



NAJIT 2009-2010 Court Interpreter Survey

1 Purpose of the survey

The purpose of the NAJIT survey was to obtain detailed information nationwide about the ways in which state and federal courts use certified and non-certified spoken-language interpreters, so that NAJIT may better target its future advocacy and support work. The survey targeted primarily spoken-language court interpreters because the use of sign-language interpreters is governed by different types of legislation, specifically from the Americans with Disabilities Act.

2 Description of respondents

Survey invitations were sent twice in October 2009 to NAJIT members and to subscribers of listservs whose members include court interpreters in the United States. A Web link was included in the email notice of the survey. All responses were anonymous. In order to avoid duplicate responses, the survey hosting site allowed only one respondent per computer to enter the system. The total number of valid responses received was 654.

2.1 Non-English languages that respondents interpret in court

Respondents were asked to name the language or languages that they interpreted into and from English in court. Most named only one language, but several interpreters listed two or more. Following is a list of the principal languages interpreted:

Principal language interpreted			
Spanish	470	Slovak	2
ASL	27	Somali	2
Russian	22	Amharic	1
Portuguese	20	Bengali	1
Arabic	19	Burmese	1
Mandarin	18	Dutch	1
Korean	11	Farsi	1
Vietnamese	8	Finnish	1
French	7	Greek	1
Japanese	4	Gujarati	1
Laotian	4	Hindi	1
Tagalog	4	Hungarian	1
German	3	Macedonian	1
Haitian Creole	3	Punjabi	1
Italian	3	Samoaan	1
Polish	3	Soussou	1
Thai	3	Turkish	1
Bosnian/Serbo-Croatian	2	Urdu	1
Hmong	2	Yoruba	1
Total: 654			

NAJIT 2009-2010 Court Interpreter Survey

Following is a list of all working languages listed by respondents:

All languages interpreted			
Spanish	470	Slovak	2
ASL	28	Turkish	2
Portuguese	27	Amharic	1
Russian	22	Apoi	1
Arabic	19	Bengali	1
Mandarin	18	Burmese	1
French	14	Catalan	1
Korean	11	Dari	1
Vietnamese	8	Dinka	1
Cantonese	6	Dutch	1
Laotian	6	Farsi	1
German	5	Finnish	1
Haitian Creole	5	Greek	1
Thai	5	Gujarati	1
Italian	4	Hebrew	1
Japanese	4	Hungarian	1
Polish	4	Ilaje	1
Tagalog	4	Ikale	1
Somali	3	Macedonian	1
Urdu	3	Samoan	1
Bosnian/Serbo-Croatian	2	Soussou	1
Cebuano	2	Swedish	1
Hindi	2	Tigrinya	1
Hmong	2	Ukrainian	1
Punjabi	2	Yoruba	1
Total: 703			

2.2 State court systems in which respondents interpret

Respondents were asked to list the states in which they worked regularly in the state court system, and in which state they worked principally. Following are the responses in descending order of frequency:

Work regularly	#	% Resp
California	53	9.7%
Texas	43	7.9%
Florida	40	7.3%
New York	40	7.3%
Washington	39	7.2%
New Jersey	30	5.5%
Maryland	28	5.1%
Arizona	22	4.0%
Ohio	19	3.5%
Colorado	17	3.1%
Pennsylvania	17	3.1%
Tennessee	16	2.9%
Massachusetts	14	2.6%
Virginia	14	2.6%
Nevada	12	2.2%
Oregon	12	2.2%
Connecticut	11	2.0%
New Mexico	11	2.0%
Georgia	10	1.8%
Delaware	9	1.7%
Illinois	9	1.7%
Minnesota	9	1.7%
Wisconsin	9	1.7%
Idaho	5	0.9%
Indiana	5	0.9%
North Carolina	5	0.9%
Hawaii	4	0.7%
Iowa	4	0.7%
Missouri	4	0.7%
Nebraska	4	0.7%
Kentucky	3	0.6%
Louisiana	3	0.6%
New Hampshire	3	0.6%
South Carolina	3	0.6%
Utah	3	0.6%
Alabama	2	0.4%
Maine	2	0.4%
Michigan	2	0.4%
North Dakota	2	0.4%
Oklahoma	2	0.4%
Wyoming	2	0.4%

Work principally	#	% Resp
California	47	10.7%
Florida	40	9.1%
Texas	40	9.1%
Washington	34	7.7%
New York	31	7.0%
Arizona	21	4.8%
Maryland	20	4.5%
New Jersey	18	4.1%
Ohio	18	4.1%
Colorado	17	3.9%
Pennsylvania	16	3.6%
Tennessee	14	3.2%
Massachusetts	12	2.7%
Nevada	11	2.5%
Georgia	9	2.0%
Wisconsin	8	1.8%
Illinois	7	1.6%
Virginia	7	1.6%
Connecticut	6	1.4%
Minnesota	6	1.4%
New Mexico	6	1.4%
North Carolina	5	1.1%
Delaware	4	0.9%
Hawaii	4	0.9%
Nebraska	4	0.9%
Oregon	4	0.9%
Idaho	3	0.7%
Indiana	3	0.7%
Iowa	3	0.7%
Kentucky	3	0.7%
Missouri	3	0.7%
South Carolina	3	0.7%
Utah	3	0.7%
Alabama	2	0.5%
Louisiana	2	0.5%
Wyoming	2	0.5%
Maine	1	0.2%
Michigan	1	0.2%
New Hampshire	1	0.2%
Oklahoma	1	0.2%
South Dakota	1	0.2%

NAJIT 2009-2010 Court Interpreter Survey

Kansas	1	0.2%
Montana	1	0.2%
South Dakota	1	0.2%
Alaska	0	0.0%
Arkansas	0	0.0%
Mississippi	0	0.0%
Rhode Island	0	0.0%
Vermont	0	0.0%
West Virginia	0	0.0%
Total	545	

Mississippi	0	0.0%
Rhode Island	0	0.0%
Alaska	0	0.0%
Arkansas	0	0.0%
Kansas	0	0.0%
Montana	0	0.0%
North Dakota	0	0.0%
Vermont	0	0.0%
West Virginia	0	0.0%
Total	441	

2.3 Employment status

Respondents were asked to describe their employment status, and over two-thirds of respondents reported working as independent contractors.

What best describes your employment status?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Independent contractor	68.7%	449
Staff interpreter, state court	16.2%	106
Staff interpreter, federal court	3.1%	20
Interpreter coordinator	3.2%	21
Employee of language agency	2.4%	16
Other or no answer		42

2.4 Certifications held

2.4.1 State certification

Respondents were asked whether they were certified as interpreters by any entity. Please note that although some states do not use the term “certification,” but instead may list court interpreters as “approved” or “licensed,” the term “certification” was meant to include such categories. In addition, some states offer several tiers of certification or approval. Respondents were allowed to list more than one state, and there was no means to verify self-reporting of certification status.

State	#	% Resp	State	#	% Resp
Alabama	2	0.3%	Missouri	5	0.9%
California	75	13.0%	Nebraska	4	0.7%
Colorado	24	4.2%	Nevada	16	2.8%
Connecticut	8	1.4%	New Hampshire	2	0.3%
Delaware	6	1.0%	New Jersey	36	6.2%
Florida	51	8.8%	New Mexico	18	3.1%
Georgia	19	3.3%	New York	43	7.4%
Hawaii	6	1.0%	North Carolina	2	0.3%
Idaho	3	0.5%	Ohio	7	1.2%
Illinois/Cook County	6	1.0%	Oregon	13	2.2%
Indiana	10	1.7%	Pennsylvania	13	2.2%
Iowa	3	0.5%	South Carolina	1	0.2%
Kentucky	7	1.2%	Tennessee	21	3.6%
Maine	1	0.2%	Texas	56	9.7%
Maryland	27	4.7%	Utah	3	0.5%
Massachusetts	19	3.3%	Virginia	10	1.7%
Michigan	4	0.7%	Washington	36	6.2%
Minnesota	11	1.9%	Wisconsin	10	1.7%
Total: 578					

2.4.2 Other certifications

One-quarter of the 654 respondents overall stated that they were certified by the U.S. courts, and another 5 percent stated that they hold the NAJIT interpreter certification. Other credentials reported included certifications in translation from the American Translators Association, academic degrees, and credentials from non-certifying entities such as Lionbridge, Bridging the Gap, and the U.S. State Department.

Other certifications held	Response Percent	Response Count
Federal certification	25.1%	164
NAJIT	5.2%	34
Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID)	4.0%	26

2.5 Professional memberships

Memberships in professional associations		
NAJIT	348	53%
American Translators Association	128	20%
State or regional associations	238	36%
Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf	20	3%
Other national or international	10	2%

3 State interpreter policies & experiences

Respondents were asked about their experiences interpreting in state court systems, particularly with regard to policies on compensation and use of certified or otherwise state-approved interpreters. At the time of the survey, only 40 out of the 50 states were members of the National Consortium for State Courts, and not all of these had a certification or licensing program in place. Moreover, few of those that do offer a form of certification include spoken languages other than Spanish, although some have registry and/or qualification processes that offer diverse levels of screening to assist the courts in choosing interpreters. Respondents were asked to address policies on certification without necessarily being certified themselves, as their work in the state court system gives them a wide range of familiarity with local policies and practices.

3.1 Interpreters who work regularly in state courts

A total of 468 respondents stated that they work regularly in one or more state court systems. The data presented in section three is based only upon the answers given by these respondents.

3.2 Is there a state policy on compensation for court interpreters?

States for which most respondents said Yes, with a summary of comments	
California	1/2-day and full-day rates, mileage; staff salaries negotiated statewide
Colorado	2-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, some travel
Connecticut	Hourly rate with 4-hour minimum, some travel; staff salaries set
Delaware	3-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum
Florida	It appears that staff interpreter salaries are set but not freelance rates
Hawaii	5-tier pay scale, 2-hour minimum, travel
Idaho	3-tier scale, mileage
Iowa	Rates set by tier, with ceiling on hourly
Kentucky	2-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, some travel
Maryland	2-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, travel, 48-hour cancellation
Massachusetts	2-tier scale, 1/2 day and full-day, travel; staff salary minimum set
Minnesota	3-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, some travel
Nebraska	Hourly rate with 2-hour minimum, some travel, 48-hour cancellation
New Jersey	3-tier scale, 1/2 day and full-day, mileage; staff salaries also set
New Mexico	2-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, travel
New York	1/2 day and full-day rates; staff salaries set by civil service grade; union negotiates
North Carolina	5-tier scale, hourly rate, 3-hour minimum, 48-hour cancellation, some travel
Oregon	hourly rate, some travel
South Carolina	hourly rate, 2-hour minimum
Tennessee	3-tier scale, hourly rate, travel
Utah	no information given
Virginia	2-tier scale, hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, some travel
Washington	recommended hourly rate, negotiable travel; state reimburses 1/2 to courts if they pay recommended rate
Wisconsin	recommended hourly rate, 2-hour minimum, some travel

3.3 Is there a state policy mandating certified interpreter use wherever possible?

States for which most respondents said Yes, with a summary of comments on the policy		Comments on Enforcement problems
California	There is a state law requiring certified or registered interpreters to be used in all major languages, where available	Mostly enforced - some courts make little or no effort to secure the most qualified interpreter, particularly in rural areas
Colorado	Judicial directive mandates certified interpreters for felony cases	Some city courts do not feel bound by the directive; rural courts may use fewer certified; one district won't use certified to save money
Connecticut	Unless no certified interpreter available	Policy mostly used for criminal matters
Delaware	Courts must try to get certified interpreters first, but lists include 'registered' and 'conditionally approved'	
Florida	As of July 2008, courts must use certified (felony) or duly qualified (misdemeanor) interpreters where available	Wide range of variation in use of certified interpreters, with some courts complying fully and some refusing.
Georgia	Courts encouraged to 'make every effort' to hire certified interpreters	Uneven compliance.
Hawaii	Courts 'may give preference' to certified interpreters	Some courts comply, many do not.
Idaho	Administrative rule establishes priority for certified interpreters	Some rural districts evade the rule.
Iowa	Priority established for certified interpreters	
Kentucky	Certified must be used first if available, then 'registered' or 'qualified'	There is still a shortage of certified interpreters in all regions, and some courts prioritize funding over quality
Maryland	Certified must be used first, then 'eligible'	Better compliance for Spanish than other languages; overall good compliance with some exceptions.
Massachusetts	Must use certified, or else 'screened'	Overall compliance is good, with some exceptions
Minnesota	Rule 8 requires certified interpreters to be called first	Overall compliance is good, but some courts save money by using non-certifieds
Nebraska	Certified interpreters to be called first, then 'registered', then 'otherwise qualified'	Some do, some don't - one respondent stated 1/2 and 1/2
New Jersey	State-approved interpreters (Master's, Journeyman, and Conditional levels) must be called first	Some municipal courts do not prefer the most-qualified interpreters, but overall compliance is good
New Mexico	Must use certified first, where available.	
New York	Non-certified interpreters may only be used if no certified available	Some municipal courts do not prefer the most-qualified interpreters, but overall compliance is good
North Carolina	Only state and federally certified interpreters for Superior Courts - district courts are encouraged to use most qualified available	Overall compliance is good, with exceptions principally in rural areas
Oregon		

NAJIT 2009-2010 Court Interpreter Survey

Pennsylvania	Act 172 requires the use of certified interpreters whenever possible; also offers 'registered' interpreters	Compliance varies widely, with little enforcement in some places: "old habits die hard"
Tennessee	Supreme Court rules require certified interpreters or, if not available, registered	Compliance varies widely, complaints have been filed with judicial authorities
Texas	Mandatory for Spanish, though waived in smaller counties - it is a 'license' not a certification	Overall compliance is good, with some exceptions, particularly in municipal and more rural courts, even when a qualified interpreter is available
Utah	It is a policy, not a law	More in state courts than in municipal
Virginia	Certified must be called first, their use is 'strongly encouraged'	
Washington	State-certified or registered interpreters must be called first; there is also a category 'qualified'	Overall compliance is good, with some exceptions, particularly in municipal and more rural courts - "some courts don't care"
Wisconsin	It is more of a preference or recommendation than a mandate - more for pleas and sentencings	Mandate is rather new, but efforts are being made, particularly in pleas and sentencings

States for which most respondents said No, with a summary of comments	
Arizona	Although in Maricopa County there is such a policy; but no state certification available in Arizona
Illinois	No certification available in state
Indiana	Certification available but no mandate - state offers grants to subsidize certified interpreter use
Michigan	
Nevada	Legislative provisions have not yet been formally adopted as rules of the court
Ohio	Certification is not yet available in Ohio
Oklahoma	No certification available, though state encourages their use. Proceedings using non-certified interpreters must be recorded. Some courts allow anyone to interpret - others try to find qualified interpreters
South Dakota	
Wyoming	No certification available - regulations specify use of a 'qualified' interpreter

3.4 Use of certified interpreters in state courts

To your knowledge, do the state courts where you regularly interpret make a habit of calling certified interpreters FIRST for pretrial proceedings?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All	28.7%	128
Most	28.5%	127
Some	20.0%	89
None	5.6%	25
Don't know	15.0%	67
Not applicable	2.2%	10
<i>answered question</i>		446

To your knowledge, do the state courts where you regularly interpret make a habit of calling certified interpreters FIRST for trials, pleas and sentencings?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
All	36.2%	162
Most	30.2%	135
Some	14.5%	65
None	3.8%	17
Don't know	13.0%	58
Not applicable	2.2%	10
<i>answered question</i>		447

In state court systems, the use of certified interpreters appears to be slightly more frequent in pleas, sentencings, and trials than in pretrial proceedings.

NAJIT 2009-2010 Court Interpreter Survey

Breakdown by state:

To your knowledge, do the state courts where you regularly interpret make a habit of calling certified interpreters FIRST...												
	For pretrial proceedings:						For pleas, sentencings, and trials:					
State	All	Most	Some	None	N/A	Total resp	All	Most	Some	None	N/A	Total resp
Alabama			1	1		2			1	1		2
Arizona	3	3	6	2	8	22	5	5	4	1	8	23
California	25	12	6		6	49	30	12	2		5	49
Colorado	8	5	3		0	16	8	7	1			16
Connecticut	3	1	1		4	9	4	1			3	8
Delaware	2		1		1	4	3		1			4
Florida	5	10	11	4	11	41	9	8	11	3	10	41
Georgia		1	7	2		10		3	6	1		10
Hawaii		2	2			4		2	1		1	4
Idaho	1	1	1			3	1	1	1			3
Illinois	1	1	4		1	7	1		4		2	7
Indiana		3				3	1	2				3
Iowa	1	1		1	1	4	1	1		1	1	4
Kentucky		1	1		1	3		1	1		1	3
Louisiana		1	1			2		1	1			2
Maryland	5	8	5		7	25	7	9	3		6	25
Massachusetts	3	4	2		4	13	4	5	2		2	13
Minnesota	3	3				6	5	1				6
Missouri		2	1			3	1	2				3
Nebraska	1	1	2			4	1	2	1			4
Nevada	1	5	2	1	2	11	3	5	2	1		11
New Jersey	10	10			2	22	12	8			2	22
New Mexico	3	2			1	6	5	1				6
New York	15	7			13	35	17	7	1		10	35
North Carolina		1	1	1	2	5		1	2		2	5
Ohio			5	6	7	18		2	5	4	7	18
Oregon	4					4	4					4
Pennsylvania	3	2	5	2	4	16	4	4	3	1	4	16
South Carolina		1		2		3		1		2		3
Tennessee	2	3	7		3	15	1	6	5		3	15
Texas	8	15	7	1	11	42	10	18	2		12	42
Utah	1	2				3	2	1				3
Virginia	3	2	1		2	8	3	2	1		2	8
Washington	11	12	3		8	34	12	12	2		8	34
Wisconsin	3	2	3			8	3	3	1		1	8
Totals	125	124	89	23	99	460	157	134	64	15	90	460

3.5 Types of proceedings in which respondents interpret at the state court level

For what types of proceedings are you regularly called to state court/legal settings? (check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Criminal: Police interviews	18.3%	82
Criminal: Bookings	12.3%	55
Criminal: Pretrial investigations	30.6%	137
Criminal: Initial hearings/arraignments	88.4%	395
Criminal: Pretrial conferences/motions	82.3%	368
Criminal: Pretrial depositions	57.7%	258
Criminal: Plea hearings	85.9%	384
Criminal: Sentencing hearings	82.8%	370
Criminal: Jury trials	79.2%	354
Criminal: Bench trials	76.1%	340
Criminal: Attorney/client interviews	74.3%	332
Civil: Divorce/custody/family	70.5%	315
Civil: Children's services	55.9%	250
Civil: Torts/lawsuits	42.1%	188
Administrative: Workers' compensation	39.4%	176
Administrative: Unemployment	19.0%	85
Other		86
<i>answered question</i>		447

4 Federal interpreter experiences

U.S. law provides that non-certified interpreters can be used in federal court proceedings only when “no certified interpreter is reasonably available” or the courts do not certify for the language in question. The law also states that guidelines will be provided for “for the selection of otherwise qualified interpreters, in order to ensure that the highest standards of accuracy are maintained in all judicial proceedings” 28 U.S.C. §1827(b)(1)(2). However, questions have been raised in many U.S. districts regarding compliance with the spirit and letter of this law, and several questions in the survey were designed to elicit respondents’ experiences in their districts.

4.1 Respondents who interpret regularly in federal courts

A total of 238 respondents stated that they worked regularly in federal courts. Several of these listed more than one district, as follows:

California	33	Massachusetts	4
Florida	30	Mississippi	4
New York	27	Oregon	4
Texas	25	Connecticut	3
Washington	19	Hawaii	3
Arizona	13	Idaho	3
Ohio	13	Kansas	3
Virginia	12	Nebraska	3
Colorado	11	Oklahoma	3
District of Columbia	11	Pennsylvania	3
Georgia	11	Puerto Rico	3
Illinois	11	Alaska	2
Kentucky	10	Arkansas	2
New Jersey	10	Delaware	2
Iowa	9	Michigan	2
New Mexico	9	Minnesota	2
Tennessee	9	North Dakota	2
Alabama	8	South Carolina	2
Louisiana	7	Maine	1
Nevada	7	Montana	1
Wisconsin	6	New Hampshire	1
Indiana	5	North Carolina	1
Maryland	5	South Dakota	1
Missouri	5	Utah	1
Wyoming	5	Total	367

4.2 Use of federally certified interpreters in practice

Frequency tables were constructed for responses from three subsets of respondents, as even those who do not work regularly in federal courts may have knowledge of the prevailing practices at their local U.S. District Courts.

To your knowledge, do the division courts in the federal district where you regularly interpret make a habit of calling federally certified interpreters FIRST...									
Respondents who:	For pretrial proceedings:					For pleas, sentencings, and trials:			
	All	Most	Some	None		All	Most	Some	None
Work regularly in federal courts	83	45	28	10		94	46	19	5
Are federally certified interpreters	66	33	25	3		76	34	14	2
Interpret in the Spanish<>English pair	106	44	35	16		120	45	27	10

The views obtained from the three subsets of respondents show similar trends, in that U.S. courts appear to be using certified interpreters more frequently for pleas, sentencings, and trials than for pretrial proceedings. This trend is also similar to the one seen in state courts. However, in light of the clear requirements of federal legislation, the use of certified interpreters is clearly inadequate in many districts.

4.3 Selected comments on federally certified interpreter use in practice

Interpreters in Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, New Mexico, and the New York Metro area, for example, consistently note that federal courts here have a good record of compliance, and federally certified interpreters are often called on a rotating basis. Other court districts are not so compliant, as noted below:

- My local federal court ALWAYS uses a local NON-CERTIFIED interpreter, instead of calling CFCIs. I have brought this several times to the attention of the AOC. They always say "we can't tell the judges what to do." The court contracting officer always says, "I know she's not certified, but the judges like her, and she's 'very good.' "
- My local federal court does NOT call me to work for them even though I am the only certified interpreter in the district. They use a non-federal certified interpreter.
- There aren't currently any federally certified interpreters in my state. Courts call one or two state certified interpreters, even though there are more who have signed a contract to work for the federal court but are never called to work in court.
- My district has a habit of calling state certified interpreters for hearings, and federally certified interpreters for trials. With one exception: one of the divisions REGULARLY uses the services of a person who has tried at least twice to pass the state exam to no avail, and uses her for all of proceedings.
- One of the districts of my state does call upon certified interpreters most of the times. However, the other district does not call on certified interpreters even though certified interpreters are registered, willing and able to work.
- One magistrate routinely uses non-certified interpreters [in a state that has many federally certified interpreters available]. One district judge never uses federally certified interpreters.
- Some courts do not want to incur the expenses of bringing federally certified interpreters to their location, unless it is a trial.
- Some of the courts are calling something called "T.I.P.S." for pretrial proceedings and some seem to call non-certified interpreters for arraignments, and detention hearings, etc.
- Trials yes, the rest, no.
- Federally certified interpreters from out of state are sometimes brought in to work together with local state certified interpreters in jury trials.
- For trial, yes, but for pleas and sentencing they do not call certified interpreters, not even State Certified interpreters

4.4 Types of proceedings in which respondents interpret at the federal court level

For what types of proceedings are you regularly called to federal court/legal settings? (check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Criminal: Debriefings	27.7%	84
Criminal: Proffers	29.7%	90
Criminal: Initial hearings	60.1%	182
Criminal: Preliminary hearings	55.8%	169
Criminal: Pretrial motions	49.8%	151
Criminal: Plea hearings	59.4%	180
Criminal: Presentence investigation interviews	46.9%	142
Criminal: Sentencing hearings	60.7%	184
Criminal: Trials	58.7%	178
Criminal: CJA/Federal defender-client interviews	51.2%	155
Administrative: Immigration asylum hearings	24.1%	73
Administrative: Immigration removal hearings	22.4%	68
Comments/Other		83
<i>answered question</i>		303

5 Suggestions for how a professional organization like NAJIT can advocate for interpreters

NAJIT posed the open-ended question “In what ways would you like to see a professional organization like NAJIT advocate for improved working conditions and opportunities for interpreters in the state and/or federal courts?”

Most of the responses fit into one or more of the eight (8) categories listed below. Many of the comments included more than one suggestion.

In what ways would you like to see a professional organization like NAJIT advocate for improved working conditions and opportunities for interpreters in the state and/or federal courts?		
Response Category	Response Percent	Response Count
Improved Pay	14%	44
Improved Recognition of Profession	13%	40
Education/Training for Judges and Attorneys on the role of the Interpreter	14%	43
Academic Programs and Training for Court Interpreters	11%	34
Improved Workplace Benefits	10%	30
Improved Certification Process/Testing	10%	31
Advocacy in Specific Counties/Districts/ Systems to Identify and Remedy a Problem	8%	24
Enforcement/Promotion of Using a Certified Interpreter First	20%	63

While there was overlap in many of the comments, the general consensus was that NAJIT should work with judges, lawyers, and court administrators to help them understand and respect the role of the professional interpreter. Many comments focused on working with court systems to create and enforce laws and policies in which certified interpreters are used first in trials and proceedings.