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Overview

- Introduction of the OSEP Project Investigation
- National Results on Educational Interpreting
  - State Standards Investigation
  - Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA Analyses)
  - Survey of Educational Interpreters Summit on Educational Interpreting
  - Implications for Practitioners
  - Questions & Answers
Overarching study questions

• What are the national demographics of educational interpreters currently working in K-12 settings and the deaf and hard of hearing students they serve?

• What are the working conditions of educational interpreters, including hiring criteria, level and experience of their work, and their academic and professional credentials?

• What are educational interpreters’ primary roles and responsibilities, and what other assignments are part of their daily work?

• What are the current patterns of practice between educational interpreters as related service providers and their interface with the K-12 educational system?
State Standards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-service education</th>
<th>Written credentials</th>
<th>Performance credentials</th>
<th>Continuing education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS/GED – 7</td>
<td>EIPA – 11</td>
<td>EIPA – 42</td>
<td>CEUs – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA – 5</td>
<td>Other – 2</td>
<td>RID – 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA – 3</td>
<td>RID – 1</td>
<td>NAD – 24</td>
<td>Other – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QAST – 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2014 EIPA State Standards
Including EIPA Written Test (W)

<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>AZ</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>CO + written</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>NH + written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>IL + written</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>IN + written</td>
<td>SC + written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>RI + written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>WA + written</td>
<td>TX + written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI + written</td>
<td>WV + written</td>
<td>UT + written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT + written</td>
<td>WY + written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7       | 24       | 11                     |
### Increase in EIPA States Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIPA 3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA 3.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA 4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIPA Analyses
## Changes in EIPA Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIPA Score</th>
<th>2002-08</th>
<th>2009-14</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIPA &lt; 3.0</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA &lt; 3.5</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA &gt; 3.5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIPA &gt; 4.0</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>9,330</td>
<td>8,680</td>
<td>18,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thanks to Dr. Cathy Carotta and Ms. Frances Beaurivage at Boystown National Research Hospital and the Center for Childhood Deafness for allowing access to data from the EIPA and EIPA Written Test.
## EIPA Performance Test Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman I</th>
<th>Roman II</th>
<th>Roman III</th>
<th>Roman IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice to Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign to Voice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary &amp; Fingerspelling</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody, Space, &amp; Grammar</td>
<td>Interpreting for a student</td>
<td>9 Rated skills</td>
<td>Cohesion, Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 12 Rated skills</td>
<td>10 Rated skills</td>
<td>9 Rated skills</td>
<td>7 Rated skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIPA Results 2002-04 vs. 2012-14

Significant differences between time of testing

Domain I, III, IV increased for 2012-14 group

Domain II decreased for 2012-14 group
# What Predicts the Overall EIPA Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Amount Vocabulary</th>
<th>Key Vocabulary</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosody</strong></td>
<td>.931**</td>
<td>726**</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Space</strong></td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.838**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.944**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.736**</td>
<td>.722**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.713**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.605**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.579**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = p < .001
What Predicts Total Score

- Use of Grammar
- Use of Space
- Use of Prosody
- Use of Discourse Mapping principles

You cannot get a strong EIPA score without these critical components
  - True for ASL, PSE, and MCE
Analysis of EIPA Written Test Results

Test of Content Knowledge Related to Working with K-12 Students in a School Environment
# EIPA Written Test: Percent Correct

Sample size = 826 test takers since 2012
Collapsed into 8 categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Systems and Practices</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Cognitive Development</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture (Multicultural &amp; Deaf)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Profession</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Good News

- More states have required standards for K-12 interpreters
- Standards appear to work: EIPA scores have improved over time as a group
- States with newer standards have higher EIPA requirements and are requiring the EIPA Written Test

The Bad News

- Most states allow provisional licenses and unrestricted emergency licensure
- Most states do not have an academic requirement
- Less than half the states (24) have CEU requirements
- EIPA written test
  - Many score in the C and D range on the Written Test
  - EIPA written English skills are problematic
NATIONAL SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL INTERPRETERS
Survey Overview

• 98 primary questions
• Primarily quantitative questions
• 20-30 minutes to complete
• No forced responses
• Pilot run: Canadian educational interpreters
• Launched April 7, 2014/Closed April 25, 2014
Survey available to ~25,000 potential educational interpreters

1728 respondents
1607 completed surveys

Reaching all educational interpreters was challenging
National figure of educational interpreters is unknown
Survey topics

Demographics
Roles & Responsibilities
D/HH Student Demographics
Working Conditions
Salary & Benefits
**Demographics**

**Gender**
- Prefer not to respond: 9
- Male: 13
- Female: 1459

**Ethnicity**
- Native American/American Indian: 9
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 12
- Other: 43
- African-American/Black: 50
- Hispanic/Latino: 60
- Caucasian: 1420
### Demographics

**GEOGRAPHICS OF EMPLOYMENT**

- **Suburbs**: 42%
- **Urban**: 37%
- **Rural**: 21%
65% interpreted for extracurricular activities (all that applied)

- 75% Athletics
- 52% Clubs
- 44% Arts

In addition to interpreting (all that applied)

- 61% Tutor
  [NOTE: 69% of this group indicated no training to tutor]
- 37% Assist other students in the classroom
- 31% Bus, playground and lunch duty
- 28% Teacher support
Roles & Responsibilities

Educational Team

59% attended IEP meetings as a member of the team

78% had access to the IEP Report

Interpreter seen as a resource for
(all that applied)

87% Sign Language Modality
75% Profession of interpreting
54% Language development
42% Deaf/HH education
30% Tutoring

Who did interpreters talk to about student progress
(all that applied)

75% Teacher of the Deaf/HH
71% Classroom/general education teacher
43% Other interpreters/team/lead
32% Deaf/HH students
89% received specialized training to work in a K-12 setting (all that applied)

- 55% Language development
- 54% Child development
- 45% Tutoring
- 45% Literacy
- 38% Educational theory
- 42% Content specific coursework

52% indicated no training in (check all that apply average for all three areas)

- Child development
- Cognitive development
- Language development
Working Conditions

- 75% had an official job title of “Interpreter”
- 61% worked primarily with one student
  - 42% worked in pre-k/elementary
  - 38% worked in high school
  - 20% worked in middle school
- 66% Deaf
- 34% Hard of Hearing
- 37% of students spoke for themselves
87% wanted continuing education/professional development opportunities

NOTE: 57% of the respondents indicated that their state did not include continuing education in state licensing requirements

86% said there is a need for a professional organization specifically for K-12 Interpreters
Compensation

- 36% Salaried
  $20,000-$49,999

- 64% Hourly
  $15.00-$27.49

- 83% receive benefits
National Summit on Educational Interpreting
Purpose of the Summit

- Continue discovering patterns of practice
- Gather qualitative data in addition to the quantitative data from the survey
- Validate survey findings – or not
CRITERIA

- At least 18 years of age
- Minimum of three years of experience as a K-12 interpreter
- Currently working in the classroom as a K-12 interpreter
- Met state requirements for working in a K-12 educational system
Summit Participation Selection

One educational interpreter representative from each of the 50 states

Recommendations from state education agencies and RID affiliate chapter presidents

Consideration given to diversity, e.g., age, experience, gender and geographic location
## Participant Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 females / 3 males</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% interpreted in K-12 more than 75% of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All met their state standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 EIPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 RID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ed:K12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 held dual certifications (RID &amp; Ed:K12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% have worked in K-12 for 11 or more years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summit Results

- A national standard, higher than current state standards, was recommended.

- Understanding the educational system and on how Deaf/HH children learn was a stated as a training need.

- Only a small number of participants knew about the EIPA Guidelines for Professional Conduct.

- Qualified supervisors was identified as essential.

- Deaf/HH students from other countries, and with low language skills, constituted large majority of students.

- A national organization, specifically focused on educational interpreting was endorsed by the majority.
The overarching goal was to identify current practices in K-12 interpreting and to better prepare interpreters for educational settings.

The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, #H325K100234. However, this content does not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government or the Project Officer, Maryann McDermott.
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QUESTIONS

unco.edu/doit
**Other Resources**

- **Clerc Center:**

- **Classroom interpreting:**
  [http://www.classroominterpreting.org](http://www.classroominterpreting.org)

- **Hands and voices:**

- **RID Standard Practice Paper:**
  [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3DKvZMflFLdcFE2N25NM1NkaGs/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3DKvZMflFLdcFE2N25NM1NkaGs/view)

- **Pepnet 2:**

**Contacts**

- Leilani Johnson - University of Northern Colorado: leilani.johnson@unco.edu
- Marty Taylor – Interpreting Consolidated: mtaylor@connect.ab.ca
- Brenda Schick – University of Colorado Boulder: brenda.schick@Colorado.EDU
- Susan Brown – University of Northern Colorado – susan.brown@unco.edu
- Laurie Bolster - University of Northern Colorado – laurie.bolster@unco.edu