



A License to Interpret

By Nataly Kelly

Nearly one thousand occupations are currently regulated in some fashion in the U.S.¹ Regulation, which is often defined as a system of control over the practice of a given profession, serves to protect consumers from unqualified individuals. This is especially important in professions such as medicine, where there is the potential for serious harm due to improper practice. Regulation is seen as a way to promote quality and encourage responsibility. Two of the most common forms of regulation are licensure and certification.

In the past few months, certification has received significant attention, especially in the field of health care interpreting. Numerous articles have been written and conference presentations delivered regarding interpreter certification. In contrast, there has been little discussion of a topic that is equally important: interpreter licensure. While not yet commonly addressed within the interpreting community, licensure exists for both spoken and sign language interpreters in the U.S., and, in some cases, it has been in place for decades.

This article provides an introduction to the main conceptual differences between certification and licensure. This introduction is followed by a description of the pros and cons of licensure, as well as the possible ways to avoid the disadvantages of licensure while retaining the benefits. Then, two basic models for state-based regulation of the sign language interpreting profession in the U.S. are provided. Finally, the article provides a series of recommended questions for consideration and further discussion in the field.

While the main focus of this article is licensure, the discussion of this topic is not meant to imply that licensure is preferable to certification. This article

Figure 1: Conceptual Differences Between Licensure and Certification

Concept	Licensure	Certification
View of the Activity	Presumes that the work activity is a privilege.	Presumes that the activity is a right.
Purpose	To strictly control the activity and/or restrict entry into the profession, often in the interest of safety.	To inform and educate consumers about the qualifications of individual providers.
Function	Grants permission to perform an activity.	Confirms that one meets certain criteria.
Adoption by Practitioners	Mandatory in order to perform an activity.	Voluntary. Non-certified individuals are still allowed to practice.
Decision-making	The government is empowered to require licensed interpreters; reduces the power of consumer to choose providers who may not be qualified.	Enhances the power of the consumer to choose from among certified or non-certified providers.
Reprimands	If licensing law is violated, the violator is subject to fines, penalties, and/or other forms of punishment.	Certification could be revoked, but the individual may still practice.

aims only to share information regarding licensure and its potential implications for the field as a means of supplementing the current discussions related to certification. As the article will show, certification and licensure each have some interesting points of distinction and possible intersection, and the coexistence of the two can present both benefits and challenges.

Basic Conceptual Differences

Licensure refers to the laws that regulate a given occupation. Its purpose is essentially twofold: 1) title protection (i.e., preventing unqualified individuals from utilizing the given title); and 2) scope of practice (i.e., defining the specific tasks that constitute the practice of the given occupation). Certification, on the other hand, is a nonstatutory process whereby an accrediting body grants recognition to an individual for having met predetermined professional qualifications.

There are several conceptual differences between licensure and certification, but the majority of them relate to the core premise for how the practice of a given occupation to be licensed or certified is viewed. The fundamental difference is that licensure presumes that the work activity is a privilege, whereas certification presumes that the activity is a right.² In other words, a

The deeper we plunge into the fascinating topic of qualifications for interpreters and how this has historically been addressed by state legislation, the more questions seem to be raised.

system that uses licensure presumes that an individual should not be allowed to practice within the occupation unless they have been granted a license. Certification is a credential that recognizes those individuals who have demonstrated their qualifications, but maintains that non-certified individuals still have the right to practice the occupation. Certification also presumes that consumers have the right to choose from among a variety of providers, including those who are not certified.

This issue of how the work activity is viewed relates directly to a second important conceptual difference between certification and licensure: power and who possesses it. Licensure shifts the majority of decision-making power from consumers to a government licensing board, which decides who is allowed to legally practice the occupation legally. This can restrict entry into a

particular occupation, and potentially limits consumer choice. In many cases, this is done out of valid concerns for the safety of others, particularly when consumers might not know enough about the profession to make the best choices. For example, licensing drivers keeps unsafe drivers off the road. As another example, many health care professions require practitioners to obtain licenses to protect the safety of patients.

Certification, on the other hand, leaves the decision-making process entirely up to consumers. Certification recognizes practitioners who have demonstrated professional competence, such as completing a course of study and/or passing an examination, but is generally not required. Consumers have access to this information so that they can make educated decisions regarding which practitioners (certified or non-certified) they select to perform a

A License to Interpret Continued

given activity. Certification does not restrict entry into the profession, unless laws are passed that require certification in a given area.

Licensure provides a method of strict control over who can and cannot practice a given occupation. Individuals who do not follow the prescribed rules associated with the license risk losing their ability to practice the activity. Certification may be used to obtain a certain level of control of this sort, but it tends to be more limited in scope. For example, certification can be withdrawn or revoked, but this does not remove an individual's ability to practice within a profession entirely.

To summarize, a license gives an individual permission to engage in a specified activity, especially when high levels of risks are associated with carrying out this activity. The purpose of a license is to control the activity and restrict entry into a profession, often to protect others from harm. Licensure assumes that the right to engage in the activity is a privilege that is bestowed by a government licensing board. It also entails reprimands. If one violates the licensing law, one is subject to prosecution under the laws of the governing body.

In contrast, certification is a state-

ment of an individual's qualifications. Certification can be issued by non-governmental bodies, and does not normally entail government reprimands. It does not assume that the right to engage in the activity is a privilege, but rather is based on the premise that one has a right to engage in the work. It serves to give the consumer information about the practitioner, and, in some cases, can be combined with state laws to control entry into a profession, although to a lesser degree than licensure. (See Figure 1 on page 25 for a snapshot of the main conceptual differences between certification and licensure.)

Pros and Cons of State Licensure

In general, licensure requires that practitioners of an activity meet the same set of minimum standards, thereby protecting the public and the practitioners themselves. In doing this, licensure has the potential of denying some practitioners entry into the field until they are able to meet the designated standards. As mentioned before, this could potentially limit the supply of practitioners a given field, thereby resulting in higher fees to consumers. According to one economic study, the median earnings of licensed occupations were 50%

higher than the median earnings of unlicensed occupations.³

Even though working practitioners in most fields would welcome increased earnings, consumers may not be willing to pay the costs. Also, limiting the pool of available candidates can restrict consumer choice. Sometimes this can actually result in a shortage of qualified individuals to do the work. There is also the potential for a decreased demand for services, as some consumers may prefer to do the work themselves or to pay unqualified individuals lower rates to perform the job functions.

Licensure may also entail other consequences as well. When licensure is carried out at the state level, which is most often the case, states may develop diverse requirements. This inhibits a practitioner's ability to move freely from state to state. When requirements differ from one state to another, this can prevent the existence of nationally accepted standards.

Issues of liability are also important to consider when discussing licensure. If a consumer receives services deemed to be substandard from a licensed practitioner, the state licensing board could be sued for failing to live up to its mandate. Therefore, any licensure program must be able to defend the validity of its exams and standards. When programs cannot demonstrate validity, the outcome can be very costly. As an example, in the 1970s, several states spent \$183 million in federal dollars to develop individual programs for licensing paramedics. When faced with lawsuits, these programs could not prove their validity. Since then, 46 states have dropped their state licensure programs for paramedics and replaced them with nationally recognized standards developed by the National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians.⁴

While this is an important example to

Figure 2: Pros and Cons of State Licensure

Pros	Cons
Unqualified practitioners are excluded from the profession.	Possible shortage of practitioners due to restricted entry into field.
Enhanced recognition for practitioners and the profession at large.	Diverse requirements across states (quality may vary).
Potential for greater market demand.	Decreased mobility for practitioners from one state to another.
Revenue opportunities for states.	Liability for states.
Higher income for practitioners.	Higher costs for consumers.

When training requirements differ from one state to another, this can prevent the existence of nationally accepted standards for training.

consider, please keep in mind that the cost of licensure at the state level is viewed by some as being balanced in the end by the assurance of higher quality work (assuming that the program is recognized). Higher quality also serves to improve the public's perception of the profession. Sometimes this can lead to an increased demand in the market.

It is possible that higher costs to consumers could result regardless of the form of regulation that is pursued, be it certification or licensure. Licensure could end up costing more than certification if states work independently and do not benefit from economies of scale, but this depends on many things, including the model and processes implemented. (See Figure 2 on page 26 for an overview of the pros and cons of licensure and certification.)

Avoiding the Pitfalls, Retaining the Benefits

Various “hybrid” approaches combining elements of licensure with certification might be possible. One key step would be to implement uniform and detailed standards, including standards for training, that would be accepted across all states. For example, if a standard describes a minimum level of language proficiency that an interpreter must have in order to interpret accurately, it is possible to make the testing of language proficiency a prerequisite for either entering a training program or for taking an interpreting skills test. This could cut down on the chance of excessive rates of failure by ensuring that individuals who take the test demonstrate the required proficiency. Another option could be to grant a “provisional license” once certain

requirements are met, making it possible for individuals to practice without a full license, but still alerting consumers that the holder is not “fully licensed.” This would provide consumer choice and ensure that willing practitioners are still able to practice, thereby preventing a national shortage of qualified interpreters.

Conversely, if national standards are not issued and widely accepted, this could result in disparate requirements across states, even with a national certification process in place. This situation has occurred in other professions. For example, in the nursing profession, confusing and disparate state regulations existed until an effort began in the 1950s to create a common set of national standards. These standards have since been accepted by nearly every state in the nation, and are now overseen by the Council of State Boards of Nursing.⁵

An Example of Licensure for Spoken Language Interpreting

In Texas, the concepts of licensed and certified court interpreters exist simultaneously. According to Section 57.001, Definitions, a “certified court interpreter” is an individual who is a qualified interpreter as defined in Article 38.31, Code of Criminal Procedure, or Section 21.003, Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or certified under Subchapter B by the Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services to interpret court proceedings *for a hearing-impaired individual* [emphasis added].⁶ A “licensed court interpreter” means an individual licensed under Subchapter C by the Texas Commission of Licensing and Regulation to interpret court pro-

ceedings *for an individual who can hear, but who does not comprehend English or communicate in English* [emphasis added].⁷

While the distinction between certification and licensure used in Texas seems quite clear, the same cannot be said when looking at the national picture of licensing for interpreters. As far as this author is aware, aside from Texas, no other state has a licensing process for spoken language interpreters.

State-based Approaches to Regulating the Sign Language Interpreting Profession

Some authors have pointed out that it may be important for the spoken language interpreting community in the U.S. to identify the lessons that have already been learned in the sign language interpreting field in order to benefit from its much longer history in this country, which has resulted in major strides toward professionalization.⁸ As with many issues we deal with in the spoken language interpreting world, the issue of state regulation is indeed something that has already been discussed in detail and addressed by our colleagues from this sister field.

In sign language interpreting, the issues regarding licensure not only abound in many states, but are often quite difficult to navigate. In his article, “The ‘State’ of State Licensing for Interpreters: Growing Pains Versus Growth Spurts,” Jay Scirratt described the confusion of state licensing by describing it as a “maze,” adding, “I would like to have a resource page in ‘plain English’ for lay people to be able to get information and a contact person for their states’ requirements. But with so many certifications, acronyms, categories, etc., this is no easy task.”⁹

To help shed some light on ➡

A License to Interpret Continued

this complex topic, in its policy paper, “State Regulation of Interpreters: Critical Issues and Model Legislation,” the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) identifies two approaches that are taken by states for regulating the sign language interpreting profession: 1) recognizing existing standard qualification processes; and 2) assigning the authority to a board, state agency, or commission.¹⁰ RID points out that states can often avoid complexities and financial burden by simply recognizing a national certification as the default standard through state statute. The negative side to this approach, however, is that such statutes can be difficult to enact and to modify at a later date.¹¹

RID’s position paper goes on to identify 10 important considerations for state regulation by recognizing a standard qualification process:

- 1) Scope of regulation;
- 2) Standard(s)/types of certification to be recognized;
- 3) Exemptions;
- 4) Grandfathering of currently working interpreters;
- 5) Recognition for graduates of interpreter education programs and interpreter preparation programs;

- 6) Continuing education requirements or mandatory re-testing;
- 7) Grievance and mediation systems;
- 8) Penalties for working without credentials;
- 9) Reciprocity with other states; and
- 10) Definitions.

When considering the second approach—that of assigning the authority to a board, state agency, or commission—RID points out that, in addition to the 10 considerations just outlined, there are four additional factors to consider: 1) composition of the board; 2) board appointments; 3) administration; and 4) fees. RID then goes on to provide model legislation for both of the possible approaches identified.

Ultimately, which approach is better? The National Association of the Deaf (NAD) asked this very question. Under the auspices of NAD, Lisa Parker of Gallaudet University conducted research on the various state laws regulating the profession.¹² Her research found that both approaches have pros and cons, but that in states with no current overseeing body, it may be advantageous to adopt the approach of recognizing existing standards. For states that already have an existing overseeing body, however, it

may be more applicable for those states to continue to certify and/or license interpreters.

As for the issue of promoting state licensure of interpreters, NAD states, “NAD does not have a position on this issue, but encourages the states to consider both options of certifying and licensing and to explore the advantages and disadvantages as well.” In other words, NAD’s view on this subject seems to be that individual states should explore issues of licensure on their own to determine whether or not licensure will be beneficial.

NAD also provides several additional guidelines and considerations for state regulation and legislation, building upon the considerations of RID.¹³ In addition, NAD guidelines detail some of the perceived advantages and disadvantages of certifications and licensure for interpreters, which are summarized in Figure 3.

NAD also has a helpful table that includes legislation from 49 states related to the regulation of the interpreting profession. There are various categories used to indicate what areas or settings are addressed by the legislation. Some apply to legal proceedings, for example, while others apply to medical settings, educational settings,

Figure 3: Advantages and Disadvantages of Licensure and Certification for Sign Language Interpreters

	Licensure	Certification
Advantages	<p>May give unlicensed interpreters a limited period to practice interpreting until they receive a license.</p> <p>License fees may be used to provide interpreting training and continuing education workshops.</p>	<p>Can be done without an overseeing body.</p> <p>Given by a nationally recognized certifying organization.</p>
Disadvantages	<p>Can be given only by an overseeing body, and cannot be done without an overseeing body.</p>	<p>Non-certified interpreters may not be allowed to interpret.</p> <p>Interpreters may not be able to practice before taking a national certification test.</p>

Figure 4: State Laws and Regulations on Requirements of Sign Language Interpreters in the U.S.

Setting or Industry Addressed by Legislation ¹⁴	States with Legislation for Named Industry	Total Number of States with Relevant Legislation
ALL	Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, Wisconsin	14
Legal ¹⁵	Arizona ¹⁶ , Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	35
Education	Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin	10
Medical	Washington	1

administrative proceedings, and other settings. NAD table is eight pages long, so it is too extensive to reprint here. However, Figure 4 provides some interesting highlights extracted from the data compiled by NAD.

It is worth noting that in Figure 4, the overwhelming majority of states (35) have some legislation in place for sign language interpreting in legal settings. This focus on legal settings is quite similar to what we are experiencing in the spoken language interpreting world, in which 34 states reported membership in the Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification at the end of 2005.¹⁷ Another parallel to be drawn is the fact that medical settings have historically ranked low in priority when developing requirements for both sign and spoken language interpreters and certification programs. This large gap in addressing the need for interpreters in health care settings may seem strange in light of the widely reported fact that the chance of medical errors and potential for great harm to human life is often high when no safeguards are in place to guarantee the quality of the interpreting that is provided.

The gap in areas of high potential risk and harm to individuals is not limited to health care. Another area of great risk that appears to receive less attention than is merited by language access legislation is that of public safety. In the U.S., there is generally

very little discussion of providing interpreting in public safety settings. In other countries, such as the U.K. and Japan, however, areas such as police interpreting are more widely accepted as a unique field of interpreting, and there are numerous courses offered, tests available, and structures in place to ensure that interpreters can be provided for this important area of society.¹⁸

The reasons some areas of interpreting are given more attention by legislators are likely too numerous and varied to discuss in this article. However, if licensure and certification are to be considered and discussed, the fact that some areas enjoy greater legislative popularity than others should not be overlooked. Interested parties may wish to dig deeper to explore the factors that give rise to “explosions” in legislation for some industries while other areas go largely unnoticed by lawmakers. These underlying factors could be key in driving legislation to a critical point where a greater impact can be achieved.

Another point of interest from the NAD table that may be of assistance to those interested in issues of interpreter certification and licensure is the recognition of national certifications for sign language interpreters by individual states. Figure 5 on page 30 shows the states in which NAD and RID certifications are officially recognized, unofficially recognized, or not recognized at all.

As Figure 5 indicates, there are 13 states that officially recognize the NAD certification in legislation and 30 states that officially recognize the RID certification. There are 13 states, however, that do not officially recognize either certification for sign language interpreters. Yet, legislation exists in those states. How, then, are they addressing the issue?

The short answer is that each state varies in its requirements and approach. Arizona requires the interpreter to be authorized by a state Council for the Deaf. In Massachusetts, qualifications are determined by the Office of Deafness. In Utah, qualifications are determined by the Department of Rehabilitation Services.

The variability in program requirements is not just limited to the states that do not recognize either certification. Even in states that do recognize both programs, there are variations. For example, in Alabama, which recognized both the NAD and RID certifications, licensure is issued by the Alabama Board of Interpreters and Transliterators. In Illinois, which also recognizes both certifications, interpreters must pass an interpreter skills assessment screening.

There is also variability even within a given state. For example, Wisconsin does not recognize either NAD or RID certifications for legal settings. For that, the Department of Health and Family Services maintains a list ➡

A License to Interpret Continued

of qualified interpreters. However, for educational settings, RID certification is recognized.

Questions for Consideration

If anything, the deeper we plunge into the fascinating topic of qualifications for interpreters and how this has historically been addressed by state legislation, the more questions seem to be raised. In fact, given that interpreter certification in its broadest sense is a largely underexplored field, each question may merit at least a small research study of its own in order to provide the most valuable information for which to funnel such findings into a national agenda for certification.

With regard to the questions most pertinent to this discussion of licensure and certification, Figure 6 on page 31 includes seven key questions to assist in the identification of a

model. This list includes basic questions only, and is by no means exhaustive.

The questions in Figure 6 are only a basic starting point for considering the limitations and possibilities of cer-

for spoken languages and in the sign language community.

In spite of the many unanswered questions that remain, it is important to remember that progress toward a formal process for regulating the interpreting

Any licensure program must be able to defend the validity of its exams and standards.

tification and licensure models. They do not include questions regarding the actual implementation of such models, although many potential questions can be identified from further analysis of the information, especially when reviewing the models used in the realm of court interpreting

profession is not only possible, but is something that is already evolving in many forms across the nation. Therefore, rather than ask, “can we move forward?” with regulation in any industry, it may be important to reframe the question as, “what form do we want it to take?” Do we want spoken language

Figure 5: Recognition of NAD and RID Certifications in State Legislation

	States Where Certification is Officially Recognized in Legislation	States Where Certification is Unofficially Recognized in Legislation	States Where Certification is Not Recognized in Legislation
NAD Certification	Alabama, Arkansas ¹⁹ , California, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia	Michigan, New York, South Dakota, Virginia	Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin
RID Certification	Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin	Maine, Maryland, Michigan, New York, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia	Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Utah

Figure 6: Additional Questions for the Identification of a Model for Licensure

1. What is the underlying purpose of the process toward a formal process for regulating the interpreting profession, and is this purpose more in line with a specific model (e.g., certification, licensure)?
2. Who are the stakeholders affected by the proposed process?
3. What are the pros and cons of certification and/or licensure as they relate to the proposed process?
4. How will the stakeholders be affected by the pros and cons that have been identified?
5. How can we minimize the negative impacts to each stakeholder?
6. How will we ensure the participation of stakeholders, especially those most negatively impacted, throughout the entire process to ensure high possibilities of acceptance and success?
7. What negative impacts are we collectively willing to accept in exchange for implementing a process?

interpreting to someday mirror the high degree of variability in the sign language interpreting world? Or, do we prefer to identify the lessons learned in order to create new best practices that will combine the benefits of many programs while reducing the negative elements?

The professional regulation of interpreting is something that cannot be stopped. Individuals and organizations can and will work toward interpreter certification and licensure within their sphere of influence, as they have in the past, even though they are frequently burdened by a lack of resources. Sometimes their efforts are largely in vain, as they may last only until the group they represent is absorbed by another effort. At other times, their efforts will influence the field and lead to new models and practices.

Many national and state-level groups around the country have been established while others continue to develop certification and other forms of professional qualification. Many nonprofit, academic, and for-profit entities have already developed certification processes, some of which are being used widely across the country.

Certification programs are being discussed for specific industries, and some are being discussed that would be pan-industry in scope.

The most important lesson of all may be that it is essential to move forward with a realistic mindset. While we must continue carrying out the necessary research, we also need to be mindful that efforts toward the professional qualification of interpreters are crucial and will not stop in their tracks to wait for a full research agenda to be completed. For this reason, it is important for groups to beware of duplicating efforts whenever possible and to try to form partnerships to facilitate collaboration. In addition, a great degree of transparency is needed to ensure that steps toward certification take place in a manner that is gradual and methodical, allowing stakeholders to participate and be fully involved at numerous stages in a process to which they can accord a high level of trust.

If the four key principles—realism, collaboration, transparency, and trust—can be a core part of program development to the point where they reflect the very values on which a program is

based, it may ensure a high degree of success, regardless of whether or not each and every research question can be fully answered.

Notes

1. Cox, Carolyn, and Foster, Susan. *The Costs and Benefits of Occupational Regulation* (Bureau of Economics, Federal Trade Commission, October 1990).
2. *Merriam-Webster* defines licensure as “the granting of licenses, especially to practice a profession.” License is defined as “a permission granted by competent authority to engage in a business or occupation or in an activity otherwise unlawful.” See also:
 - Wilson, Lawrence. *Legal Guidelines for Unlicensed Practitioners* (L.D. Wilson Consultants, Inc., January 1, 2005).
 - Oliver, Suzanne, MT-BC. *Certification Versus Licensure: What Are the Differences?* (The Certification Board for Music Therapists), www.cbmt.org/default.asp?page=Certification%20vs.%20Licensure.
 - Supan, Terry. *Licensure Versus Certification: How It Can Affect You* (Amputee Coalition of America), www.amputee-coalition.org/absolutenm/anmviewer.asp?a=19&z=3.
3. Clarkson, Kenneth W., and Timothy J. Muris. “The Federal Trade Commission and Occupation Regulation,” In *Occupational Licensure and Regulation*, edited by Simon Rottenberg (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, ➡

A License to Interpret Continued

1980), 108.

4. *History of National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians* (National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians), www.nremt.org/about/nremt_history.asp.
5. Barnum, Barbara Stevens. "License, Certification, and Accreditation," *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing* (August 13, 1997), www.nursingworld.org/ojin/tpc4/tpc4_2.htm.
6. Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation. Court Interpreters Government Code, Title 2, Subtitle D, Chapter 57 (Effective September 1, 2005), www.license.state.tx.us/court/lcilaw.htm.
7. Ibid.
8. Roat, Cynthia E. *Certification of Health Care Interpreters in the United States. A Primer, a Status Report and Considerations for National Certification* (The California Endowment, September 2006); Kelly, Nataly. "Interpreter Certification in the United States: Where Are We Headed?" *The ATA Chronicle* (January 2007).
9. Scirratt, Jay. "The 'State' of State Licensing for Interpreters: Growing Pains Versus Growth Spurts," *VIEWES* (May 2001).
10. *State Regulation of Interpreters: Critical Issues and Model Legislation* (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf), www.rid.org/model.pdf.
11. Ibid.
12. *Developing State Legislation on Certifying and Licensing Inter-*

Links

Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification

www.ncsconline.org

The National Association of the Deaf

www.nad.org

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf

www.rid.org

preters (National Association of the Deaf, September 2000), www.nad.org/site/pp.asp?c=foINKQMBF&b=180368.

13. *Guidelines for Developing State Legislation on Certifying and Licensing Interpreters* (National Association of the Deaf, April 2000), www.nad.org/site/pp.asp?c=foINKQMBF&b=180367.
14. Other categories of settings included in the National Association of the Deaf table that are not mentioned here various settings for which sign language interpreters are more commonly provided, such as administrative proceedings of state agencies and departments, tax exempt organizations, and places of employment. The categories listed here are limited to the ones most commonly discussed with relation to the provision of interpreters for spoken languages.
15. If a state is not listed in a single category, such as "Legal," but is listed under "ALL," this does not mean that the state legislation does not include legal settings; rather, it means that the listing under "ALL" includes all settings.
16. If a state is listed in more than one category, this indicates that the state has more than one piece of legislation. For example, Arizona is listed

under both "ALL" and "Legal" because it has legislation and/or requirements in both categories.

17. *Frequently Asked Questions* (National Center for State Courts. Consortium for State Court Interpreter Certification), www.ncsconline.org/D_Research/CourtInterp/Res_CtInte_ConsortCertFAQ.pdf.
18. See www.colc.co.uk/cambridge/cintra/intro.doc and www.lr.mdx.ac.uk/lang/interpret/pdf/Police_interpreting.pdf for two examples of police interpreting course curricula outlines within the U.K. To read more about the Miyagi Prefectural Police Interpreting Center in Japan, see the center's website at www.police.pref.miyagi.jp/hp/sotai/sosiki_index-e.html.
19. Some states, such as Arkansas and Arizona, are listed in multiple columns due to the fact that certification may be recognized in legislation for some settings, but is not applicable in others. For example, in Texas, neither NAD nor RID certifications are officially recognized by the Human Resources Code that addresses interpreted conversations; however, RID certification is officially recognized in three other codes (civil, education, and criminal).

ata