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Primary goal:
Personnel prep for educational interpreting students

Secondary goal:
Project evaluation
Define patterns of practice in educational interpreting
- Design a 3-year plan
- Create a team
- Review current patterns
  - Convene expert group to validate patterns
  - Conduct national practitioner survey to validate patterns

Review UNC ASLEI curriculum using identified patterns of practice
● Literature review: Amy Seiberlich

● State education agency requirements: Laurie Bolster

● State education agency practices: Susan Brown

● Interpreter education curricula review: Marty Taylor
Topic Areas

- Educating interpreters
- Educational interpreting in general
- Educational interpreter roles and responsibilities
- Educational interpreting standards
- Impact of educational interpreting on Deaf and hard-of-hearing student outcomes
Topic Areas cont.

- Interpreting considerations
- Issues related to serving this target population
- Legislation pertaining to educational interpreting
- Population and interpreter demographics
- Other
Ranking Categories

Critical
- Contributes to turning point in patterns of practice

Essential
- Contains necessary considerations

Relevant
- Directly related but not of high importance

Of interest
- Not directly related
Method of Inquiry

- Academic databases / Journals
- Books / Anthologies
- Professional publications
- Codes of Conduct / Standards
- Personal inquiry
- Websites
Project Scope

- Jan 2000 – April 2012
- Over 225 pieces considered
- 100 selected
- Ranked by topic area
- References
- Websites of general interest, potential additions
Breakdown
Unique Content Themes

- Experiential learning
- Psychological constructs
- How to teach, what to learn (interpreter)
- K-12 interpreting specific programming
- Evolving models of interpreting
- Deaf community as educational partner
- Overall call to action
State Standards

- Academic credentials
- Skills – sign, oral, cued
- Professional knowledge
- Alternative pathways
- CEUs
Method of Inquiry

2007
Internet search

2012
Comprehensive data collection of official documentation of standards
- Internet search
- Phone calls to contact people and State Education Agencies
- Each state’s summary sent to contact people for review
- Additional phone and email exchanges for updates on legislative activities
## Overview: 2007 & 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Skills Exam</td>
<td>33 Total</td>
<td>38 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 EIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credentials</td>
<td>11 Total</td>
<td>17 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sets</td>
<td>9 Total</td>
<td>15 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 EIPA written</td>
<td>11 EIPA written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Units</td>
<td>19 Total</td>
<td>20 Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t have...Couldn’t find...2012

13 States

- Arizona
- Arkansas
- Florida
- Hawaii
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- New York
- Ohio
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- Vermont
- Washington
- Washington D.C.
## EIPA as a Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIPA 3.0</td>
<td>10 states</td>
<td>3 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA 3.5</td>
<td>11 states</td>
<td>14 states (+1 in Jan 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA 4.0</td>
<td>2 states</td>
<td>10 states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# States Using EIPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIPA 3.0</th>
<th>EIPA 3.5</th>
<th>EIPA 4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ND (1/14)</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH = “passing”
Apparent Trends

- More informed professionals at state level
- Increased use of nationally recognized examinations for skills, especially the EIPA
- Little change in BA requirements
- CEUs individual to state and chaotic range
- Alternative pathways are still problematic
All state information tables are available on the DO IT Center’s website at: www.unco.edu/doit

To update:
send a document or URL showing current state requirements to susan.brown@unco.edu
Educational Interpreter
State Handbooks

- Method of Inquiry
  - Purpose for handbooks
  - Web search of all 50 states
  - Reviewed for topics and patterns of topics/content discussed within the handbooks
Data Collected

13 States

- Arkansas (2000)
- Colorado (2012)
- Indiana (2002)
- Iowa (2002)
- Kansas (2003)
- Kentucky (2008)
- Louisiana (2011)
- Nebraska (2002)
- New Mexico (2009)
- Ohio (2011)
- Oregon (2012)
- Pennsylvania (n/a)
- South Carolina (2007)
Other Observations

- Important topics with limited acknowledgment:
  - Student testing considerations (5 states)
  - Co-occurring disabilities (4 states)
  - EIPA testing information (6 states)

- Important topics not acknowledged:
  - Use of team interpreters in the classroom
  - Working with students with cochlear implants
  - Title and role other than educational interpreter, e.g., language facilitator, sign support practitioner
All state handbooks are available on the DO IT Center’s website at: www.unco.edu/doit (under the respective state licensing link)

To update: Send handbook URL to susan.brown@unco.edu
Interpreter Education Curricula

- What were the foundational requirements?
- What learning outcomes were related to interpreting in the K-12 educational setting?
- What resources were used in the programs?
Methods of Inquiry

- Descriptive data from 5 programs
  - Websites
  - Syllabi

- Analytical framework
    http://www.lulu.com/content/1592795
Thank you

- Kapiolani Community College
- LaGuardia Community College
- University of Arizona
- University of Arkansas at Little Rock
- University of Northern Colorado, DO IT Center
## Findings

### Commonalities
- e.g., prerequisites for entry into program
- e.g., recognition of the importance of 4-year degrees

### Differences
- e.g., number of courses related to interpreting in educational settings
- e.g., scope and currency of course materials
Degree Offered
2 Year & 4 Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IPPs</th>
<th>Degree Years Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CCIE Accredited Programs
ASL Prerequisites

Credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT HOURS REQUIRED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPPs
K-12 Interpreting: Credit Hours Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREDIT HOURS REQUIRED</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>IPPs</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>