

COURT PROGRESS IN PROVIDING INTERPRETERS IN CIVIL CASES

(as of September 30, 2015)

Strategic Plan Goal: “By 2017, and beginning immediately where resources permit, qualified interpreters will be provided in the California Courts to LEP court users in all courtroom proceedings.”*



9 courts (15.5% of 58 courts)	28 courts (48.3% of 58 courts)	9 courts (15.5% of 58 courts)	12 courts
Full expansion	Priority Order 1–8	Priority Order 1–4	No Response or Have Not Started
Nine responding courts reported that they could provide interpreters in all civil matters upon request, regardless of priority level; the overwhelming majority of these were small courts that said they infrequently had a request for an interpreter in civil proceedings but would be able to arrange interpreting services if needed.	Of the 47 courts that provided data, 28 responded they provide interpreters in civil case types following the priority order dictated by statute (as set forth in the priority chart shown below). These tended to be larger to midsized courts; these services are offered when interpreters are available and have completed assignments in criminal and juvenile matters. One court reported that it is only able to provide interpreters for hearings that are no more than one day and that these additional services require, on average, one extra Spanish interpreter each day, and two extra OTS interpreters each week (half day each).	Nine of the responding courts reported being able to provide interpreter services through priority level 4 at this time; these tended to be midsized courts with high language demand, and which reported that availability of interpreters limited their expanding services more.	Eleven courts (19%) did not provide data; the majority of these were smaller courts without significant demand for interpreter services. Only one responding court (1.7%) (a medium-sized court in a county that had significant economic impacts in the last recession) reported that they had not started expansion into civil proceedings (as of 9/30/2015).

Priority 1: *DV, civil harassment where fees are waived (Code Civ. Proc., § 527.6(w)), elder abuse (physical abuse or neglect)*

Priority 2: *Unlawful detainer*

Priority 3: *Termination of parental rights*

Priority 4: *Conservatorship, guardianship*

Priority 5: *Sole legal or physical custody, visitation*

Priority 6: *Other elder abuse, other civil harassment*

Priority 7: *Other family law*

Priority 8: *Other civil*

General Observations:

- 1) The ability of courts to provide interpreters in civil case types varied according to size, demand, and availability of interpreters.
- 2) Larger courts tended to use existing staff to meet needs.
- 3) Smaller courts were able to arrange interpreters more easily owing to less frequent requests.

* Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts, Goal 2