Group E

Article title: The Legal Framework for Language Access in Healthcare Settings: Title VI and Beyond

Case: Crooked Teeth

**PART ONE**

Directions: After you have carefully read your article, complete the following sentences with whatever elaboration you think necessary to make your meaning clear.

1. The main purpose of this article is:
* To describe the federal mandates for language rights in health care and provide a broad overview of existing state laws and describe recent legal developments in addressing language barriers.
1. The main points of view presented in this article are:
* What are the authors focused on and from what angle? The authors are focused on the current laws and policies in place that regulate access to interpretation services and how these apply to healthcare professionals.
1. The key question (whether stated or unstated) is:
* Are the current mandates in effect capable of providing sufficient language access in the healthcare setting, or should more be done to address the barriers?
* What are the changes that need to occur to create more comprehensive system for language assisting services?
* how can federal and state regulations be applied to daily healthcare practice to ensure that all patients are fully informed of all medical procedures, and their risks and benefits, and are able to give a fully informed consent for any medical encounter they have.
1. The main assumption(s) underlying the author’s thinking is (are):

Author’s Assumptions

* Readers understand and recognize the problem that exists on delivering health care to patient with language barrier
* The reader is from one of the healthcare professions (medical, dental etc.) and due to the lack of understanding of the rights of non-English speaking patients, provides information to the reader on what to provide for their patients so that there is no miscommunication.
* Most healthcare professionals are not fully aware of the federal and state regulations in place regarding language interpretation.

Reader’s Assumption:

* The authors are not biased in their presentation of the material.
* The studies cited are as specific and as up-to-date as possible.
* The article is from a peer-reviewed journal and the data is unbiased.
* There was no measurement bias or misrepresentation in statistics reported.
1. The most important information in this article is:
* 1964 Civil Rights Act is the most important piece of legislation for providing limited English speakers with the legal right to language assistance services. In summary, it states that no person based on race, color or national origin, can be discriminated against or denied benefits of any program that receives federal funding. Although several mandates are in effect at the federal level, the states have gone on to provide their own laws for providing language access to patients. In addition, more needs to be done in addressing the financial aspects, investment in interpreter workforce, understanding of deleterious effects of language barriers, and letting LEP patients understand their rights.
1. The main idea(s) we need to understand in order to understand this article is(are):
* Over the past few decades, the number and diversity of limited English speakers in the USA has burgeoned. With this increased diversity has come increased pressure including new legal requirements on healthcare systems and clinicians to ensure equal treatment of limited English speakers. We need to understand the mandates and come up with a proper way in making sure that our patients are capable of understanding what is said and done to them in the healthcare setting to avoid any miscommunication or accidents.
1. The main conclusion(s) in this article is(are):
* Much more remains to be done to ensure that the language one speaks does not diminish the quality of health care one receives. As our nation continues to become more culturally and linguistically diverse, we owe it to Gricelda Zamora and all our LEP patients to ensure that communication is not an impediment to health.
1. The main implications of this line of reasoning are:
* Despite the federal right to language access for LEP patients in healthcare settings, the reality is that many healthcare providers are not aware of their responsibility, have not prioritized the issue, or have not been held accountable through consistent enforcement of these laws.

## PART TWO

Directions: You should comment on the reasoning as appropriate in terms of its clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breath, logicalness, significance, and Fairness---or lack thereof.

**Clarity**— The article has clarity as it describes the problems that may arise in providing health care to patients who are limited in speaking English, and it clearly describe the need for interpreter in health care facilities.

**Accuracy**—The information is accurate as it cites the precise references on all the data mentioned in this article. The author’s approach in reviewing the federal mandates in addition to review of laws at the state’s level appears to make the presentation accurate.

**Precision**— The article was precise. The authors provided a overview of the issues and implications for healthcare providers in addition to suggesting further issues that will need to be addressed in order to make sure that patients are being given the proper care without communication being an impediment to their health.

**Relevance**— The article is very relevant for dental health professionals and/or students as it provides them with an easy to read, informational introductory piece on how we need to be aware of patient’s need who are limited in speaking English and what kind of assistance are out there for us in order to communicate in a better way to provide an excellent care to our patients. It is necessary to be aware of what is required at both the federal and state level for patients.

**Depth**— The article is written in detail and cites most of the legal rights to language access in health care settings. It includes the federal mandates which were passed in addition to the laws in effect at the state level to provide translation services to non-English speaking patients.

**Breath**— The article covers many topics from the federal landscape for language rights in health care, the role of the Department of Health and Human Services Office for Civil Rights, recent policy developments on the issue of language access in healthcare settings, state laws, and an analysis of what can be improved upon in the future. This makes the article very broad, as it includes several significant factors for health professionals to keep in mind in daily practice.

**Logicalness**— The article appears to be based on logical reasoning with the least amount of emphasis based on the author’s personal experience. This format helps the reader progressively focus attention on how personal daily medical practice can be influenced and shaped.

**Significance**— The article focuses on emphasizing the importance of the existence of language barrier in our patient pool is increasing and in order to provide an excellent care, we, as a health care provider need to know what interpretation services are available for us to get help.

**Fairness**— The author cites very respectable sources. The authors did not seem to have a monetary interest in the publishing of the article and the information presented was fairly presented. The authors provided us with 4 aspects to think about to provide a more consistent comprehensive system.