

**Form for 1.3.2 (Page 1 of 3)**  
**Evaluation of Interpreter Services**

*Instructions: Complete a separate form for each interpreter you observe. If the same interpreter works on several different cases, complete a form for each case, if possible.*

Court session: (Please record as much of the following information as possible)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_ Courtroom number: \_\_\_\_\_

Court session description: \_\_\_\_\_, or

Language: \_\_\_\_\_

Case identification information:

Case number: \_\_\_\_\_ Case name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation**

**1. Language proficiency.** (Was the interpreter easily understandable in both languages? Were there any problems with vocabulary, grammar, or rendering of idiomatic speech?)

- No problems noted.
- Some problems, but overall did not appear to interfere significantly with communication.
- Significant problems. Example notes:

---

---

**Form for 1.3.2 (Page 2 of 3)**  
**Evaluation of Interpreter Services**

**2. Interpreting skills.** (Was the appropriate mode of interpreting used? Could the interpreter keep up without omitting or summarizing what was said? Was the register of speech preserved? Were names and numbers accurately conserved?)

- No problems noted.
- Some problems, but overall did not appear to interfere significantly with communication.
- Significant problems. Example notes:

---

---

**3. Professional conduct.** (Were verbal exchanges between the interpreter and the party or witness restricted to interpretations only? Did the interpreter refrain from giving advice? Did the interpreter refrain from adding or modifying anything that was said? Did the interpreter refer to herself or himself properly in the third person when addressing the court?)

- No problems noted.
- Some problems, but overall did not appear to interfere significantly with communication.
- Significant problems. Example notes:

---

---

**Form for 1.3.2 (Page 3 of 3)**  
**Evaluation of Interpreter Services**

4. Overall evaluation.

- Appears to be a skilled interpreter.
- Appears to be an adequate interpreter, but additional study and practice is indicated. Some caution should be exercised when assigning this interpreter.
- Problems appear to be severe. The court should further evaluate this interpreter's language knowledge and skills with structured testing (see Measures 1.3.3 and 1.3.4).