

**Shared Remote Interpreting Governance Committee
Orange County Courthouse
8:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. EST
April 13, 2017
Judicial Conference Room, 23rd Floor
Meeting Summary**

Members in attendance:

Judge Elizabeth Metzger, Judge J. Keven Abdoney, Mathew Benefiel, German Bernal, Noel Chessman, Win Ellenwood, Jeffrey Fuller, Elizabeth Garber, Gilberto de Paz, Tom Genung, Gary Hagan, Judge Leandra G. Johnson, Craig McLean, Mark Weinberg, and Astrid Rodriguez

Members absent:

Roosevelt Sawyer

Others in attendance:

Judge Diana Moreland, Arlene Johnson, Patty Harris, Victor McKay, Lisa Bell, Kris Slayden, Lindsay Hafford, Jessie McMillan, Steve Shaw and Maggie Lewis via teleconference.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Judge Metzger welcomed them to the Shared Remote Interpreting Governance Committee meeting. She added that Information pertaining to shared remote interpreting services will be discussed. We are directed to oversee the management and administration of shared remote interpreting services in the trial courts. There are a few voting issues on the agenda to officially commence that oversight responsibility. It was further explained that shared remote interpreting services is a new model, implemented in a few circuits. Some demonstrations are planned to help familiarize the members with the technology being used. The first demonstration will be provided by Cisco on the proposed enhancements to the statewide call manager. The second demonstration will be hosted by the 9th Circuit.

II. Review and Approval of the February 21, 2017 Meeting Minutes

The motion proposed to approve the February 21, 2017, meeting minutes. Judge Johnson moved the motion and Tom Genung seconded. The motion carried with modification.

III. Phase I of Shared Remote Interpreting Services

A. Updated Pilot Events Data

In 2014, a funding request to the legislature of \$100,000 was approved to support expansion efforts of a shared remote interpreting regional model for the trial courts. The appropriation was based on expanding a regional pilot to multiple judicial circuits. The regional pilot:

- Uses advanced audio/video technology that enables judges to access an on-line statewide registry of available staff and/or contractual interpreters to obtain on demand interpreting services.
- Builds on circuit model audio/video conferencing systems.
- Leverages circuit-level equipment and includes a state-level call manager to schedule and manage shared services.

To register interpreting events, court interpreters used a web-based data entry form created by the OSCA through a Formstack subscription service. Each interpreter is asked to use Formstack to enter detailed, descriptive information on each interpreting event. As a result of the Phase I (pilot), the 3rd, 7th, 9th, 14th, 15th, and 16th circuit currently participate in the shared remote interpreting model. The meeting materials provides an example of data interpreters entered in Formstack for each interpreting event as well as provides summary data charts to illustrate how the data registers once the information is entered by the interpreters. For example, what circuits are providing and receiving services from the pool, if the event was performed by a contract or staff interpreter, what language was provided during the interpreting event, etc. Currently, the 7th and 9th circuit provide services to the pool. The model is primarily being used for Spanish, although some non-Spanish languages were covered using contracted interpreters, most events were covered using FTE for Spanish. The vast majority of the events were scheduled in advance. Arraignments provide the bulk of the events registered by the pool. This item was presented for informational purposes only.

IV. Phase II of Shared Remote Interpreting Services

A. Continued Expansion and Update on FY 2017-18 Legislative Budget Request

The strategy this year was to have a comprehensive technology plan and interpreting as separate issues. The Senate proposed giving 14 million to the trial courts for technology in their initial work plan they presented. Unfortunately, the money was in the non-interpreting line item. For FY 2017-18 the courts is requesting \$1,231,958 in recurring and \$2,395,733 in non-recurring ODPS funding to support the first phase of a statewide expansion of digital remote court interpreting from the pilot project. The request contemplates full life cycle funding and recurring maintenance costs to support future fiscal years, with expansion to more circuits in the second year of funding and ultimately expanding to the full state in the third year. The request for FY 2018-19 is for \$3,807,295 (\$3,373,000 non-recurring) in ODPS funding. This out-year funding will support the second phase of expansion of remote court interpreting including implementation of the technology and support services-refresh maintenance. Further, it is anticipated that requests will be made for FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 for the remaining expansion and maintenance/refresh of equipment purchased in previous years. These requests will continually support, maintain, and refresh the remote interpreting equipment necessary to ensure trial courts statewide are able to meet the needs of judges, court staff, and the public they serve in future years. The requests Provide access to qualified interpreters remotely over a

broader geographical area, using audio/video technology, which allows pooling of limited resources for certified interpreters and provides a more consistent level of interpreting services across the state. Additionally it allows circuits to maximize existing resources across a single county with multiple courthouses, using localized remote interpreting. The request also allows for cost containment in interpreter staff and contractor expenses and creates potential for expansion to utilize this technology platform in expert witness testimony.

B. Governance Issues to Address

Ms. Harris discussed the charges outlined in AO16-105. The charges:

- 1) Establish the statewide court interpreting pool for remote interpreting;
- 2) Develop recommendations to the TCBC for its review and consideration on additional funding needs, as requested by the circuits, for interpreting services associated with shared remote interpreting. These recommendations should be based on standardized room models/costs, for both state and county obligated portions of remote interpreting technology, as developed by the TCBC;
- 3) Collect workload data and needs-based funding information for shared remote interpreting for the circuits;
- 4) Oversee administration/management issues. This shall include procedural changes to the shared remote interpreting model based upon periodic review of circuit data, as well as feedback and recommendations from the circuits regarding operational issues arising from the use of virtual remote interpreting, with modifications made as appropriate; and
- 5) Establish Memorandums of Understanding between circuits and the governance committee.

The February 21, 2017 meeting identified several initial tasks to support the Committee in responding to these charges. Tasks identified included addressing operational and funding related issues and developing governance strategies for shared remote interpreting services. Proposed governance committee actions for these tasks include the following:

Establish Statewide Pool and Memorandums of Understanding

As a first priority, circuits currently participating in the model as a result of Phase I should be provided operational support. Developing Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) between the governance committee and these circuits can be useful for both collaborating these arrangements and assuring on-going delivery of remote interpreting services. MOU's allow for development of protocols for using the statewide pool, collecting performance data, addressing problems/delays associated with inter-circuit relations, and ensuring pool coverage meets demands. The MOUs may be tailored to meet each circuit's specific needs. Accordingly, the members agreed to explore allowing the 14th Circuit, which previously withdrew from the pilot after expressing concerns regarding the need to provide remote interpreting services to outside entities, to re-join the shared remote interpreting services model. Their concern was that differing local practices may make the VRI solution not suitable. Additionally, consideration may be given to developing educational/training provisions relating to the appropriate use of

interpreters across or between circuits. A motion was made to establish an operations sub-group to collect data on local circuit practices and prepare recommendations to the governance committee on the statewide pool and MOUs for the circuits currently participating in the pool. Also to direct the sub-group to contact each circuit seeking their assistance in reviewing a draft MOU. Data on local practices and a final draft MOU should be prepared for consideration at the next meeting. Tom Genung moved and Judge Abdoney seconded. The motion passed. The members of the sub-group include Tom Genung as Chair, Judge Abdoney, Judge Johnson, Astrid Rodriquez, Gilberto De Paz, German Bernal, and Elizabeth Garber.

Develop Recommendations Regarding Multi-Point Functionality

A sub workgroup was created at to February meeting to review the initial quote of \$272,000 received from Presidio. The quote provided hardware and software to enhance the call manager. The quote was based on an initial estimate of 25 concurrent conferences and showing the pricing for a redundant system. The subgroup members include Matt Benefiel, Gary Hagan, Tom Genung, Craig McLean, Alan Neubauer, Roosevelt Sawyer and Noel Chessman. After meeting in March 2017 to review the quote and circuits' business requirements for the multi-point functionality, the sub-group recommended requesting a re-quote based on a reduced concurrent license count of 7 licenses and excluding the cost of an additional server for redundancy. They also recommended suggested inviting Cisco to demonstrate the capability of the multi-point connection and compatibility with non-Cisco based technologies, such as Polycom. The members discussed the possibility the possible pushback from others circuits due to not all circuits benefiting from the model. A motion to prepare a recommendation to the TCBC for the approval of funding in the amount of \$122,625 (non-recurring) to allow the purchase and installation of the Cisco Meeting Server 1000. Also work with OSCA Office of Information Technology to determine recurring costs to allow necessary upgrades to the statewide network (bandwidth) and on-going maintenance. The motion was moved by Craig McLean and seconded by Gary Hagan. The motion passed.

Provide Communication to Circuits Regarding the Shared Remote Interpreting Governance Committee

The members discussed fostering communication between the governance committee and other circuits that may be interested in expanding. Developing a formal communication mechanism in which each circuit can communicate their business needs to the governance committee prior to purchasing and installing remote interpreting equipment. This process will allow for coordination of additional resources to the statewide pool, upgrades to the statewide network, and other resource enhancements as deemed necessary for improving efficiency in service delivery. The members also discussed educating the circuits on the pool. Matt Benefiel volunteered to host a training session on installing the system.

A motion was made to provide a letter on behalf of Judge Metzger to the Chief Judges, Trial Court Administrators and Court Technology Officers explaining the existence of the governance committee and how its charges are outlined to assist the circuits in participating in the model. Also to develop a standard for the circuits to provide the governance committee certain points of information that will assist the committee with

expansion efforts. Tom Genung moved and seconded by Judge Johnson. The motion passed.

Group Exercise

The members participated in a group exercise by which they were divided into common groups with the purpose of identify their top five questions or concerns regarding shared remote interpreting services. The groups consisted of Judges, Trial Court Administrators, Court Technology Officers, Court Interpreter Supervisors/Due Process Managers and Court Interpreters. The results will be discussed at the next meeting.

V. Presentation by Cisco

Cisco presented a demonstration of their multi-point functionality and connectivity with non-Cisco units. Cisco concluded the demo with a brief presentation Q&A. Additionally, Cisco demonstrated:

- How the use of their bridge will merge different protocols and allow them to talk to each other directly. This was demonstrated by connected connecting to a conference room in Panama City, a Cisco customer at the University of New Hampshire, a Cisco representative using a mobile phone and a jail facility as well.
- Along with remote interpreting, the system can be expanded to include remote witnesses and someone providing expert testimony.
- The solution supports 96 high definition, 192 standard definition, and 300 audio end points. The solution also includes the hardware
- A “branding” options is also available that allows the user to what system is being access during the video conferences. For example, Florida Courts can be displayed on the screen. This option may be deleted from the quote if it is not wanted as part of the video solution.
- To connect to a video conference bridge, the user must dial in. For added security, the system requires a password to be able to connect to the conference room and are not attached automatically.
- A link can be sent, via the web, to a participant that allows them to use their camera on a laptop or mobile device to connect as well.

VI. 9th Circuit Host Live VRI Demonstration at 11:00

The 9th circuit hosted a demonstration for the members the process by which interpreters connect to court proceeding and deliver real time court interpreting via video conferencing.

VII. Next Steps and Meeting

The members were informed the next meeting will take place via conference call to review the draft MOU’s and to finalize recommendations to the TCBC on the multi-point functionality. Staff will send a meeting notice.

With no further business, I adjourn this meeting at 12:00.

DRAFT