May 7, 2015

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I write on behalf of NAJIT, the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators, and in my capacity as Chair of NAJIT’s Advocacy Committee. I have been particularly requested by our Board to comment on the fee schedule for interpreter services proposed by the California DWC.

NAJIT has as its main purpose the fostering of professionalism among interpreters, especially those working in judicial and quasi-judicial settings. We are not a trade union, and do not concern ourselves as an organization with monetary compensation.

We strongly support certification of interpreters as a means of assuring their competence and their adherence to ethical and other professional standards. We believe that, for certification to do its job, those who hire interpreters must require that their interpreters be certified. In this way, interpreters who want to work are encouraged to obtain certification, and those who hire interpreters are assured of quality interpretation.

In the alternative, people who speak two languages are deceived into believing, and deceive others into believing, that they are competent to interpret.

As I read this fee schedule, a Claims Administrator – apparently a creature of the insurance industry – is permitted to dispense with the certification requirement after expending minimal effort to find one (9931(c)), or on his own initiative (9932(a)(3)). Here is the proverbial slippery slope, well-greased and prepared for the descent into injustice.

Our organization can provide a wealth of material concerning the benefits of insisting on certified interpreters and detailing the tragedies that have resulted from depending on unqualified personnel.

Sincerely,

John Estill
Chair, Advocacy Committee