

# **Alternative Pathways Task Force Meeting - #6**

## **Minutes**

**Date:** Wednesday, August 5, 2026

**Time:** 7:40 PM

**Topic:** Alternative Pathways – Knowledge/Ethics Evaluations, and Performance Requirements for Licensure

### **Attendance**

#### **Members Present**

Jimmy Beldon  
Tisha Bera  
Caitlin Comstock  
Joshua Finkle  
Marylourdes Gayles  
April Jackson-Woodard  
Jacob Leffler, SBSLI Chair (Taskforce Lead)  
Jadalynn Orr  
Jerry Seremeth  
Sarah Yates

#### **GODDBHH Staff Support**

Usherla DeBerry

#### **Members Absent**

Thomas Horejes  
James Skjeveland, SBSLI Member

Task Force members and invited participants includes the following overall in the meeting:

Maryland State Board of Sign Language Interpreters  
Deaf Interpreters

Hearing Interpreters  
Interpreter Educators  
Interpreter Agency Owners  
Deaf Consumers  
RID Board Experience  
Interpreter Training Programs (ITPs)

## **Purpose**

The meeting focused on developing recommendations for the **Alternative Pathways Licensure Program**, specifically discussing:

Knowledge requirements  
Ethics requirements  
Cultural competency  
Continuing Education Units (CEUs)  
Performance assessment options

## **Discussion Summary**

### **1. Knowledge, Ethics, and Culture Requirements**

The task force reviewed several possible methods for demonstrating competency, including:

Passing the RID written examination.  
Developing a Board-approved knowledge and ethics examination.  
Requiring specific Continuing Education Units (CEUs) focused on ethics, culture, and professional development.

Members discussed whether the Board should develop its own assessment and recognized the need for any examination to be legally defensible and professionally validated.

### **2. BEI Written Examination**

The group discussed whether the BEI written examination should satisfy the ethics and knowledge requirement.

Discussion concluded that:

The BEI written examination primarily measures English language competency.  
It does not sufficiently assess ethics or cultural competency.

Therefore, BEI alone may not satisfy the Alternative Pathways knowledge requirement.

### **3. Continuing Education Unit Requirements**

There was broad support for allowing CEUs as one pathway to demonstrate competency.

Discussion included organizing CEUs into categories such as:

- Ethics
- Deaf Culture
- Professional Studies
- Interpreting Process / Professional Practice (PPO)

Several members recommended following RID's existing Professional Studies framework whenever possible.

### **4. Proposed CEU Structure**

A preliminary recommendation discussed included:

Total of **8.0 CEUs (80 hours)** completed within **four years**

Approximately:

- 2.0 CEUs in Ethics
- 2.0 CEUs in Deaf Culture
- 2.0 CEUs in Professional Studies
- 2.0 CEUs in Interpreting Process/PPO

This proposal was viewed as consistent with RID's current professional development expectations.

### **5. Timeframe**

Members discussed requiring CEUs to be recent.

General consensus favored:

- CEUs earned within the previous **four years**
- Avoid counting training completed many years ago.

### **6. Interpreter Experience**

Discussion referenced previous recommendations requiring approximately:

Three - five years of interpreting experience  
before qualifying for Alternative Pathways General Licensure.

## **7. General vs. Provisional Licensure**

The task force reviewed the distinction between:

### **Provisional License**

Limited practice  
Up to five years  
Certain settings (legal, medical, mental health) require additional supervision or restrictions.

### **General License**

Requires completion of all Alternative Pathways requirements.

## **8. Performance Assessment**

The group emphasized that ethics and knowledge should remain separate from performance evaluation.

Discussion included:

Maintaining a separate performance assessment process.  
Exploring structured evaluations rather than relying solely on national performance examinations.  
Developing reviewer qualifications and standardized evaluation procedures.

## **9. Live Review Panel**

The proposal for a live evaluation panel received little support.

Concerns included:

Scheduling difficulties  
Maintaining consistency  
Administrative burden

The task force generally agreed to move away from this option.

## **10. Consumer Recommendation Letters**

Members discussed whether letters from Deaf consumers should be used to demonstrate interpreter competency.

Concerns included:

- Subjectivity
- Personal preference versus professional competence
- Lack of standardized evaluation criteria

General agreement was that consumer preference alone should **not** determine interpreter competency.

## **Emerging Areas of Consensus**

- Support using CEUs as part of Alternative Pathways.
- Align requirements with RID whenever practical.
- Require training in ethics, Deaf culture, and professional studies.
- Maintain a separate performance evaluation.
- Avoid relying solely on consumer recommendation letters.
- Develop objective and defensible evaluation standards.

## **Topics Requiring Additional Discussion**

- Final CEU distribution and required hours.
- Whether to create a Maryland Board-developed knowledge examination.
- Final performance evaluation model.
- Reviewer qualifications and training.
- Documentation requirements for applicants.
- Implementation timeline.

## **Action Items**

- Continue refining CEU requirements and category definitions.
- Review RID Professional Studies standards for alignment.
- Develop recommendations for performance evaluation criteria.
- Explore legally defensible options for Board-approved knowledge assessments.
- Continue discussion on Alternative Pathways performance review process at the next meeting.

*Special note:*

*July 15th: Pathway Structure and July 29th: Ethics, Accountability, and Safeguards meetings were rescheduled for August 5, 2026.*