

Flynn, Eileen

From: Jim Pinkston <jpink196901@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2015 9:05 AM
To: HSTestimony
Subject: Testimony

To Human Services Committee:

My name is James Pinkston and I have been working as an educational tutor and American Sign language instructor for the past 5 years.

I am writing this testimony on behalf of all the interpreters who feel threatened by this Bill that is currently trying to pass.

My concern is as an educator who works with Deaf children (varying degrees and issues), I feel this law is too restrictive. Although I support the fact that having qualified people work with our Deaf children is very important, this bill will impact the work that is being accomplished in our public schools in such a way that the children will suffer. The school systems are equipped to hire and terminate interpreters without the states involvement. This law will cause the state to spend more money monitoring who is working and where they are working than allowing the schools to provide educational needs based on the students IEP, which this bill clearly excludes. For example, In the Educational setting: when the school system hires a sign language interpreter, that person has many other titles i.e. interpreter/tutor/aide. The concern I have is that this bill addresses only the interpreter skills and in my experience based on I.E.P guidelines, a deaf child may have other disabilities i.e. deaf/blind, deaf/autistic etc and that particular interpreter may not meet all the mandates of the 6765 standards but has other specialized skills that is outlined in the IEP and is best suited for that child's needs. My fear is this bill oversteps the IEP process where professionals and parents have outlined the specific needs of that child. I meet all the mandates of this law but could not work with a deaf child that had autism. I think an exception clause needs to be inserted to protect the IEP process and in the best interest of the child. In addition to this, the proposed law also is trying to restrict how long an interpreter has to take and pass the national test which is over seen by RID (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf). RID, allows the interpreter 5 years to take and pass the certification exam. If an interpreter doesn't pass during the five year, the interpreter under RID has to retake the written exam and with more training and mentoring has the ability to retake the performance test. However, according to this bill, if the interpreter fails to pass within the 5 years, they will never be allowed to interpret in the state of Connecticut. This will greatly impact the Deaf community as a whole and greatly reduce the number of interpreters who could potentially work in this state.

I am asking that you thoroughly investigate this proposed bill and stop it from being passed. There are so many that will be affected by this, especially the children.

Regards,
Jim Pinkston