

# **The Use of Remote Technology in Legal Interpreting: Focus Groups Summary**

## **INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY**

As part of the effort to gather insight from interpreters who work in legal settings through remote technology, a series of focus groups was conducted in the spring and summer of 2013. Additional information was taken from a focus group conducted in April 2012.

Altogether, a total of six focus groups met that included one attorney and 16 interpreters, one of which was a certified deaf interpreter. Five of the interpreters and the attorney involved in the focus groups noted that they are responsible for coordinating interpreter services in their home courts. Another five interpreters identified themselves as working full-time for the administrative office of the courts in their home states as staff interpreters and one identified him/herself as holding an administrative position with a state commission. Six of the interpreters work as free-lance interpreters in the court system.

Taken together, these individuals represent decades of experience relating to interpreting in the courts through remote technology. Their insight and experience offer a nuanced view of this specialized interpreting setting as detailed in the following pages.

Here is a summary of the key findings from focus group participants:

The use of remote technology in the courts is still very much in its infancy. Although certain states, such as California and Oregon, are ahead of the game in terms of implementing a formalized system for remote legal interpreting, the other states represented in the focus groups are still in the “pilot” program stage. Further, it should be noted, that a number of states were not represented in the focus groups, making it impossible to determine the degree to which judiciaries are rel

consensus among practitioners that clear guidelines and best practices should be established so that courts and interpreters across the country are similarly guided.

The technology set-up used in courtrooms varies across the country. In some instances, the interpreter controls the camera, while in other instances it is controlled by court personnel or information technology staff who are present in the courtroom. In most instances, the interpreter is located in a space established within another courthouse in the state, although one participant noted that in some instances the interpreter might be located in another state or even at home.

Only interpreters with extensive experience interpreting in the legal setting should be tapped to interpret remotely. Knowledge of the culture of a courtroom, a sense of what participants might be discussing, and a comfort level with the judiciary is essential to ensure an adequate interpretation despite the fact that the interpreter is located in a remote location.

## **METHODOLOGY & PROCEDURE**

To fulfill our aim to secure a broad cross-section of interpreters who work in court settings through remote technology, we undertook 6 Focus Group meetings. One (1) meeting occurred face-to-face and five (5) meetings occurred via audio-conference. Solicitation of participants took place through the RID Legal Interpreter Member Section (LIMS), graduates of the UNC Legal Interpreter Training Program, and through the NCIEC network.

The face-to-face group meeting took place in Denver, Colorado as part of the 2012 ILI conference hosted by the NCIEC MARIE Center and LIMS. The five audio-conference meetings were with interpreter practitioners and court personnel from Arizona, California, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. Each meeting lasted approximately 90 minutes. All participants were assured of confidentiality. Each meeting included a facilitator who fostered dialogue and posed questions from a focus group script that was approved through the IRB process

technology. To accomplish this goal, the NCIEC Legal Interpreting workgroup is engaging in a series of focus groups with interpreters from across the United States. The information gleaned from these events will assist the NCIEC Legal interpreter



Almost all of the interpreter practitioners noted that they had worked via remote technology in non-legal settings and that this experience was of great benefit to them in working in the courts.

This provided a level of knowledge about and comfort with the technology and experience in trouble-shooting any technological issues that might come up. In those states implementing remote technology in the courts for both sign and spoken languages, participants noted that sign language interpreters were at an advantage because the use of remote technology is much more prevalent in the field of sign language interpreters.

With regard to specific use of technology in the courtroom, many of the



In fact, when asked about the use of team interpreters, most participants stated their belief that any proceeding which required more than one interpreter was not appropriate for remote interpretation. Although the participants articulated different ideas about what types of proceedings could be interpreted remotely, there were three themes that arose from the focus groups. In evaluating whether a proceeding is appropriate for remote interpretation, courts and interpreters should focus on: 1) the length of the proceeding; 2) the nature of the proceeding; and 3) any unique linguistic issues that present. If the proceeding is so long as to require team interpreting, it may be inappropriate for the use of remote technology. If the nature of the proceeding requires the submission of evidence or witness testimony, it may be inappropriate for the use of remote technology. If the deaf consumer requires a CDI in order to effectively communicate or there are multiple deaf consumers, it may be inappropriate for the use of remote technology.

Participants repeatedly noted that short, procedural hearings, such as arraignments, trial management conferences, scheduling conferences, post-trial sentencings, and plea allocutions, are appropriate for the use of remote technology. Different court systems approached this determi

iPads could be assigned to deaf consumers for use throughout a courthouse, in recognition of the fact that so much of what happens in a courthouse is incidental to what happens in the courtroom.

Participants also mentioned their belief that an interpreter's ethical obligation extends to making sure that the technology is sufficient and allows for appropriate communication. One participant noted that it is harder to be proactive while in a separate location from the others and another participant noted that an interpreter's remote location could make the proceeding feel less formal. The general consensus was that interpreters must work even harder to uphold their ethical obligations while not physically present in the courtroom. One participant opined that a national model code should be created so that an interpreter's ethical obligations are the same across the country, much like an attorney's.

The focus groups participants related that they had little to no experience doing sight translations remotely. Some supposed that the document could be held up to the camera in order for such a translation to occur. One participant suggested that the remote interpreter could have access to such documents by fax or on a computer should a sight translation need to occur. A few participants noted that document sight translation was one of the incidentals that occurred outside a courtroom and might be facilitated by mobile devices.

The participants indicated that they had no direct experience using a certified deaf interpreter in remote settings, though there was agreement that the use of a CDI remotely would require a known, trusting relationship between the interpreters. The focus group participant who worked as a freelance certified deaf interpreter noted that he had never been asked to participate in a remote situation, but had



