreters might be lost in the transfer to third-party entities and not be able to maintain their certification. She held that separating community colleges as only being the training party and not conducting the testing, is appropriate She addressed that Option 5 and the focus of this work group has only been on medical interpreting.
Radu Smintina	Absent
Quan Trần	Absent
Rokaih Vansot	Absent
Elena Vasiliev	Pass
Daniel(le) Vasquez	Absent
Cathy Vue	Absent
Yun-Mei Wang Wilborn	Option 2 & Option 5 – Focus on continuing education from DSHS. Highlighted need on medical terminology
James Wells	Pass – Interim vs long-term solutions. State needs to invest heavily into language access and coordinate around training
Michael Woo	Pass
Antoinette Wynne	Option 2 & Option 4 – To include expectations of LTC and authorize interpreters to be trained through accredited programs, similar to CC. Option 1 – May not be viable. DES contracts are for eligible entities. She stated that Option 1 would require purchasers to be the individual/independent interpreters themselves, with contractors and this changes authority around statewide contract use. Testing and services delivered from the contractors under this option may constitute a potential conflict of interest. Keeping everything separate, testing the interpreters and providing the service from statewide contracts. All interpreters used by DES are asked to meet skills of industry standards and to be in the expectation of the DSHS Language and Testing Certification program, along with training at higher education institutes.

Full Name	Status/Response/Comments
	Approving the extension of Option 2 or Option 4. Need to define what a statewide contract.
Sandy Yang	Absent
Grace Yoo	Absent

## REVIEW CONTENT FOR THE FINAL REPORT AND NEXT STEPS

The Project Manager shared her screen to show the poll that participants would use to rank the options. She explained how to fill out the poll. She also showed where on the Language Access Work Group website people could find the poll results, which would be posted no later than 5:00pm on Friday, October 6.

Considering that Antoinette Wynne of DES raised a concern that Option 1 may not be viable, participants asked if the Options table would be updated for the poll. Some participants continued to state their preference that the option for DSHS to resume testing be added to the vote. Dr. Miao noted that if the legislature wanted DSHS to continue medical interpreter testing, then Senate Bill 5304 would have passed. That option is not viable, so Substitute Senate Bill 5304 was created. SSB5304 mandated DSHS to convene a work group to find other viable options. Dr. Miao announced that if the options table were to be revised, the updated version would be shared with participants by 2:00pm the same day (Tuesday, October 3, 2023).

The Project Manager then showed the [Proposed Process Timeline](#) and shared the basic content of the final report.

## CONCLUSION

Participants were encouraged to contact the Project Manager, Malia Wallace-Mello, if they have any questions.

Everyone was thanked.

#####