

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from electronic originals
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

INTERPRETING SERVICES IN MAINE:

A Report by the Study Committee on Interpreting Services



Advisory Committee
Division of Deafness
Bureau of Rehabilitation
Department of Human Services

APRIL 1989

INTERPRETING SERVICES IN MAINE:

A Report by the Study Committee on Interpreting Services

Prepared by:

Advisory Committee
Division of Deafness
Bureau of Rehabilitation
Department of Human Services
William H. Nye, Chairperson

APRIL 1989

Dr. Pamela Tetley, Director, Bureau of Rehabilitation
Norman R. Perrin, Director, Division of Deafness

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction
- II. Summary of Public Hearings: Including Survey and Written Comments
- III. Summary of Findings
- IV. Recommendations
- V. Appendices
 - A. Results of Hearing Polls
 - 1. Bangor
 - 2. Auburn
 - 3. Portland
 - B. Lists of Participants in Hearings
 - C. List of Interpreter Agencies

Section I

INTRODUCTION

Deafness is a major chronic disability which affects one out of every sixteen Americans. Twenty out of every 1000 hear speech well enough to comprehend it. A hearing loss affects both communication and understanding. Out of Maine's approximately 70,000 citizens who are deaf or hard of hearing about 2,000 persons are profoundly deaf. This group represents a significant consumer group within our State. Due to their profound hearing loss, use of American Sign Language and distinct culture, special accommodations are needed in order for deaf people to use public services.

The Report on Interpreter Issues deals with one aspect of the special services needed to accommodate the communication and delivery of services to deaf and hard of hearing persons in the State. It focuses on the area of interpreting for the deaf, a process of transmitting a message from one person to another, from one language to another, from auditory to visual and vice-versa. The interpreter facilitates communication on a particular occasion for individuals and audiences who do not share the same language or the same modality for using language.

The State of Maine has a 1979 statute that assigns the Bureau of Rehabilitation with responsibility for administering the law concerning interpreting funds and services for the deaf and hard of hearing in legal and agency settings (5 MRSA 48). The State and the deaf community have seen an increasing growth in the profession of interpreting for the deaf and the number of interpreter agencies. Currently more than thirty interpreters work in a variety of settings throughout the State. However, the current demand for interpreting services outstrips the supply of interpreters. This is not only a State problem, but it is part of a growing national crisis facing the deaf community. Requests for interpreting services are becoming increasingly difficult to fulfill because of contractual commitments of interpreters to the mainstreaming programs in public schools. The quality and quantity of interpreters have been noticeably inconsistent. The training evaluation and certification of interpreters in Maine is inadequate. The State statute on interpreting services for the deaf and hard of hearing has been called out of date and restrictive.

In the spring of 1987, William H. Nye, Chairperson of the Advisory Committee to the Division of Deafness brought these concerns of the deaf community to the attention of the Bureau of Rehabilitation and its Division of Deafness. This led to

the formation of the Study Committee on Interpreting Issues. The Committee scheduled, announced and held three public hearings in three regional sites as follows:

Bangor - October 30, 1987.
Auburn - November 13, 1987.
Portland - November 20, 1987.

The purpose of the public hearings was (a) to gather testimonies from consumers, interpreters and service providers interpreting services for the deaf and hard of hearing; (b) administration of interpreting funds by the Bureau of Rehabilitation; (c) quantity and quality of interpreters; (d) evaluation and certification of interpreters in Maine.

Transcripts of the public hearings, letters and data from a survey of interpreters, interpreter agencies and service providers have been gathered, assembled and documented. These reinforce the recommendations of the Study Committee and identify some solutions to the concerns and needs expressed by consumers, interpreters, agencies and organizations.

The Bureau of Rehabilitation and the Advisory Committee to the Division of Deafness are deeply grateful to the following individuals for their contributions to the work of the Study Committee and the Report:

William H. Nye,
Norman R. Perrin,
Jan K. Repass.
Amy Melick,
Toni Rees,

and to each individual who participated in the regional public hearings and the interpreters for their time, effort and skill in making testimony available for the public record.

Section II

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARINGS, WRITTEN COMMENTS, AND SURVEYS OF:

- a. Organizations that hire interpreters
- b. Interpreting agencies
- c. Interpreters

Public Hearings

Public hearings were held in three locations: Bangor, Lewiston-Auburn, and Portland. Each was well attended by deaf consumers and others involved with the interpreting process. Mr. William Nye, Chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Division of Deafness and Mr. Norman Perrin, Director of the Division of Deafness facilitated the presentation of testimony at each site.

The format for the hearings was an introduction followed by a free flowing discussion about interpreting in Maine. Discussion issues included the following:

- . Certification process - who should evaluate? Interpreters? Consumers? Training Programs?
- . What are qualified interpreters? Standards?
- . Is there a conflict between interpreters and consumers?
- . How can equivalency, validity, and reliability be measured and built into the system of evaluating interpreter competency?
- . Consumer education for both deaf and hearing.
- . Attitude problems - grievance proceedings.
- . RID Bylaws - mission and objectives do not mention the deaf consumer.
- . Deaf people should be more involved in developing, evaluating, certifying, policy formulating, etc.
- . Each organization has a lot to contribute to the other - Need to avoid the medical model with its doctor - patient relationship. The necessity to view relationships among interpreters and deaf consumers in a cultural model, in viewing consumers not as people needing help, but as people with accessibility rights. (Excerpts from a recent NAD Board meeting Discussion).

The findings are reported in more detail in Section III which follows this section.

Written Comments

In addition to the comments made at the public hearings, four letters were received with additional comments and concerns. The comments contained in those letters have been summarized here:

- . Quality control and qualification standards for interpreters must be developed.
- . Certification standards must be developed for interpreters in the educational setting.
- . Evaluations should be developed to qualify interpreters for specialized situations, e.g. mental health interpreting.
- . Interpreters are frequently not available.
- . The skill and knowledge of interpreters in mental health settings needs to be upgraded.
- . Interpreters must be trained to follow ethical procedures.
- . Interpreters need to follow RID standards.
- . Interpreters must develop proficiency in various sign systems.
- . Can interpreters advertise for their services?
- . More information is needed about sources that help to pay for interpreter services.
- . May insurance companies pay for interpreting services?
- . Should the doctor who requires the interpreter pay for this service?
- . More cued speech interpreters are needed.
- . Rehabilitation counselors should receive interpreter training.
- . Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) should provide interpreters.
- . Division of Deafness should use all available

interpreting agencies.

- . Consumers are generally satisfied with interpreters.
- . It is easier to get interpreters here than in New Jersey.
- . Information is needed on how the Bureau of Rehabilitation funds interpreter agencies.
- . How would the Bureau of Rehabilitation evaluate interpreter services?
- . A statewide interpreter register is needed.
- . Consumers want quality assurance.

The above comments were edited slightly for clarity. (Ed. note)

Survey of Organizations That Hire Interpreters

A survey of agencies and organizations where interpreters are employed regularly in Maine revealed disturbing gaps and inadequacies. Of thirteen (13) agencies, none employed an interpreter in a full-time salaried position. Eight of the agencies/organizations did not have a budget for interpreting services. Instead, funding came from a variety of sources and categories such as "overhead". More than half the organizations reported that they had problems scheduling for interpreter services through interpreter agencies. Problems noted by the organizations included: (a) role conflicts experienced by employees who sometimes acted as interpreters; (b) the inappropriateness of relying on family members to interpret; (c) interpreter agencies not returning telephone calls, etc.

Ten of the thirteen organizations stated that they would welcome additional training for their staff to increase awareness of deaf related issues and provide more appropriate interpreter services.

Survey of Interpreter Agencies

The survey of interpreter agencies focused on one larger agency in Maine. The agency employs three (3) full-time and twenty four (24) part-time interpreters. This agency makes 2,187 assignments of interpreters each year, not including the assignment of classroom interpreters.

It is interesting to note that many of the concerns expressed in the public hearings were emphasized by this major interpreting agency. Areas addressed fell into two broad

categories also reported in Section IV SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.

Problems associated with the quality and quantity of interpreting services include the following:

- . Increased interpreter training opportunities are needed.
- . Pay for interpreters must be increased to match pay rates in similar states (Vermont and New Hampshire). This will help recruit interpreters into Maine as well as keep interpreters in Maine.
- . Interpreters in Maine need the support of an active professional organization such as Maine Registry Interpreters of the Deaf (Me. RID).
- . A standard system must be developed to document the qualifications of interpreters. Without this, referral organizations and prospective employers have no way of assessing the qualifications of the people they hire.
- . Standardized policies must be developed to protect the working conditions of interpreters; for example, (a) if a meeting lasts more than two hours, more than one interpreter should be hired, (b) interpreters must be provided with a break after no more than one hour of interpreting.

Suggestions relating to the interpreter laws include:

- . A much more comprehensive law relating to interpreting is needed in Maine. For example, when a deaf person is arrested by the police, or when a deaf person is a victim, he/she should have a right to an interpreter.
- . A state version of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act should be passed so that action can be taken to compel the hiring of interpreters by state agencies and city welfare agencies that are presently refusing to do so.
- . The privileged communication law should be clarified and strengthened to ensure the protection of the confidentiality rights of deaf consumers.
- . More state funding is needed to assist with the cost of providing interpreters in specific types of interpreting situations, for example, those relating to mental illness, substance abuse, visits to the eye doctor as well as those of a

non-medical nature such as house closings, etc.

Survey of Interpreters

Ten interpreters completed surveys. All had passed either a state and/or national screening for interpreters. The interpreters were asked to comment on working conditions for interpreters in Maine. They raised concerns similar to those reported in the public hearings. Problems noted included inadequate training, insufficient interpreters, the need for improved evaluation and certification procedures, etc.

Two areas not clearly covered in other forms of testimony were:

- . The lack of job security and benefits for individuals choosing to become professional interpreters.
- . The need to educate deaf people about their rights and about the resources available to them.

Section III, SUMMARY OF FINDINGS provides more detailed explanations of the very valuable comments provided by everyone involved in this project.

Section III

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

There are four general areas into which the findings are categorized. They are: Quality and Quantity, Program Funding and Contracts, Law and Legal, and Evaluation and Certification. A fifth area is added for Miscellaneous issues.

A. Quality and Quantity

This area summarizes the comments and responses related to quality and quantity of provision of interpreting services.

1. There are an insufficient number of interpreters to meet the demand especially in Central and Northern Maine.
2. There is a need for 24 hour interpreting services. Interpreters are not available to meet last minute requests. For example, to interpret in emergency situations, or at meetings suddenly called in the work place.
3. In school settings, untrained personnel often act as interpreters. These persons may have little or no training in interpreting or deaf awareness.
4. Because of ignorance and lack of funding, some schools and employers do not provide adequate and appropriate interpreting. For example, only one interpreter may be hired for an all day assignment interpreting at a workshop, or an untrained volunteer may be asked to interpret.
5. In recent years there has been an increased demand for interpreters, particularly, because of mainstreaming in public schools, vocational training, and adult education classes.
6. Knowing the vocabulary in the classroom is an important prerequisite for interpreting in that setting.
7. If an interpreter falls behind or is not clearly understood by the deaf person, it is unnerving to repeat the statements.
8. Reverse skills interpreters are sorely needed for interpreters from sign language to voice. Many NRID certified interpreters and those new to Maine do not have good reverse skills and cannot speak articulately what the deaf person is signing.

9. Confidentiality continues to be a problem, in that, interpreters should not talk to others about specific assignments.

10. In-service training for interpreters is often not well attended. There needs to be incentive awards for good attendance.

11. Training for specialized interpreting should be provided. Examples are movies, slides, and telephone interpreting.

12. At present, there is no system for evaluating interpreting services by consumers and parties to the interpreting setting on a regular basis.

B. Program Funding and Contracts

This area relates to the methods of funding of interpreters services and specialized contracts such as the one Pine Tree Society has with the Bureau of Rehabilitation.

1. For a college course not sponsored by the university, who pays for the interpreter? These particular courses are not traditionally covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

2. There is a need for a centralized, state funded agency to coordinate interpreting by four different agencies.

3. Advance notice for interpreting requests should be made as early as two weeks in advance.

4. A system should be established to give a deaf person advance notice when an interpreter cannot show up.

5. Clear instructions should be given to agencies regarding assignments over a three hour duration. More than one interpreter should be assigned.

C. Law and Legal Issues

This area refers to the current interpreter laws in Maine and to the fee schedules established.

1. The 1979 law limits the amount agencies can pay interpreters to \$15.00 per hour. In other states, agencies may pay up to \$30.00 an hour or more depending on circumstances. To attract quality interpreters, Maine law should be revised to increase payment for interpreting services.

2. The present law does not cover interpreting in civil cases in the judicial system.

3. The present law is restrictive and relates only to quasi-judicial and judicial assignments. Other important needs are not covered such as: post-secondary and adult education, substance abuse, physicians and psychologists, and medicaid.

4. A weakness in the current law is that the focus is on interpreting speech for deaf persons. Communication should be a two-way street. Access to town meetings and other community activities are a right for deaf citizens.

5. The law should be revised to give deaf people access to all aspects of government such as the Legislature, councils, school boards and other community services.

D. Evaluation and Certification

This area refers to the systems of evaluating and certifying interpreters according to skill levels.

1. At present, there is no system in Maine of evaluating interpreter's skills. There is no way of knowing an interpreter is qualified or competent.

2. Interpreters who work in schools are frequently uncertified. Maine currently does not require certification. Sometimes people who know a little sign language are hired to interpret under the guise of tutors or aides.

3. Health care facilities often do not use qualified interpreters in the emergency room or in the hospital clinics. This is also true in police settings and mental health clinics.

E. Miscellaneous Issues

This area reflects concerns and issues in a variety of categories.

1. The general public, schools, service providers and consumers need to be educated about: a. When to use an interpreter? b. How to obtain an interpreter? c. What are the roles and function of interpreters?

At the present time, in some classrooms, hearing children who know some signs are being deprived of their own education when they are expected to play a dual role as the

student and the volunteer interpreter for a deaf student when a qualified interpreter is not available.

3. Public seminars, workshops, town meetings, and other activities are rarely interpreted, therefore, are inaccessible to deaf persons.

4. There is a need for more sign language courses and training about deafness in the work place and in the community. This would help to facilitate communication, for example, between a supervisor and deaf employee, and among everyone in the community.

5. Some deaf awareness training and sign language classes are taking place in businesses such as, Bath Iron Works, Central Maine Power Company. There are not enough of these classes.

6. Many doctors and hospitals do not seem to know that interpreters exist and try to communicate by writing notes to deaf persons.

7. The general public and users of interpreters such as hospitals and police do not understand the interpreting profession. For example, a nurse who knows a little fingerspelling may be called upon to interpret. This is not appropriate especially in an emergency.

8. Deaf people have been patient and polite. It is time to stand up and complain about atrocious interpreting instead of remaining quiet.

9. Most deaf people do not know there is a grievance procedure. They can register a complaint through the agency that provides the interpreter. The Division of Deafness can be contacted to refer the parties to an advocate agency.

10. While unrelated to this survey, deaf person have issued complaints about the vocal relay services. The problem is basically busy signals for hours.

11. There are no trained advocates for deaf persons in the area of interpreting.

12. Because many deaf people are unaware of the Human Rights Act, they are facing interpreting gaps on the job and when applying for housing.

13. Many deaf persons may be able to obtain interpreters at reduced cost by using a sliding fee scale through one of the interpreter agencies. Many do not understand this concept. More education is needed for consumers regarding this process.

Section IV

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the following does not represent the full number of recommendations possible from the findings, it does represent the most significant issues which surfaced in hearings and survey results.

1. A grievance procedure or appeals policy should be established within the state interpreter law so that the deaf person shall have recourse in the disputed assignment.
2. Funding should be provided for interpreting with private physicians, psychologists, and in substance counseling.
3. Funding should be provided for interpreting in post-secondary, adult education, and continuing education programs.
4. It is the responsibility of a health care facility to provide auxiliary aids to ensure effective communications between persons with hearing impairments and the medical staff. The range of options must include sign language interpreters, flash cards, lipreading, written notes, supplementary hearing devices, charts, signs or a combination of these. All of these must be available during the open hours of the admitting and business offices and out-patient clinic. They must be available on a 24 hour basis for in-patient care and emergency services.
5. All people working as interpreters in public schools (interpreters, interpreter-aides, interpreter-tutors) should be required to take an evaluation and screening test. All these individuals must work toward RID certification and to continue employment in public schools must obtain certification within five years.
6. A committee shall be formed by the Maine Division of Deafness with representatives from the Advisory Committee (1), Maine Association of the Deaf (1), Maine Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf (1), a Service Provider (1), and Consumers (2) to review the current statute on the interpreting law and make recommendations for the 1991 Legislature. The committee should consider the following areas:
 - A. Areas of need for interpreting service.
 - b. Current legislation on interpreter services in other states.
 - c. Quality assurance (QA)

d. Grievance procedures.

e. Evaluation and certification of interpreters.

7. Consumer orientation should be provided on a statewide basis through the coordination of the Maine Division of Deafness, Maine Association of the Deaf, and the Maine Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf to promote consumer awareness of the state law on interpreter service, community resources, and rights of consumers.

8. An interdepartmental advisory committee should be created by the Bureau of Rehabilitation and the Division of Deafness and other state agencies to review the state contracts for the administration of funds for interpreting services and address issues related to interpreting programs and services. It should include representatives from the deaf community and community agencies.

9. A simplified form for the standard evaluation of the quality of services rendered by the interpreting/appointing agency and interpreter in the interpreting setting should be developed and utilized on a statewide basis by the Bureau of Rehabilitation and the Division of Deafness to measure the outcome of quantity and quality assurance of the state funded interpreting services. It should be strictly voluntary for consumers and those using interpreter services to fill out the form.

10. In response to concerns for the shortage of interpreters and demands for interpreting services in the state, there is an urgency for the coordinated effort of the state agencies such as the Department of Human Services, Department of Educational and Cultural Services, and Department of Mental Retardation and Mental Health, Maine Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf, Maine Association of the Deaf, and the University of Maine to address the problem and promote the awareness of the needs of the profession and training program for interpreters at a single university or college in Maine.

11. The Maine Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf should investigate the liability for workman's compensation for interpreters employed in the state.

12. The Maine Registry of Interpreters for the deaf should study the statewide issue of requests for interpreting services in emergency situations and recommend guidelines for handling last minute or urgent requests.

Appendix A

RESULTS OF HEARING POLLS

BANGOR - AUBURN - MACKWORTH ISLAND

ITEMS	TOTAL #	TOTAL %
1. Number of Participants	94	100%
2. Number of Hearing Impaired Persons	63	67%
3. Number of Hearing Persons	31	32.9%
4. Number of Interpreters	18	19%
5. Number of Consumers	56	59.5%
6. Number of Service Providers	19	20%
7. Number of Employers	11	11.7%
8. Number of Educators	10	10.6%
9. Number of Persons Familiar With the Maine Law on Interpreting Services for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired	22	23%
10. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of the Bureau of Rehabilitation in Administering the Interpreting Service Fund	54	57%
11. Number of Persons Familiar With All (4) Interpreters for the Deaf Agencies in Maine	27	28.7%
12. Number of Persons Familiar With the Pine Tree Society Deaf Services	70	74%
13. Number of Persons Familiar With the Purpose and Function of an Interpreter for the Interpreter Agency	47	49.9%
14. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of an Interpreter	67	71%
15. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of a Service Provider as Relating to the Interpreter for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired Law	55	58.5%

16.	Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of a Consumer in Using the Interpreting Service	63	67%
17.	Number of Persons Who are Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service In Maine	28	29.7%
18.	Number of Persons Who are Not Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service In Maine	24	25.5%
19.	Number of Persons Who are Uncertain About the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	25	26.5%
20.	Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Certified Interpreters	33	35%
21.	Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Non-Certified Interpreters	7	7%
22.	Number of Persons Expressing the Importance of the Certification of Interpreters	76	80.8%
23.	Number of Persons Indicating No Preference for the Status of Interpreters, Either Certified or Non-Certified	10	10.6%
24.	Number of Persons Checking on the Certification of an Interpreter Prior to an Appointment	3	3%

Appendix A-1

BANGOR HEARING POLL ON INTERPRETING ISSUES

October 30, 1987

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>TOTAL #</u>	<u>TOTAL %</u>
1. Number of Participants	28	100%
2. Number of Hearing Impaired Persons	16	57%
3. Number of Hearing Persons	12	43%
4. Number of Interpreters	4	14%
5. Number of Consumers	15	54%
6. Number of Service Providers	4	14%
7. Number of Employers	2	7%
8. Number of Educators	3	11%
9. Number of Persons Familiar With the Maine Law on Interpreting Service for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired	0	0%
10. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of the Bureau of Rehabilitation in Administering the Interpreting Service Fund	8	26%
11. Number of Persons Familiar With All (4) Interpreters for the Deaf Agencies in Maine	5	18%
12. Number of Persons Familiar With the Pine Tree Society Deaf Services	13	46%
13. Number of Persons Familiar With the Purpose and Function of an Interpreter Agency	6	21%
14. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of an Interpreter	6	21%
15. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of a Service Provider as Relating to the Interpreter		

for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired Law	5	18%
16. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of a Consumer in Using the Interpreting Service	10	36%
17. Number of Persons Who Are Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	6	21%
18. Number of Persons Who Are Not Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service In Maine	2	7%
19. Number of Persons Who Are Uncertain About the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	2	7%
20. Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Certified Interpreters	13	46%
21. Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Non-Certified Interpreters	6	21%
22. Number of Persons Expressing the Importance of the Certification of Interpreters	18	64%
23. Number of Persons Indicating No Preference for the Status of Interpreters, Either Certified or Non-Certified	2	7%
24. Number of Persons Checking on the Certification of an Interpreter Prior to an Appointment	0	0%

Appendix A-2

AUBURN HEARING POLL ON INTERPRETING ISSUES

November 13, 1987

ITEMS	TOTAL #	TOTAL %
1. Number of Participants	22	100%
2. Number of Hearing Impaired Persons	17	77%
3. Number of Hearing Persons	5	23%
4. Number of Interpreters	4	18%
5. Number of Consumers	16	72%
6. Number of Service Providers	6	27%
7. Number of Employers	2	9%
8. Number of Educators	4	18%
9. Number of Persons Familiar With the Maine Law on Interpreting Service for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired	9	41%
10. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of the Bureau of Rehabilitation in Administering the Interpreting Service Fund	10	45%
11. Number of Persons Familiar With All (4) Interpreter for the Deaf Agencies in Maine	7	39%
12. Number of Persons Familiar With the Pine Tree Society Deaf Services	17	77%
13. Number of Persons Familiar With the Purpose and Function of an Interpreter Agency	18	82%
14. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of an Interpreter	22	100%
15. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of a Service Provider as Relating to the Interpreter for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired Law	16	72%

16.	Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of a Consumer in Using the Interpreting Service	14	64%
17.	Number of Persons Who Are Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	8	36%
18.	Number of Persons Who Are Not Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	6	27%
19.	Number of Persons Who Are Uncertain About the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	5	23%
20.	Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Certified Interpreters	14	64%
21.	Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Non-Certified Interpreters	1	4.5%
22.	Number of Persons Expressing the Importance of the Certification of Interpreters	18	82%
23.	Number of Persons Indicating No Preference for the Status of Interpreters, Either Certified or Non-Certified	1	4.5%
24.	Number of Persons Checking on the Certification of an Interpreter Prior to an Appointment	1	4.5%

Appendix A-3

MACKWORTH ISLAND HEARING POLL ON INTERPRETING ISSUES

NOVEMBER 20, 1987

ITEMS	TOTAL #	TOTAL %
1. Number of Participants	44	100%
2. Number of Hearing Impaired Persons	30	68.1%
3. Number of Hearing Persons	14	31.8%
4. Number of Interpreters	10	22.7%
5. Number of Consumers	25	56.8%
6. Number of Service Providers	9	20.4%
7. Number of Employers	7	15.9%
8. Number of Educators	3	6.8%
9. Number of Persons Familiar With the Maine Law on Interpreting Service for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired	13	29.5%
10. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of the Bureau of Rehabilitation in Administering the Interpreting Service Fund	36	81.8%
11. Number of Persons Familiar With All (4) Interpreter for the Deaf Agencies in Maine	15	34%
12. Number of Persons Familiar With the Pine Tree Society Deaf Services	40	90.9%
13. Number of Persons Familiar With the Purpose and Function of an Interpreter Agency	23	52.2%
14. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of an Interpreter	39	88.6%
15. Number of Persons Familiar With the Role and Function of a Service Provider as Relating to the Interpreter for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired Law	34	77.2%

16.	Number of Persons Familiar With the Role of a Consumer in Using the Interpreting Service	39	88.6%
17.	Number of Persons Who Are Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	14	31.8%
18.	Number of Persons Who are Not Satisfied With the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	16	36.3%
19.	Number of Persons Who Are Uncertain About the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine	18	40.9%
20.	Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Certified Interpreters	6	13.6%
21.	Number of Persons Satisfied With the Quality of the Present Interpreting Service in Maine Performed by Non-Certified Interpreters	0	0%
22.	Number of Persons Expressing the Importance of the Certification of Interpreters	40	90.9%
23.	Number of Persons Indicating No Preference for the Status of Interpreters, Either Certified or Non-Certified	7	15.9%
24.	Number of Persons Checking on the Certification of an Interpreter Prior to an Appointment	2	4.5%

Appendix B

List of Participants in Hearings

Bangor Public Hearing October 30, 1987

Evangeline Ackley, East Holden

Robbin Addams, Brewer

Suzanne Ames, Bar Harbor

Madeline Batchelder, Hampden

Polly Bell, Rockport

Pat Bragg, Bangor

Jim Butterfield, Bangor

Janet Cameron, E. Holden

Marlene Carras, Bangor

Virginia Colson, Augusta

Craig Dean, Bangor

Shirley Garceau, Brewer

Doris Homsted, Bradley

Richard Kunkel, Bar Harbor

Lester Legassee, Brewer

Marion Legasse, Brewer

Adeline Lyons, Bangor

Bernard J. Mann, Bangor

Loreston McCrum, Glenburn

William Nye, Cumberland

Norman Perrin, Winthrop

Betty Perry, Brewer

Alex Pizarro, Bar Harbor

Elizabeth Pomroy, Brewer

Joyce Pratt, Bangor
Joanne Tardiff, Bangor
Judith Whitmore, Brewer
Fauna Yarrow, Orono

Auburn Public Hearing, November 13, 1987

Joyce Austin, Lewiston
Polly Bell, Rockport
Deborah Bolduc, Lisbon
Claude Bolduc, Lisbon
John H. Doughty III, Topsham
Lola E. Frost, Brunswick
Margaret Haberman, Brunswick
Anita Hardy, Sabbattus
Erik Magnussen, Lewiston
Thomas McOsker, Lewiston
Kenneth Morrison, Lewiston
William H. Nye, Cumberland
Chuck Overholser, Auburn
Glenn J. Pelletier, Lisbon
Norman Perrin, Winthrop
Greg Ouellette, Bath
Jan K. Repass, Portland
Willie Tarr, Auburn
Leigh K. Walton, Randolph
Cathy Welch, Norway
Ed Welch, Norway
Jacqueline Willette

James A. Wilson, Lisbon
Charles C. Wyman, Auburn

Portland Public Hearing November 20, 1987

Dick Arthur, Portland
Lelia Bracy, Portland
Beth Cassese, So. Portland
Phil Cassese, So. Portland
Katherine Corbin, Westbrook
Rita Deschaines, Freeport
Alcide Dube, Westbrook
Marge Earnhardt, So. Portland
Linda Follansbee, So. Portland
Robert Follansbee, So. Portland
Margaret Haberman, Brunswick
Sammy Hargis, Portland
Robertta Hodgkins, Westbrook
Mr. Hodgkins, Westbrook
Joyce Jellison, Hollis Center
Valerie Keith, Gorham
Leslie Kennedy, Portland
Robbin Kyshura, Portland
Mark Lane, Portland
Peter Leith, Biddeford
Mrs. Peter Leith, Biddeford
Cathy Lemieux, So. Portland
Lorna Logan, Westbrook

J. Rod MacInnis, Portland
Robert E. Moore, West Buxton
Janet Moore, West Buxton
Lois Morin, East Baldwin
Douglas Newton, East Sebago
William H. Nye, Cumberland Center
Pat Nye, Cumberland Center
Raymond Olson, Portland
Mary Jane Olson, Portland
Norman Perrin, Winthrop
Walter Perry, Falmouth Foreside
Angelina, Peterson, Portland
Harry Peterson, Portland
Gary Potter, Portland
Jan Repass, Portland
Donald Sirois, Old Orchard Beach
James Snow, East Baldwin
Carol E. Staples, Windham
Willie Tarr, Auburn
Jackie Tripp, Portland
Victor Vigna, Windham
Ruth Vigna, Windham
Dan Williams, Lisbon

Appendix c

List of Interpreter Agencies

Certified Interpreting Associates

Ruth and Victor Vigna
45-B Pope Road
Windham, Maine 04062
(207)892-6304

Pine Tree Society Interpreter Services

Doug Newton, Director
197 Lancaster Street
Portland, Maine 04101
(207)774-9438

Professional Services for the Deaf

Pam Fogg, Director
14 Emmons Street
Portland, Maine 04103
(207)772-4241

The Sign Center

Pat Bragg, Director
86 Lincoln Street
Bangor, Maine 04401
(207)947-3165 or 942-9822