

STATE OF CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH
PUBLIC TRUST AND SERVICE COMMISSION
LEP COMMITTEE

SURVEY WORK GROUP

AGENDA and Minutes

Wednesday, January 6, 2010

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

Room #313, 936 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield

Attendees: Hilda Nieves (Chair), Karen Franchi, Alejandra Donath, Michaelangelo Palmieri, Karen Chorney (Staff)

1. Welcome

Hilda Nieves offered welcoming remarks and introduced the members of the work group.

2. Review of Survey Work Group Goals as set for by LEP Committee:

- ◆ analyze the internal survey conducted several months ago and develop a list of recommendations (i.e., recommended materials) identified by Branch staff to be translated, and
- ◆ identify trends within the survey responses as they pertain to forms, court documents, educational opportunities and interests/needs to present as recommendations to the LEP Committee.

Hilda suggested that the work group members review the survey itself as shared by Faith: look at the questions and responses, look for insight with regard to forms (i.e., Judicial forms versus discipline-specific forms), look for insight within the comments. Hilda asked the group members to make note of themes, trends, comments, and forms suggested for translation; also to look at the types of materials being recommended for translation (e.g., correspondence, official court documents/notices, forms, treatment plans, victim information, client contracts, etc.), as well as whether the materials are “COLP” generated or discipline-specific. In addition, Hilda requested that members track miscellaneous issues and add their own thoughts about working with LEP populations that were not addressed by the survey.

Hilda explained how she approached the survey as it pertains to CSSD and extracted information specific to CSSD. As the survey reflects, 29% of the total responses came from CSSD employees.

Hilda suggested questions for the group to consider in their individual reviews of the survey results: How might these forms be prioritized for translation? Would it be the rate or manner in which they are used? If information needs to be conveyed, responded to by a client, and mailed back does that get prioritized first? Would it be by the importance of that form to the specific discipline requesting translation?

Hilda further notes that CSSD identifies all forms attached to their policies and prioritizes them by discipline. Hilda suggested a similar approach for the Branch.

One issue noted pertained to forms used by contracted service providers: if the Branch has forms required of its providers, who is responsible for translating them (for use by non-English speaking clients)?

3. Develop Plan of Action

Hilda would like to generate a spreadsheet of recommended forms and other materials that were in the survey for the LEP Committee to consider.

Hilda asked each of the work group members to (a) prioritize the forms suggested for translation and (b) review the survey and responses from the following perspectives:

- Michaelangelo - Juvenile Probation perspective
- Karen Franchi – civil and criminal clerk's office perspective
- Alejandra – court based interpreter's perspective
- Hilda – general CSSD perspective

4. Next Steps

The next meeting of this work group will be Tuesday, February 2, 2010 from 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., Room # 313, 936 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield.