



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 9, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #275

Court Interpreters (Circuit Courts)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 161, #3 and #4]

CURRENT LAW

If a court has notice that a party or witness, including children and parents in both children in need of protective services (CHIPS) actions and juvenile offenses, in criminal, delinquency, protective service, Chapter 48 (Children's Code) and Chapter 51 (Mental Health Act) proceedings has a language difficulty because of the inability to speak or understand English, has a hearing impairment, is unable to speak or has a speech defect, the court must determine whether it is sufficient to prevent the individual from: (a) communicating with his or her attorney; (b) reasonably understanding the English testimony; or (c) reasonably being understood in English. If the court determines that an interpreter is necessary, the court must advise the party or witness that he or she has a right to a qualified interpreter and that, if the party or witness cannot afford one, an interpreter will be provided for him or her at the public's expense. Any waiver of the right to an interpreter is effective only if made voluntarily in person, in open court and on the record. The court may also authorize the use of an interpreter in other actions or proceedings.

Interpreters for persons with language difficulties or hearing or speaking impairments may be prevented from disclosing privileged communications by any person who has a right to claim the privilege. The interpreter may claim the privilege, but only on behalf of the person who has the right.

State agencies holding administrative contested case proceedings must apply the same standard in determining whether an interpreter is necessary. If so determined, the administrative agency must advise the party that he or she has a right to a qualified interpreter and, after considering the party's ability to pay and other needs of the party, may provide for an interpreter at the expense of the unit of government for which the proceeding is held.

When a circuit court appoints an interpreter for an indigent person, the state provides reimbursement to the county for the resulting interpreter fees at the rate of \$35 per half day. The county must cover any costs in excess of \$35 per half day associated with retaining an interpreter for an indigent person and must also cover county-paid interpreter services provided to non-indigent persons. Adjusted base funding for court interpreter fee reimbursements to counties is \$188,800.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$50,000 GPR annually to increase the state reimbursement to counties for court interpreter services.

In addition, make the following statutory changes concerning court interpreters:

a. *Right to a Qualified Interpreter.* Create a new standard of "limited English proficiency" for courts and agencies to use when determining whether an individual may potentially have a right to a qualified interpreter. Define "limited English proficiency" as: (1) the inability, because of the use of a language other than English, to adequately understand or communicate effectively in English in a court proceeding; or (2) the inability, due to a speech impairment, hearing loss, deafness, deaf-blindness, or other disability, to adequately hear, understand, or communicate effectively in English in a court proceeding. Define a "qualified interpreter" to mean a person who is able to do all of the following: (1) readily communicate with a person who has limited English proficiency; (2) orally transfer the meaning of statements to and from English and the language spoken by a person who has limited English proficiency in the context of a court proceeding; and (3) readily and accurately interpret for a person who has limited English proficiency, without omissions or additions, in a manner that conserves the meaning, tone, and style of the original statement, including dialect, slang, and specialized vocabulary.

Modify current law provisions concerning agency use of interpreters for individuals who have a substantial interest in the proceeding and payment of interpreter expenses to refer to "qualified interpreters."

b. *Use of Qualified Interpreters by Clerks of Circuit Courts.* Allow clerks of circuit courts to provide qualified interpreters to respond to requests for assistance regarding a legal proceeding by individuals with limited English proficiency. With court approval, these qualified interpreters would be allowed to provide interpreter services outside the courtroom that are related to the court proceedings, including court-ordered psychiatric or medical exams or mediation.

c. *Waiver of Right to a Qualified Interpreter.* Provide that a person with limited English proficiency may waive the right to a qualified interpreter at any point in a court proceeding if the court advises the person of the nature and effect of the waiver and determines on the record that the waiver has been made knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily. Further,

provide that at any point in the court proceeding, for good cause, the person would be allowed to retract his or her waiver and request that a qualified interpreter be appointed.

d. *Removal of a Qualified Interpreter for Good Cause.* Allow any party to a court proceeding to object to the use of any qualified interpreter for good cause and allow the court to remove a qualified interpreter for good cause.

e. *Oath of a Qualified Interpreter.* Provide that every qualified interpreter, before commencing his or her duties in a court proceeding, be required to take a sworn oath that he or she would make a true and impartial interpretation. Authorize the Supreme Court to approve a uniform oath for qualified interpreters.

f. *Supreme Court Oversight of Qualified Interpreters.* Require the Supreme Court to establish the procedures and policies for the recruitment, training and testing of persons to act as qualified interpreters in a court proceeding and for the coordination, discipline and retention of those interpreters.

g. *Court Interpreter Training.* Request the Supreme Court to cooperate with the Technical College System Board in the development and implementation of a curriculum and testing program for training qualified interpreters.

h. *Delay in Appointing a Qualified Interpreter and Court Time Limitations.* Provide that delay resulting from the need to locate and appoint a qualified interpreter could constitute good cause for a court to stop the running of time limitations in court proceedings.

i. *Delays, Continuances and Extensions.* Provide that any delay resulting from the need to appoint a qualified interpreter be excluded in determining whether time requirements under the Children's Code (Chapter 48) or the Juvenile Justice Code (Chapter 938) were met, including the time requirement that a court must issue an order within three days after an initial appearance as to whether the requirement for parental consent to a minor's proposed abortion will be waived.

j. *Interpreter Privileged Communication.* Add interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency to the current law provisions concerning interpreter privileged communications.

k. *Initial Applicability and Effective Date.* Provide that these changes would take effect and would first apply to interpreters used or appointed on July 1, 2002.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The state currently provides reimbursement to counties for interpreter services for indigent persons under criminal, delinquency, protective service, Chapter 48 (Children's Code) and Chapter 51 (Mental Health Act) proceedings in circuit court. In other proceedings interpreters may

be appointed by the court and their costs reimbursed by the state, but these appointments are infrequent. The cost of reimbursing counties for providing interpreters for indigent persons has been steadily rising. At its April 24, 2001, s. 13.10 meeting, the Joint Committee on Finance approved a one-time supplement of \$60,000 for court interpreter reimbursement to eliminate a projected 2000-01 deficit in the appropriation.

2. The Director of State Courts appointed a Committee to Improve Interpreting and Translation in the Wisconsin Courts to make recommendations for immediate and long-term improvements in court interpreting and translation practices. The Committee found that between 1990 and 1999, Wisconsin's Hispanic and Asian-Pacific Islander populations each grew by more than 50%. Director of State Courts Office officials indicate that they expect continued growth in populations needing interpreter services.

3. Given recent history and the expected continued growth in populations needing court interpreter services, the bill provides an additional \$50,000 GPR annually for reimbursement to counties for court interpreter services.

4. Currently, there are no statutory requirements governing the procedures or time frame for counties to seek reimbursement. As a result, some counties have submitted reimbursement claims months and even years following the interpreter services. To address these concerns, the Committee to Improve Interpreting recommended a procedure that would require a county to submit, on forms provided by the Director of State Courts, an accounting of the amount paid for expenses related to court interpreters that are eligible for reimbursement by the state. The proposal would require the form to include expenses for the preceding three-month period and require counties to submit reimbursement requests within 90 days after that three-month period ended. The proposal would also prohibit the Director of State Courts from reimbursing a county for any expenses related to court interpreters that would be submitted after the 90-day period had ended.

5. The bill would also make a number of changes to court interpreter statutory provisions. In her remarks to the Joint Committee on Finance on March 15, 2001, the Chief Justice requested that the Court's court interpreter proposal, based on the recommendations of the Committee to Improve Interpreters, be adopted. Attachment I provides a comparison of current law to both the bill and the Court's proposal concerning the court interpreter system.

6. Under current law, a person who is determined to be in need of an interpreter is entitled to a "qualified interpreter," but the statutes do not define "qualified." The bill would define "qualified interpreter" to mean a person who would be able to do all of the following: (a) readily communicate with a person who has limited English proficiency; (b) orally transfer the meaning of statements to and from English and the language spoken by a person who has limited English proficiency in the context of a court proceeding; and (c) readily and accurately interpret for a person who has limited English proficiency, without omissions or additions, in a manner that conserves the meaning, tone, and style of the original statement, including dialect, slang, and specialized vocabulary.

7. The proposed definition of "qualified interpreter" under the bill would set a rigorous standard for the level of interpretation that would be required. If this were to be enacted into law, it can be expected that judges would need to appoint more paid interpreters, rather than relying on persons such as the friends or relatives of the person requiring interpreter services. Therefore, counties would likely see an increase in the costs they incur to provide these more highly skilled interpreters.

8. Officials from the Director of State Courts Office have indicated that the bill's statutory provisions, without the funding mechanisms proposed by the Court, would not be helpful and would be misleading if they led persons to believe interpreter needs were being met. The officials further indicate that the provisions could be problematic by putting increased demand on the courts to appoint qualified interpreters without a system in place to train, certify and make available qualified interpreters. The increased costs to counties without increases in state reimbursement could also be viewed as an unfunded state mandate.

9. It is the Court's position that to improve the interpreter services provided to Wisconsin residents: (a) resources are needed to create the recruitment, training and certification of interpreters required under the bill; (b) out of concern for providing equal access to the courts, interpreter services should be provided in all civil proceedings; (c) because interpreter services benefit not only the party receiving the service but are also necessary for the court to discharge its duties, the indigency requirement for public payment of interpreter fees should be dropped; and (d) increased state reimbursement to counties at differential rates of \$30 per hour for qualified interpreters and \$40 per hour for certified interpreters should be provided to more closely reflect counties' actual costs (according to a 1999 survey of the clerks of court, the average cost of providing interpreters is \$40 per hour) and to provide incentive for interpreters to become certified. The bill does not include any of these provisions.

10. Under the Court's budget proposal, the Court requested \$97,800 GPR in 2001-02 and \$100,800 GPR in 2002-03 and 1.0 two-year project interpreter coordinator position annually to develop a court interpreter certification and education and training program. The Court envisions that during the first year of the program, contract interpreter trainers would conduct a faculty development seminar to train a selected group of judges, interpreters and court staff to act as trainers. These trainers would then present orientation workshops to prospective interpreters covering ethical conduct, legal terminology and court procedure, and basic legal court interpreting skills. The workshops would culminate with a written comprehension and ethics test. During the second year, court staff and volunteers would administer certification exams to test the foreign language (Spanish and Hmong) interpreting skills of prospective interpreters. The interpreter coordinator would establish a statewide roster of certified interpreters and revise the court interpreters' handbook.

11. In addition to the state costs, the Court's proposal contains three provisions that would also increase costs for state reimbursement to counties. First, the reimbursement rate paid to counties for providing court interpreter services (foreign language interpreters and interpreters for the hearing impaired), would be increased from \$35 per half day to \$30 per hour for qualified

interpreters and \$40 per hour for certified interpreters. It is estimated that this provision would require \$271,500 GPR in 2002-03, assuming a July 1, 2002, effective date. Secondly, state reimbursement would be expanded to provide coverage in all civil proceedings. (Although judges have discretion under current law to make interpreter appointments in other proceedings, interpreter appointments are generally limited to criminal, delinquency, protective service, Chapter 48 [Children's Code] and Chapter 51 [Mental Health Act] proceedings.) It is estimated that this provision would require \$450,600 GPR in 2002-03. Finally, it is estimated that interpreter usage would increase as a result of the statutory definition of qualified interpreter, greater public awareness as to the right to an interpreter and judicial education as to the court interpreter requirements. While this effect is difficult to estimate, the Court assumes a 50% increase in interpreter use due to these factors, which would require \$225,300 in 2002-03. In total, reimbursement to counties under the Court's proposal would increase by \$947,400 GPR in 2002-03. The full cost of the proposal would not be felt until the 2003-05 biennium because costs would not be fully phased in until after 2002-03. Annualized reimbursement costs are estimated to be \$1.4 million.

12. The Court assumes that the provision to eliminate the indigency requirement for state reimbursement would not result in a significant cost. The Committee to Improve Interpreting stated in its report that, "expanding the statute to cover non-indigent parties is expected to have only an incremental [cost] effect. A high percentage of recent immigrants are indigent and already qualify for court-appointed interpreters."

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$50,000 GPR annually to increase the state reimbursement to counties for court interpreter services. In addition, approve the Governor's recommendations for statutory changes concerning the right to a qualified interpreter, use of qualified interpreters by clerks of circuit courts, waiver of right to a qualified interpreter, removal of a qualified interpreter for good cause, oath of a qualified interpreter, Supreme Court oversight of qualified interpreters, court interpreter training, delay in appointing a qualified interpreter and court time limitations, delays, continuances and extensions, and interpreter privileged communications. Provide that these changes would take effect and would first apply to interpreters used or appointed on July 1, 2002.

2. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$50,000 GPR annually to increase the state reimbursement to counties for court interpreter services, but delete the statutory provisions regarding court interpreters. In addition, provide that the Director of State Courts Office reimburse counties up to four times each year for court interpreter costs. Require a county to submit, on forms provided by the Director of State Courts, an accounting of the amount paid for expenses related to court interpreters that are eligible for reimbursement by the state. Require the form include expenses for the preceding three-month period and require counties to submit reimbursement requests within 90 days after that three-month period ended. Prohibit the Director of State Courts from reimbursing a county for any expenses related to court interpreters that would be

submitted after the 90-day period had ended.

3. Modify the Governor's recommendation by: (a) providing \$97,800 GPR in 2001-02 and \$100,800 GPR in 2002-03 and 1.0 two-year project interpreter coordinator position annually to the Supreme Court's Director of State Courts Office to develop a court interpreter certification and education and training program; (b) providing \$947,400 GPR in 2002-03 to increase the reimbursement rate to counties for interpreter services from \$35 per half day to \$30 for the first hour and \$15 for each additional 0.5 hour for qualified interpreters and \$40 for the first hour and \$20 for each additional 0.5 hour for certified interpreters, and expand interpreter reimbursement to all civil proceedings in circuit and appellate court and to all persons regardless of indigency; and (c) making the following modifications to the bill's statutory provisions concerning court interpreters:

(1) Delete the request to the Supreme Court to cooperate with the technical college system board in the development and implementation of a curriculum and testing program for training qualified interpreters.

(2) Delete the application of the "limited English proficiency" standard in municipal court and state agency administrative contested case proceedings.

(3) Provide no definition of "qualified interpreter" in municipal court and state agency administrative contested case proceedings.

(4) Provide that the state reimbursement rates for interpreters be adjusted yearly to reflect the changes in the consumer price index.

(5) Tie reimbursement for interpreter mileage to the mileage reimbursement rate set for state officers and employees by statute.

(6) Provide that the Director of State Courts reimburse counties up to four times each year for court interpreter costs. Require counties to submit, on forms provided by the Director of State Courts, an accounting of the amount paid for expenses related to court interpreters that are eligible for reimbursement by the state. Require the form to include expenses for the preceding 3-month period and be submitted within 90 days after that 3-month period ended. Do not permit the Director of State Courts to reimburse a county for any expenses related to court interpreters that would be submitted after the 90-day period had ended.

(7) Provide that the additional uses of qualified interpreters by the clerks of circuit court permitted by the bill qualify for state reimbursement.

(8) Delete the provision that the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) may provide funding for interpreters for hearing-impaired persons in those civil court proceedings covered under the court interpreter provisions and provide that DHFS would only provide funding for legal services not covered by the court interpreter provisions.

(9) Provide that a court may appoint multiple qualified court interpreters and that their

cost is reimbursable by the state to the extent provided otherwise, so long as the appointments are necessary.

(10) Specifically require the appointment of qualified interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency in the context of circuit and appellate courts to permit their service on a jury panel.

(11) Provide that the following parties would qualify, if the other conditions were met, for a qualified interpreter: (a) a party in interest; (b) a witness, while testifying in a court proceeding; (c) an alleged victim; (d) a parent or legal guardian of a minor party in interest or the legal guardian of a party in interest; and (e) another party affected by the action, as deemed necessary and appropriate by the court.

(12) Provide that the reimbursement fee of interpreters attending before the Court of Appeals or Supreme Court would be determined by the Supreme Court.

Alternative 3	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$1,146,000
2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.00

4. Maintain current law.

Alternative 4	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$100,000

Prepared by: Paul Onsager
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Issue	Current Law	Governor's Proposal	Court's Proposal
Recruitment, training, testing and oversight of court interpreters	No provision.	Require the Supreme Court to establish the procedures and policies for the recruitment, training, and testing of persons to act as qualified interpreters in a court proceeding and for the coordination, discipline, and retention of those interpreters. Request the Supreme Court to cooperate with the technical college system board in the development and implementation of a curriculum and testing program for training qualified interpreters.	Require the Supreme Court to establish the procedures and policies for the recruitment, training, and certification of persons to act as qualified interpreters in a court proceeding and for the coordination, discipline and retention of those interpreters. [The Court requested \$97,800 in 2001-02 and \$100,800 in 2002-03 and 1.0 interpreter coordinator two-year project position annually to develop the court interpreter certification, education and training program.]
Potentially qualifying for qualified interpreter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Person charged with a crime. 2. Person is a child or parent subject to Chapter 48 (Children's Code) or Chapter 938 (Juvenile Justice Code). 3. Person is subject to protective service or Chapter 51 (Mental Health Act). 4. Person is a witness in any of the above proceedings. <p>A court may authorize the use of an interpreter in other actions or proceedings in addition to those specified above whose costs are eligible for reimbursement from the state (in practices, these appointments are infrequent.)</p>	Maintain current law.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A party in interest. 2. A witness, while testifying in a court proceeding. 3. An alleged victim. 4. A parent or legal guardian of a minor party in interest or the legal guardian of a party in interest. 5. Another person affected by the action, as deemed necessary and appropriate by the court.
Indigency requirement	The state only provides reimbursement of interpreter services provided by the counties to the indigent.	Maintain current law.	Provide state reimbursement of interpreter services regardless of indigency in circuit court and appellate court proceedings. The indigency requirement for municipal court and state agency contested case proceedings would be retained.

Issue	Current Law	Governor's Proposal	Court's Proposal
Standard for determining need for a qualified interpreter	Courts, and state agencies holding administrative contested case proceedings, use the following standard when determining whether an individual has a right to a qualified interpreter: does an individual have a language difficulty because of the inability to speak or understand English, a hearing impairment, is unable to speak or have a speech defect that is sufficient to prevent the individual from communicating with his or her attorney or others, reasonably understanding English testimony or reasonably being understood in English?	Include a standard of "limited English proficiency" to determine if a person has a right to a qualified interpreter. "Limited English proficiency" would be defined as follows: 1. The inability, because of the use of a language other than English, to adequately understand or communicate effectively in English in a court proceeding. 2. The inability, due to a speech impairment, hearing loss, deafness, deaf-blindness, or other disability, to adequately hear, understand, or communicate effectively in English in a court proceeding. The standard would apply in all municipal, circuit and appellate court proceedings and in state agency administrative contested case proceedings.	Same standard of "limited English proficiency" as bill, to be applied only in circuit and appellate court proceedings.
Definition of "qualified interpreter"	No definition.	Defined as a person who is able to do all of the following: 1. Readily communicate with a person who has limited English proficiency. 2. Orally transfer the meaning of statements to and from English and the language spoken by a person who has limited English proficiency in the context of a court proceeding. 3. Readily and accurately interpret for a person who has limited English proficiency, without omissions or additions, in a manner that conserves the meaning, tone, and style of the original statement, including dialect, slang, and specialized vocabulary. The definition would apply to all municipal, circuit and appellate court proceedings and state agency administrative contested case proceedings.	Definition the same as bill, to be applied only to circuit and appellate court proceedings.

Issue	Current Law	Governor's Proposal	Court's Proposal
State reimbursement rate to counties	\$35 per half day of interpreter service.	Maintain current law.	Increase the state reimbursement rate to counties to \$30 for the first hour and \$15 for each additional 0.5 hour for qualified interpreters and \$40 for the first hour and \$20 for each additional 0.5 hour for certified interpreters. Require the Director of State Courts to adjust the reimbursement rates annually to reflect changes in the consumer price index, beginning July 1, 2003. [The provisions modifying reimbursements to counties would require, in total, \$947,400 GPR in 2002-03.]
Reimbursement of interpreters before the Court of Appeals or Supreme Court	\$35 per half day of interpreter service.	Maintain current law.	Fee as determined by the Supreme Court.
Reimbursement for mileage	20 cents per mile.	Maintain current law.	Tie reimbursement for interpreter mileage to the mileage reimbursement rate set for state officers and employees by statute.
Statutory procedure for providing reimbursement payments to counties	No provision.	No provision.	Require the Director of State Courts to reimburse counties up to 4 times each year for court interpreter costs. Require counties to submit, on forms provided by the Director of State Courts, an accounting of the amount paid for expenses related to court interpreters that are eligible for reimbursement by the state. Require the form to include expenses for the preceding 3-month period and be submitted within 90 days after that 3-month period ended. Do not permit the Director of State Courts to reimburse a county for any expenses related to court interpreters that would be submitted after the 90-day period had ended.

Issue	Current Law	Governor's Proposal	Court's Proposal
Use of qualified interpreters by clerks of circuit courts	No provision.	Allow clerks of circuit courts to provide qualified interpreters to respond to requests for assistance regarding a legal proceeding by individuals with limited English proficiency. With court approval, these qualified interpreters would be allowed to provide interpreter services outside the courtroom that are related to the court proceedings, including court-ordered psychiatric or medical exams or mediation. Under the Governor's proposal, however, these additional uses of qualified interpreters would not be uses qualifying for reimbursement from the state. (Under current law, clerks of circuit court are already free to appoint qualified interpreters for these purposes under the circumstances specified.)	Same as bill; however, provide that these additional uses of qualified interpreters by the clerks of circuit court would qualify for state reimbursement.
Waiver of right to a qualified interpreter	Any courtroom waiver of the right to an interpreter is effective only if made voluntarily in person, in open court and on the record.	Provide that a person with limited English proficiency may waive the right to a qualified interpreter at any point in a court proceeding if a court advises the person of the nature and effect of the waiver and determines on the record that the waiver has been made knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily. Also provide that at any point in a court proceeding, for good cause, the person would be allowed to retract his or her waiver and request that a qualified interpreter be appointed.	Identical to bill.
Removal of qualified interpreter for good cause	No provision.	Allow any party to a court proceeding to object to the use of any qualified interpreter for good cause, and allow a court to remove a qualified interpreter for good cause.	Identical to bill.
Oath of a qualified interpreter	Interpreters are subject to an oath or affirmation that they will make a true translation.	Provide that every qualified interpreter, before commencing his or her duties in a court proceeding, would be required to take a sworn oath that he or she would make a true and impartial interpretation. Allow the Supreme Court to approve a uniform oath for qualified interpreters.	Identical to bill.

Issue	Current Law	Governor's Proposal	Court's Proposal
Delay in appointing a qualified interpreter and court time limitations	No provision.	Provide that delay resulting from the need to locate and appoint a qualified interpreter could constitute good cause for a court to stop the running of time limitations in court proceedings.	Identical to bill.
Delays, continuances and extensions	No provision.	Provide that any delay resulting from the need to appoint a qualified interpreter would be excluded in determining whether time requirements under the Children's Code (Chapter 48) or the Juvenile Justice Code (Chapter 938) were met, including the time requirement that a court must issue an order within three days after an initial appearance as to whether the requirement for parental consent to a minor's proposed abortion will be waived.	Identical to bill.
Interpreter privileged communication	Interpreters for persons with language difficulties or hearing or speaking impairments may be prevented from disclosing privileged communications by any person who has a right to claim the privilege. The interpreter may claim the privilege, but only on behalf of the person who has the right.	Add interpreters for persons with limited English proficiency to the current statutory provisions regarding interpreter privileged communications.	Identical to bill.
Initial applicability and effective date	Not applicable.	These changes would take effect and would first apply to interpreters used or appointed on or after July 1, 2002.	These changes would take effect and first apply to interpreters used or appointed on or after July 1, 2002 (modified from original proposal of January 1, 2002).
Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) funding for interpreters for hearing-impaired persons	DHFS may provide funding for interpreters for hearing-impaired persons for legal services and civil court proceedings.	Maintain current law.	Delete DHFS funding of those civil court proceedings that would be covered under the expanded court interpreter provisions and provide that DHFS would only provide funding for legal services not covered by the expanded court interpreter provisions.

Issue	Current Law	Governor's Proposal	Court's Proposal
Appointing multiple qualified court interpreters	No provision.	No provision.	Permissible and reimbursable if necessary.
Deaf jurors and the Americans with Disabilities Act	No provision.	No provision.	Specifically require appointment of qualified interpreter to facilitate service on jury.