



Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment

Final Report

**SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE
NATIONAL CONSORTIUM OF INTERPRETER EDUCATION CENTERS (#H160A&B)
BY DENNIS COKELY & ELIZABETH WINSTON
NATIONAL INTERPRETER EDUCATION CENTER
OCTOBER 2008**

Foreword

The National Consortium of Interpreting Education Centers (NCIEC) is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education. Through grants awarded by the Department, the National Interpreter Education Center (NIEC) and five Regional Interpreter Education Centers (RIECs) that comprise the Consortium are working collaboratively to increase the number of qualified interpreters nationwide and ensure that quality interpreter education opportunities and products are available across the country.

A primary requirement of the NCIEC grants is to conduct ongoing activities to identify needs in the field of interpreter education. This report has been prepared based on the findings and conclusions of a national needs assessment specifically designed and carried out to collect and assess information from interpreter referral agencies across the country. This Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment Final Report is submitted by the NCIEC on behalf of the NIEC and the five RIECs. The report provides an overview of the needs assessment process, discussion of primary assessment findings, and presentation of recommendations and next steps for responding to those findings.

Acknowledgements

This report is submitted by Dr. Dennis Cokely and Dr. Betsy Winston, National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University (NIEC), with extensive help and input from:

- Sarah Snow, NIEC
- Karen Dahms, Scott Musich, External Consultants: NIEC

We also wish to extend special thanks to the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Center Directors and staff of the:

- National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University
- Northeastern University Regional Interpreter Education Center
- Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center
- CATIE Center at the College of St. Catherine
- Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Center
- Western Region Interpreter Education Center

We gratefully acknowledge the help and support of NAD, and most importantly, of all the consumers who responded to the survey. Without their active participation, this Needs Assessment would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Needs Assessment Findings	2
A.	Respondent Agency Size	3
	Full-time versus Part-time Interpreter Employees	
	Large Agency Respondents	
	Small Agency Respondents	
B.	Basic Information about All Respondents	6
	Year Respondent Agency Established	
	For-Profit versus Not-for-Profit Respondent Status	
	Administrative Staffing Information	
	Percentage of Respondent Business in State	
C.	Respondent Requirements for Interpreter Employees	8
	Requirements for Interpreter Certification	
	Non-compete Agreements	
	Minimum and Maximum Hours Worked	
	Respondent Agency Billing Information	
D.	Interpreter Pay and Benefits	11
	Full-time Interpreter Minimum and Maximum Starting Salary	
	Part-time Interpreter Pay	
	Provision of Benefits	
E.	Training and Professional Development	14
	In-service Training	
	Internships	
	Mentoring	
F.	Interpreting Services Offered	17
	Type of Service Offered	
	Most Frequently Requested Service	
	Least Frequently Requested Service	
G.	Service Requests Received	20
	Service Identifiers	
	Requests Received by Type of Service	
	Requests Received by Interpreting Setting	
H.	Percentage of Service Requests Filled	26
	Requests Filled by Type of Service	
	Requests Filled by Interpreting Setting	
III.	Conclusions	29
IV.	Appendix A: Interpreter Referral Agency Survey	32

National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment Report

I. Executive Summary

The National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC) is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education. The Consortium is comprised of the National Interpreter Education Center and five Regional Interpreter Education Centers. Since its inception, the NCIEC has been working on a number of national initiatives, one of which has been the design, development and implementation of needs assessment activities. The objectives of the NCIEC needs assessment activities are to identify current and future needs of interpreter education programs, interpreter educators, interpreters and consumers of interpreting services. This report, the **Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment Report**, marks the fourth completed NCIEC needs assessment activity.

The objective of the needs assessment process was to compile and establish baseline information regarding interpreter referral agencies, the services they provide, and the interpreters they employ. The assessment was carried out through design, development and implementation of an electronic survey instrument that was disseminated to interpreter referral agencies across the country. The survey instrument was developed by the NCIEC through a collaborative process that included extensive opportunities for input and feedback on the part of content experts and stakeholders throughout the field of interpreter education. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent to 154 referral agencies. In response, 34 completed electronic surveys were collected. Those surveys form the basis for the analysis and findings presented in this report.

The remainder of the report is organized into two primary sections. Section II presents both broad and detailed findings, identified through a comprehensive analysis of the information that was collected through the survey process. Section III of the report presents broad conclusions developed to designed assist the Consortium in understanding basic patterns and trends that emerged through the analysis process.

Completion of this report does not mark the end of the Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment process. Findings and results will be utilized by NCIEC to develop interpreter education priorities, to identify, establish and implement effective practices, and to institute appropriate and relevant evaluation processes. In addition, the Consortium will conduct follow-up needs assessment activities designed to further assess interpreter referral agency needs, as well as the needs of the various entities and organizations that request interpreter services, the interpreters that are employed by the referral agencies, and the consumers that utilize those services.

II. Needs Assessment Findings

This section of the report provides findings related to each question posed by the Interpreter Referral Agency survey instrument. Findings are organized into a number of sub-sections based on the type and range of data collected through the survey and the results of the analysis process.

The first category of findings provides information related to respondent agency size and provides a rationale for differentiating between the large and small respondent agencies. Within that section, information about the number of full-time and part-time interpreters employed by respondents is provided, as well as more detailed information about 'Large Agency' versus 'Small Agency' respondents, including information related to the state they are located in, the nearest metropolitan area, and the number of interpreters they employ. Throughout the remaining sections of findings presented in the report, information is reported and broken out by Large Agency respondent, Small Agency respondent, and for All Respondents.

The next category of findings provides basic information about the survey respondents, including information related to the year the agency was established, for-profit versus not-for-profit status, administrative staffing information, and the percentage of the business the respondent agency does within the state where they are located. The next section of findings reports information related to respondent requirements for the interpreters they employ, and includes specific information regarding interpreter certification, non-compete agreements, minimum and maximum hours worked, and agency billing practices.

Following that information, findings are presented related to interpreter pay and benefits. Specific information is reported regarding minimum and maximum starting salaries for full-time interpreter employees and hourly pay for part-time interpreters. Information collected through the survey regarding the respondent agency provision of benefits can also be found in this section of findings. Following the findings related to pay and benefits, information related to the respondent agency provision of training and professional development opportunities is discussed, including detailed information regarding the provision of in-service training, internships and mentoring.

A substantial portion of the overall report findings relate to the actual provision of interpreting services. Specifically, findings in this regard relate to the interpreting services offered by respondents; detailed information regarding service requests received by respondents within a six month timeframe, (broken out by type of service requested and the setting in which the service is to be provided), and data regarding the requests respondent agencies actually were able to fill in that same timeframe.

The final section of findings presents provides broad information on individual respondent agencies, organized by the NCIEC regional structure.

A. Respondent Agency Size

This preliminary section of findings reports information related to the number of full-time and part-time interpreters each respondent agency employs, and provides a state-by-state breakdown of large versus small agency respondent information.

Full-time Versus Part-time Respondent Interpreter Employees

Survey respondents were asked to report on the number of full-time and part-time interpreters they employ. This information was critical with regard to understanding the size of the 34 respondent agencies. Table 1 provides respondent information regarding the number of interpreters they employ.

Full-time and Part-time Interpreter Employees		
Table 1		
# of Interpreters	Respondents with Full-time Interpreters	Respondents with Part-time Interpreters
0-10	26	15
10-20	2	6
20-30	2	3
30-40	0	2
40-50	0	2
50-60	1	0
60-70	1	0
70-80	0	0
80-90	0	0
90-100	0	1
100+	0	0
No response	2	5
Total responses	34	34

Finding: The highest number of responses for both full-time and part-time interpreter employees fell in the 0-10 range. Specifically, 26 survey respondents reported they employ between 0-10 full-time interpreters, and 15 respondents reported they employ between 0-10 part-time interpreters. As a point of comparison, two respondents reported they employ between 50-60 and 60-70 full-time interpreters respectively. In addition, in the part-time category, two agencies reported they employ between 30-40 interpreters; two other agencies reported they employ between 40-50 interpreters, and one agency reported they employ between 90-100 interpreters.

In order to better understand differences with regard to the number of respondent full-time and part-time interpreter employees, a median number was assigned for each employee range, (e.g. the number five was assigned to the 0-10 employee range). Using that median number for each employee range and number of respondents selecting that range option, it would appear that respondent agencies generally employ more part-time than full-time interpreters. Based on the assigned median range average, of the total interpreter pool reported by respondents, 40% fall into the full-time

category and 60% into the part-time category. However, these percentages are based on an estimated median average and not 'hard' employee numbers, so can only be viewed as a possible trend regarding full-time versus part-time interpreter employment.

Differences regarding variation across the 34 respondent agencies with regard to the number of interpreters they employ drove the decision to differentiate between 'large' versus 'small' agency respondents in the analysis process. To that end, large agencies were defined as those that employ at least 20-30 full-time or part-time interpreters and small agencies were defined as those that employ no more than 20 full-time or part-time interpreters. Based on those criteria, there were ten agencies that were identified as 'large' and 24 respondents that fell into the small agency category.

Large Agency Respondents

Table 2 provides a listing of the ten survey respondents that met the Large Agency criteria.

Large Agency Respondents Table 2			
Location	Nearest Metro Area	Full-time Interpreters	Part-time Interpreters
Maryland	DC	60-70	0-10
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	50-60	30-40
Virginia	DC	20-30	40-50
Michigan	Flint	20-30	0-10
Utah	Salt Lake City	10-20	20-30
New York	NYC	0-10	90-100
California	Sacramento	0-10	40-50
California	San Francisco	0-10	30-40
Nevada	Las Vegas	0-10	20-30
Florida	West Palm	0-10	20-30

Findings: Looking at Table 2, it appears that 50% of the respondents classified as large employ very few full-time interpreters. Specifically, five of the ten Large Agency respondents reported they only employ between 0-10 full-time interpreters, and one agency reported they employ between 10-20 full-time interpreters. By comparison, eight of the ten Large Agency respondents reported they employ more than 20 part-time interpreters, with three agencies reporting they employ 40 or more part-time interpreters.

Once again, if each employee range is assigned a median average number, (e.g. the 0-10 employee range would be viewed as five interpreters), it would appear that the Large Respondent agencies rely more significantly on part-time interpreters than full-time. Using the assigned median averages, 62% of the reported interpreter employees are part-time, and 38% of the reported interpreter employees are full-time. As a reminder,

these percentages are only intended as potential indicators as they are based on an assigned median average and not hard employee numbers.

It is also interesting to note the relatively high number of interpreters that are serving the DC area.

Small Agency Respondents

Table 3 provides a listing of the 24 agencies that meet the Small Agency criteria.

Small Agency Respondents Table 3			
Location	Nearest Metro Area	Full-time Interpreters	Part-time Interpreters
New York	NYC	0-10	10-20
New York	Rochester	0-10	10-20
Georgia	Atlanta	0-10	0-10
Maryland	DC	0-10	No data
N. Carolina	Piedmont Triad	0-10	0-10
DC	DC	0-10	No data
Maryland	DC	0-10	0-10
S. Carolina	Columbia	0-10	0-10
Alabama	Mobile	0-10	0-10
Missouri	Kansas City	10-20	0-10
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	0-10	10-20
Ohio	Toledo	0-10	10-20
Michigan	Detroit	0-10	0-10
Illinois	Chicago	No data	No data
Illinois	Springfield/Bloom/Champ	0-10	0-10
Iowa	Des Moines	0-10	0-10
New Mexico	Albuquerque/Phoenix AX	0-10	No data
Nevada	Las Vegas	0-10	10-20
Oregon	Salem	0-10	10-20
California	San Francisco	0-10	0-10
Arizona	Phoenix	0-10	0-10
Arizona	Phoenix	0-10	0-10
California	Sacramento	0-10	0-10
Washington	Seattle	No data	No data

Findings: Once again, if each employee range is assessed a median number, (e.g. the 0-10 employee range would be viewed as five interpreters), it would appear that the Small Agency respondents also rely more on part-time interpreters than full-time interpreters. Using median number calculation, 56% of the reported interpreters are part-time, and only 44% of the reported interpreters are full-time. As a reminder, these percentages are based on median averages and not hard employee numbers. Although the Small Agency respondents employ more part-time than full-time

interpreters, they employ a slightly higher percentage of full-time interpreters (44%) than the Large Agency respondents (38%). Once again, these numbers can only be viewed as possible indicators versus hard data.

Throughout the remainder of the report, information is broken out and reported by Large Agency respondent, Small Agency respondent, and for All Respondents.

B. Basic Respondent Information

This portion of findings provides basic information including the year the respondent agency was established; for-profit versus not-for-profit status; administrative staffing information, and the portion of respondent business that is conducted within the state in which they reside.

Year Respondent Agency Established

Survey respondents were asked to report the year in which their agency was established. Responses were organized into five year ranges and presented on Table 4.

Year Respondent Agency Was Established Table 4			
Year Established	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
1970-1975	2	1	3
1976-1980	0	1	1
1981-1985	1	2	3
1986-1990	0	3	3
1991-1995	3	4	7
1996-2000	1	6	7
2001-2005	0	6	6
2006-2008	3	1	4
Total	10	24	34

Finding: In the All Respondent category, it is interesting to note that more than 70% of respondents were established after 1990; 29% in the last eight years.

For-Profit versus Not-for-Profit Status

Survey respondents were asked to report whether they were for-profit or not-for-profit. Table 5 provides responses to that query.

For-Profit Versus Not-for-Profit Respondent Information			
Table 5			
Status	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
For-profit	7	18	25
Not-for-profit	3	6	9
Total responses	10	24	34

Finding: As presented on Table 5, the majority of respondent agencies reported they are for-profit. Specifically 74% of All Respondents identified their agency as a for-profit organization.

Administrative Staffing Information

The survey asked respondents to report how many full-time and part-time administrative, non-interpreting, staff they employ. That information is provided on Table 6 for the Large Agency respondents, Small Agency respondents, and for All Respondents.

Number of Respondent Agency Full-time and Part-time Administrative Staff						
Table 6						
# of Staff	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
0 staff	2	1	3	10	5	11
1-5 staff	6	9	15	11	21	20
6-10 staff	0	0	4	2	4	2
11-15 staff	1	0	0	0	1	0
16-20 staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
21-25 staff	1	0	0	0	1	0
26-30 staff	0	0	1	0	1	0
40-45 staff	0	0	1	0	1	0
No response	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	10	10	24	24	34	34

Finding: With regard to information reported by Small Agency respondents, two of those respondents reported what appear to be excessively high numbers of administrative staff. Specifically, one Small Agency respondent reported they employed between 26-30 full-time administrative staff. In looking at information reported by that particular respondent regarding their interpreter employees, the respondent described their interpreters as 'on call sub-contractors.' This agency may in fact be a call center that links requests to interpreters, but provides no direct services. This may explain the high number of administrative staff they employ. The second Small Agency respondent

reported they employed between 40-45 full-time administrative staff, but earlier in the survey reported they only employed between 0-10 full-time interpreters and 0-10 part-time interpreters. This raises questions with regard to why that agency seems to employ a disproportionately higher number of full-time administrative staff than interpreter staff.

Percentage of Respondent Business in the State

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of annual business they conduct within state in which they are located. Responses to that question are provided on Table 7.

Percentage of Agency Business In State				
Table 7				
% In State	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents	% of All Respondents
0-10 %	0	1	1	3%
10-20%	0	1	1	3%
20-30%	0	1	1	3%
30-40%	0	1	1	3%
40-50%	2	1	3	9%
50-60%	1	0	1	3%
60-70%	0	4	4	12%
70-80%	1	0	1	3%
80-90%	3	4	7	21%
100%	3	11	14	41%

Finding: As presented on Table 7, 62% of All Respondents reported that more than 80% of their business is within the state where they are located. Looking at the Large Agency data, two respondents reported they only do between 40-50% of their business in state. Based on their responses to other questions in the survey, those two agencies further reported they provide primarily VRS services, and both reported their closest metropolitan area as DC. It is also interesting to note the Small Agency respondent information. Of those respondents, five reported they do less than 50% of their business in the state where they are located.

C. Respondent Requirements for Interpreter Employees

This section of findings provides respondent information regarding their agency requirements for interpreter certification; information regarding non-compete agreements; the minimum and maximum hours they require of their full-time and part-time interpreter employees, and agency billing practices.

Requirements for Interpreter Certification

The survey asked respondents what certification they expect of their interpreter hires. This question was open-ended in format and responses varied. However, there were some common response sets. Specifically, seven respondents reported they require their interpreter hires to have national certification; two respondents reported they require state certification; and seven respondents reported they require both state and national certification.

Non-Compete Agreements

The survey asked respondents to report whether or not they require their interpreter employees to sign non-compete agreements. Table 8 provides responses to that question.

Non-Compete Agreements Table 8						
Agency	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
Response type	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Yes	4	3	9	9	13	12
No	6	7	10	10	16	17
No response	0	0	5	5	5	5
Total	10	10	24	24	34	34

Finding: Based on data presented on Table 8, it appears that more respondents do not require their interpreter employees to sign a non-compete agreement than do.

Minimum and Maximum Hours Worked

Respondents were asked to report the minimum and maximum hours worked by both full-time and part-time interpreters. The information was reported in ranges listed on Table 9

Respondent Requirements for Minimum and Maximum Hours Worked
Table 9

Full-time	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
Ranges	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
1-10 hours	1	0	3	0	4	0
11-20 hours	2	0	7	0	9	0
21-30 hours	5	4	5	4	10	8
31-40 hours	0	4	0	9	0	13
50-60 hours	0	0	0	2	0	2
No response	2	2	9	9	11	11
Total responses	10	10	24	24	34	34
Part-time	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
Ranges	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
1-10 hours	8	0	7	0	15	0
11-20 hours	0	0	5	6	5	6
21-30 hours	1	4	0	6	1	10
31-40 hours	0	4	0	0	0	4
50-60 hours	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	1	2	12	12	13	14
Total responses	10	10	24	24	34	34

Finding: It is interesting to note that of All Respondents, four require their full-time interpreters to work a minimum of 1-10 hours per week; nine respondents require full-time interpreters to work 11-20 hours per week; and another 10 respondents require full-time interpreters to work between 21-30 hours per week. In many other industries, this level of weekly work would be considered ‘part-time.’ By comparison, ten of All Respondents reported that they require their part-time interpreters to work a maximum of 21-30 hours per week. It would appear that interpreters considered full-time by some agency respondents could potentially be labeled part-time by other respondents.

Agency Billing Information

Table 10 provides a breakdown of respondent billing practices.

Agency Billing			
Table 10			
Billing Breakdown	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
To the nearest half-hour	3	6	9
To the nearest hour	0	4	4
Two hour minimum	6	13	19
No response	1	1	2
Total responses	10	24	34

Finding: The highest number of both Large Agency and Small Agency respondents require a two hour minimum when providing interpreter services.

D. Interpreter Pay and Benefits

This section of findings includes information on: full-time interpreter starting salary; pay for part-time interpreters based on national certification and local credentials, and the type of benefits provided.

Full-time Interpreter Minimum and Maximum Starting Salary

The survey asked respondents to report on minimum and maximum starting salaries for their full-time interpreter employees. In the analysis process, salary ranges were established to better capture and report that information.

Full-time Interpreters Minimum and Maximum Starting Salary						
Table 11						
	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
Ranges	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
\$15-20K	0	0	2	0	2	0
\$21-30K	0	0	4	0	4	0
\$31-40K	2	1	6	3	8	4
\$41-50K	3	1	1	6	4	7
\$51-60K	1	1	1	2	2	3
\$61-70K	0	1	1	1	1	2
\$71-80K	0	0	0	1	0	1
\$81-90K	0	2	0	0	0	2

Findings: Looking first at the Large Agency respondents, most agencies reported they offer a minimum starting salary in the \$31-50K range. None of the Large Agency respondents reported they offer a minimum starting salary below that range. Two of the Large Agency respondents offer a maximum starting salary in the \$81-90K range. It is interesting to compare this information to that collected from the Small Agency respondents. Of the Small Agency respondents, six agencies reported they offer a minimum starting salary below \$30K; another six respondents reported they offer a minimum starting salary in the \$31-40K range. With regard to maximum starting salary, nine of the Small Agency respondents start their full-time interpreters at less than \$50K.

In order to better understand differences in full-time interpreter salary as offered by the Large Agency versus Small Agency respondents, a closer assessment of the actual salary amounts reported by respondents was conducted. Within each category, the actual reported salary amounts were aggregated and then averaged. Based on this formula, in the Large Agency respondent category, the average minimum starting salary was calculated as \$43,000; the average maximum starting salary was calculated as \$63,000. For the Small Agency respondents, the average minimum starting salary was calculated as \$34,000, and the average maximum starting salary as \$49,000. Based on this calculation, it can be reasonably extrapolated that the Large Agency

respondents are likely to begin their full-time interpreters at a higher salary than the Small Agency respondents.

Part-time Interpreter Pay

The survey also sought to gather information related to pay for part-time interpreter employees. Table 12 provides a breakdown of part-time interpreter pay, when those interpreters have national certification. Respondents reported what they charge their client as well as what the interpreter is actually paid.

Part-time Interpreter Pay with National Certification						
Table 12						
Hourly	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
	Client Charge	Interpreter Pay	Client Charge	Interpreter Pay	Client Charge	Interpreter Pay
\$10-20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$21-30	0	0	0	3	0	3
\$31-40	0	3	3	6	3	9
\$41-50	3	5	5	10	8	15
\$51-60	1	2	7	3	8	5
\$61-70	1	0	2	1	3	1
\$71-80	3	0	3	0	6	0
\$81-90	2	0	1	0	3	0
\$91-100	0	0	1	0	1	0
\$120-130	0	0	1	0	1	0

Finding: In order to better understand differences in part-time interpreter hourly wages as offered by the Large Agency versus Small Agency respondents, a closer assessment of the hourly amounts reported by respondents was conducted. Within each category, actual reported hourly wages were aggregated and then averaged. Based on this formula, in the Large Agency respondent category, the average client charge for a part-time interpreter with national certification is \$65 per hour; the average part-time interpreter pay is \$44 per hour. With regard to the Small Agency respondents, the average client charge for an interpreter with national certification was calculated at \$60 per hour; the average hourly pay for part-time interpreters was calculated at \$42 per hour.

Table 13 provides a breakdown of part-time interpreter pay, when those interpreters have local credentials. Once again, respondents reported what they charge their client as well as what the interpreter is actually paid.

Part-time Interpreter Pay with Local Credentials						
Table 13						
	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
Hourly	Client Charge	Interpreter Pay	Client Charge	Interpreter Pay	Client Charge	Interpreter Pay
\$10-20	0	1	0	2	0	3
\$21-30	0	4	3	11	3	15
\$31-40	0	3	2	4	2	7
\$41-50	4	0	6	2	10	2
\$51-60	1	0	3	1	4	1
\$61-70	1	0	3	1	4	1
\$71-80	1	0	1	0	2	0
\$81-90	1	0	2	0	3	0
\$91-100	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$120-130	0	0	1	0	1	0

Finding: In order to better understand differences in part-time interpreter hourly wages as offered by the Large Agency versus Small Agency respondents, a closer assessment of the hourly amounts reported by respondents was conducted. Within each category, the actual reported hourly wages were aggregated and then averaged. Based on this formula, in the Large Agency respondent category, the average client charge for a part-time interpreter with local credentials is \$58 per hour; the average part-time interpreter pay is \$28 per hour. With regard to the Small Agency respondents, the average client charge for an interpreter with local credentials was calculated at \$50 per hour; the average hourly pay for part-time interpreters was calculated at \$31 per hour. It is interesting to note that the Large Agency respondents appear to be charging more for their part-time interpreters than the Small Agency respondents are, but are paying their part-time interpreters less.

It is also interesting to take note of the differences between pay for part-time interpreters that have national certification versus local credentials. With regard to the Large Agency respondents, the average client charge for a part-time interpreter with national certification is \$65 per hour, as compared to an average client charge of \$58 for interpreters with local credentials. Those same Large Agency respondents pay their part-time interpreter with national credentials \$44 per hour, but only pay their part-time interpreter with local credentials \$28 per hour.

Looking at the Small Agency respondent wages, the average client charge for an interpreter with national certification was calculated at \$60 per hour, as compared to the average client charge for an interpreter with local credentials, calculated at \$50 per hour. Likewise, the Small Agency respondent average hourly pay for a part-time interpreter with national certification was calculated at \$42 per hour, versus \$31 per

hour paid to their part-time interpreter with local credentials only. This helps illustrate the perceived value of an interpreter that has achieved national certification.

Provision of Interpreters Benefits

The survey queried respondents regarding the provision of benefits to their full-time and part-time interpreter employees.

Benefits Provided by Respondent Agency						
Table 14						
Respondent	Large Agency		Small Agency		All Respondents	
Benefit Type	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
None	0	3	6	11	6	14
Health	6	1	13	3	19	4
Dental	5	1	9	3	14	4
Retirement	5	1	7	1	12	2
Profit-sharing	2	0	0	0	2	0
Professional Dev	8	5	13	4	21	9
Education	4	1	8	3	12	4
Other	8	3	7	2	15	5

Finding: All of the Large Agency respondents offer some level of benefits to their full-time interpreters. By comparison, six of the Small Agency respondents reported they do not provide benefits to their full-time interpreters. With regard to part-time interpreting employees, three of the Large Agency respondents reported they do not provide benefits to their part-time interpreters, as compared to 11 of the Small Agency respondents that reported they do not provide benefits to part-time interpreter staff.

As might be expected, there are more benefits offered to full-time interpreters than part-time interpreters by both Large and Small Agency respondents. In the All Respondents category, the benefits most often provided to full-time interpreters are professional development (21 respondents), followed by Health (19 respondents) and Dental (14 respondents).

E. Training and Professional Development

This section includes findings related to respondent agency provision of in-service training, internships, and opportunities for mentoring.

In-service Training

Respondents were asked if they provide in-service training for their full-time and part-time interpreters.

Provision of In-Service Training Table 15			
In-service Training Provision	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Provided for BOTH full and part-time interpreters	7	12	19
Provided for full-time interpreters ONLY	2	4	6
Provided for part-time interpreters ONLY	0	2	2
No response	1	6	7
Total responses	10	24	34

Finding: The majority of respondent agencies provide training for both their full-time and part-time interpreters; specifically, 19 of All Respondents reported they offer that training. Looking at the numbers more closely, 70% of the Large Agency respondents provide in-service training to both full-time and part-time interpreter employees, as compared to the Small Agency respondents, only 50% of which provide this training to both their full-time and part-time interpreter employees. The numbers drop considerably when looking at training that is provided to just full-time or part-time interpreter employees.

In a follow-up question, the survey asked those respondents that reported they do not offer in-service training if they would like to offer that training. In response to that question, ten respondents reported 'yes' and three reported 'no'.

The survey also asked those respondents that offer in-service training, how that training is delivered. Responses are provided on Table 16.

In-Service Training Delivery Modes Table 16			
In-service Training Delivery	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
In-house	1	1	2
Contract with outside trainers	1	3	4
Combination	6	12	18
Other	0	3	3
No response	2	5	7
Total responses	10	24	34

Finding: The majority of All Respondents deliver in-service training through a combination of in-house training and through contract with outside trainers.

Respondents were asked to report on the frequency with which they offer in-service training. That information is provided below.

In-Service Training Frequency			
Table 17			
Training Frequency	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Weekly	0	0	0
Monthly	1	1	2
Quarterly	3	2	5
Annually	0	2	2
As requested	2	9	11
Other	2	5	7
No response	2	5	7
Total responses	10	24	34

Finding: In the All Respondent category, it would appear that 26% of respondents provide in-service training on a scheduled basis (monthly, quarterly or annually). A slightly higher number of agencies provide their in-service training on an ‘as requested’ basis, specifically, 32% of All Respondents.

A final open-ended question related to in-service training asked respondents to identify the three ‘most frequently requested topics’ for in-service training. Responses varied widely, making them difficult to aggregate and compare, however, several topics were more frequently identified than others. Those include: legal, medical, mental health, ethics, voicing and certification preparation.

Internships

The survey also included a question related to the provision of internships in IEP programs. Table 18 provides responses to that question.

Provision of Internships in IEP Programs			
Table 18			
Response Type	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Yes	7	12	19
No	3	9	12
Paid	2	2	4
Unpaid	5	10	15

Finding: Looking at Table 18, Large Agency respondents appear to be more likely to offer internships than Small Agency respondents. Specifically, 70% of Large Agency respondents offer internships; only 30% do not. By comparison, 50% of Small Agency respondents offer internships and 38% do not. In the All Respondent category, it is evident that for those agencies that offer internships, most are unpaid. Specifically, 44% of All Respondents offer ‘unpaid’ internships; only 12% offer ‘paid’ internships.

Mentoring

Survey respondents were asked whether they provide their interpreter employees with opportunities for mentoring. Table 19 presents responses to that question.

Provision of Mentoring			
Table 19			
Mentoring	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Provided for Both full and part-time interpreters	7	12	19
Provided Only for full-time interpreters	1	3	4
Provided Only for part-time interpreters	0	1	1

Finding: Of the Large Agency respondents, 70% reported they provide mentoring to both their full-time and part-time interpreter employees. By comparison, 50% of the Small Agency respondents reported they provide mentoring to their full-time and part-time interpreters.

It is interesting to note that Large Agency versus Small Agency respondent information is consistent across the questions related to in-service training, internships and mentoring. It might be reasonable to assume that it is the same Large Agency respondents that report they provide these experiences across all three categories.

F. Interpreting Services Offered

Within this section of findings, information is organized by the type of services offered by survey respondents. In addition, survey respondents identified the services that are 'most frequently' and 'least frequently' requested.

Type of Services Offered

The survey provided respondents with a list of possible service offerings. Table 20 provides a listing of services respondents offer.

Interpreting Services Offered
Table 20

Interpreting Services Offered	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Interpreting ASL/English	9	24	33
Transliterating English-like signing	9	20	29
Transliterating Oral Facilitation	6	15	21
Interpreting ASL/Spanish	2	6	8
Interpreting ASL/other SL	3	5	8
Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation	2	2	4
VRS (sub-contracted)	1	4	5
VRS (in-house)	3	0	3
VRI (in-house)	3	3	6
VRI (sub-contracted)	0	1	1
CART (in-house)	0	1	1
CART (sub-contracted)	3	7	10

Finding: Whether looking at the Large Agency or Small Agency respondents, the three services most respondents reported they offer are: Interpreting ASL/English, Transliterating English-like signing, and Transliterating Oral Facilitation. Looking just at the Large Agency respondents, the next highest service response categories are: Interpreting ASL/Other SL (three respondents), VRS in-house (three respondents), VRI in-house (three respondents) and CART sub-contracted (three respondents). These differ slightly from the next level of Small Agency responses. With regard to the Small Agency respondents, the next highest service response categories are: CART sub-contracted (seven respondents), Interpreting ASL/Spanish (six respondents), and Interpreting ASL/Other SL (five respondents).

With regard to Interpreting ASL/Spanish, it is interesting that only two of the Large Agency respondents and six of the Small Agency respondents reported they provide that service.

Most Frequently Requested Service

Survey respondents were asked to report on the one service most frequently requested. That information is presented on the table below.

Most Frequently Requested Service			
Table 21			
Interpreting Services	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Interpreting ASL/English	7	18	25
Transliterating English-like signing	1	2	3
Transliterating Oral Facilitation	0	0	0
Interpreting ASL/Spanish	0	0	0
Interpreting ASL/other SL	0	1	1
Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation	0	0	0
VRS (in-house)	2	0	2
VRS (sub-contracted)	0	1	1
VRI (in-house)	0	1	1
VRI (sub-contracted)	0	0	0
CART(in-house)	0	0	0
CART (sub-contracted)	0	0	0

Finding: By far, the most frequently requested service is Interpreting ASL/English. Of the Large Agency respondents, 70% identified that service as the most frequently requested; 75% of the Small Agency respondents also identified that service as most frequently requested. Again looking just at the Large Agency respondents, two agencies identified VRS in-house as the most frequently requested service. Both of these agencies service the DC area.

Least Frequently Requested Service

Survey respondents were also asked to report on the one service least frequently requested. That information is presented on the table below.

Least Frequently Requested Services			
Table 22			
Interpreting Services	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Interpreting ASL/English	0	1	1
Transliterating English-like signing	0	1	1
Transliterating Oral Facilitation	1	10	11
Interpreting ASL/Spanish	3	2	5
Interpreting ASL/other SL	1	1	2
Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation	2	4	6
VRS (in-house)	1	0	1
VRS (sub-contracted)	0	0	0
VRI (in-house)	1	1	2
VRI (sub-contracted)	0	0	0
CART (in-house)	0	0	0
CART (sub-contracted)	1	2	3

Finding: Of the Large Agency respondents, three agencies selected Interpreting ASL/Spanish as least frequently requested, and two agencies selected Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation. With regard to the Small Agency respondents, ten agencies selected Transliterating Oral Facilitation as least frequently requested, and four agencies selected Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation.

G. Service Requests Received

Information in this section provides respondent information related to numbers of service requests received. Specifically, the survey collected information regarding the number of requests received by **type of service** over a six month timeframe (January 1 through June 30, 2006). The survey also collected information regarding the number of requests received for services in a specific **interpreting setting** over the same six month timeframe. However, many respondents did not provide a response to survey questions regarding service requests, or provided non-numeric responses that could not be included in the quantifiable analysis.

Service Identifiers

In the analysis of information collected through the Interpreter Referral Agency survey, it was discovered that survey questions used slightly different terminology to identify or label the types of services offered or provided. A single list of setting identifiers was developed for the purposes of analyzing and comparing data collected through those discrete questions.

Interpreting

- Interpreting ASL/English
- Interpreting ASL/Spanish
- Interpreting ASL/other SL

Transliterating

- Transliterating English-like signing

Oral Facilitation

- Transliterating Oral Facilitation

Cued Speech Facilitation

- Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation

VRS

- VRS (in-house)
- VRS (sub-contracted)

VRI

- VRI (in-house)
- VRI (sub-contracted)

CART

- CART (in-house)
- CART (sub-contracted)

Requests Received by Type of Service

As a reminder, not every agency offers all of the services listed below. However, a number of agencies reported they offered a particular type of service early in the survey, but then did not provide data regarding the number of requests they received for that same service offering in response to subsequent survey questions. Table 23 is intended to provide information about the number of agencies that reported they offered a particular type of service, the number of agencies that reported information regarding number of requests received over the six month timeframe for those services, and the actual number of service requests received.

Requests Received – All Respondents			
Table 23			
Type of Service	Agencies Offering Service	Agencies Reporting Requests	Requests Received
Interpreting	33	21	40,032
Transliterating	29	9	3,909
Oral Facilitation	21	4	254
Cued Speech	4	1	3
VRS	7	2	7,478
VRI	6	2	118
CART	10	5	601
Other	10	1	5
Total responses	N/A	N/A	52,398

Finding: In each service category, the number of All Respondents that reported they offer a particular type of service is higher than the number of All Respondents that reported numeric information with regard to number of requests received from January 1 through June 30, 2006 for that particular type of service. For example, 33 of All Respondents reported they offer interpreting services (Table 20). However, only 21 of All Respondents, or 63% of respondents, provided numeric data regarding the number of requests for interpreting services they received during the six months. In addition, on Table 21, 26 of All Respondents reported that Interpreting services were the ‘most frequently’ requested type of service. Therefore, it can be reasonably assumed that the number of service requests reported for interpreting would be higher had all respondents that reported they offer that service provided a numeric response regarding requests received.

This same issue with regard to discrepancies in data reported bears out in the service categories of Transliterating and Oral Facilitation, both of which had relatively high numbers of All Respondents reporting they offer the service, but very low numbers of respondents reporting having received requests for those services over the six month timeframe. With regard to Transliterating, of All Respondents, 29 respondents reported they offer this service (Table 20), but only nine agencies provided numeric responses regarding the number of service requests received over the six month timeframe. With regard to Oral Facilitation, 21 of All Respondents reported the offer this service, but only four respondents provided numeric data regarding the number of service requests

received over the six months. In addition, 11 respondents identified Oral Facilitation as the 'least frequently' requested service (Table 22), which could contribute to the low number of respondents reporting requests received.

In summary, because many respondents did not report information related to service requests received, numbers are significantly lower than they should be. It might be reasonable to assume that the lack of data reported regarding requests received could be attributed to that data not being easily accessible to survey takers.

Table 24 provides a breakdown of the service requests received during the six months by type of respondent agency.

Requests for Services (January 1 – June 30, 2006)			
Table 24			
Interpreting Services	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Respondents
Interpreting	19,123*	20,909	40,032
Transliterating	754	3,155	3,909
Oral Facilitation	20	234	254
Cued Speech Facilitation	3	0	3
VRS	7,473**	5	7,478
VRI	113	5	118
CART	107	494	601
Other	0	3	3
Total	27,593	24,805	52,398

Finding: Again, it must be recalled that based on Table 23, a significant number of respondents did not provide numeric data regarding service requests received. However, looking just at that numeric data that was reported, it is interesting to note that the Small Agency respondents appear to receive significantly more requests for Transliterating services than do the Large Respondent agencies. In the VRS category, nearly 100% of the VRS requests reported come from one Large Agency respondent. Specifically, 7,473 of the total 7,478 requests received for VRS services were reported by one Large Agency respondent in Maryland, serving the DC area. That same agency accounted for 31% of the total Interpreting Service requests reported (or 12,373 requests). The high portion of requests in these two service categories accounted for by just one Large Agency respondent helps to illustrate how just one agency not reporting numeric data could potentially skew the overall analysis.

Requests Received by Service Type versus Interpreting Setting

As well as collecting information regarding requests received from January 1 through June 30, 2006 by type of service, the survey also asked respondents to break out the requests they received over those same six months by interpreting setting. Table 25 compares the number of total requests for services with the number of requests reported by interpreting setting. The purpose of this table is to illustrate how lack of

data available as discussed with regard to requests by type of service are even more notable when reported by interpreting setting.

Requests by Type of Service Compared to Requests by Interpreting Setting			
Table 25			
January 1–June 30, 2006	Large Agency	Small Agency	All Agencies
Total Requests by Service	27,593	24,805	52,398
Total Requests by Setting	10,223	13,461	23,684

Finding: It would be expected that the two sets of numbers of requests reported would be equal, as they cover the same six month time period. However, as evidenced on Table 25, the overall numbers of requests reported by type of service was higher than the total numbers of requests reported by respondents regarding interpreting setting. It might be assumed that respondents did not have information readily available to assign requests they received over the six month timeframe to a specific interpreting setting.

Requests Received by Interpreting Setting

The survey provided respondents the opportunity to report requests received from January 1 through June 30, 2006, by specific interpreting settings and sub-settings. Table 26 provides a listing of the total requests reported by broad interpreting setting. Following this information, Table 27 provides a further breakdown of requests reported by setting and sub-setting.

Service Requests Received by Interpreting Setting (Jan 1 – June 30, 2006)			
Table 26			
Requests Received	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Agency Requests
Medical	201	2,429	2,630
Mental Health	428	380	808
Legal	147	512	659
Law Enforcement	29	30	59
Business	7,390	2,114	9,504
Conferences	7	511	518
Social Services	125	2,546	2,671
Education	1,871	4,228	6,099
Religious	19	141	160
Performing Arts	6	373	379
Other	0	197	197
Total All Settings	10,223	13,461	23,684

Finding: Before looking too closely at Table 26, it must be recalled that a significant number of respondents did not report numeric data regarding service requests by interpreting setting. However, it is interesting to look at that data which was reported numerically as potential trend data. In the All Agency Requests category, the highest

numbers of requests were reported in the following settings: Business (9,504), Education (6,099), Social Services (2,671) and Medical (2,630). The requests received by All Agency respondents in Business settings account for 40% of the total requests reported in all settings, and requests in the Education settings account for 26% of all requests reported.

It is also interesting to compare the responses reported by the Large Agency respondents with those reported by the Small Agency respondents. In the Large Agency category, the two highest settings were: Business (7,390) and Education (1,871). The Large Agency requests for services in Business settings account for 78% of total requests in that setting, and requests for services in Education settings 31% of total requests in that setting. Requests in these two categories alone account for 91% of the total Large Agency requests reported.

In the Small Agency category, the settings with the highest number of responses were: Education (4,228), Social Services (2,546), Medical (2,429) and Business (2,114). The Small Agency respondents account for 69% of the total requests for services in Education settings; 95% of Social Services total requests; 92% of Medical total service requests, and 22% of total Business requests. Requests in these four categories combined account for 84% of the total Small Agency requests reported.

Table 27 provides a further breakdown of requests reported by interpreting setting and sub-setting.

Service Requests Received by Interpreting Setting (Jan 1 – June 30, 2006)			
Table 27			
Medical	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
In-patient	13	601	614
Out-patient	127	1,151	1,278
Emergency	61	642	703
Other	0	35	35
Total Requests	201	2,429	2,630
Mental Health	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
In-patient services	281	50	331
Out-patient	145	306	451
Self-help (12 step)	2	20	22
Other	0	4	4
Total Requests	428	380	808
Legal	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Court proceedings	97	282	379
Depositions	29	103	132
Attorney Meetings	21	122	143
Other	0	5	5
Total Requests	147	512	659

Service Requests Received by Interpreting Setting (Jan 1 – June 30, 2006)
Table 27 (continued)

Law Enforcement	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Emergency	18	25	43
Interrogation	9	5	14
Other	2	0	2
Total Requests	29	30	59
Business	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	Total Requests
Client meetings	7,174	1,009	8,183
Employee needs	216	984	1,200
Other	0	121	121
Total Requests	7,390	2,114	9,504
Conferences	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	Total Requests
Local	5	136	141
Regional	1	37	38
National	1	338	339
Total Requests	7	511	518
Social Services	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
VR	72	1,930	2,002
Social Security	53	580	633
Other	0	36	36
Total Requests	125	2,546	2,671
Education	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Elementary	201	454	655
Middle School	20	391	411
High School	212	939	1,151
College/Universities	1,438	2,294	3,732
Voc/Technical	0	150	150
Total Requests	1,871	4,228	6,099
Religious	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Services	19	113	132
Education	0	28	28
Total Requests	19	141	160
Performing Arts	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Museums/Exhibits	3	89	92
Concerts	3	284	287
Total Requests	6	373	379
Other Venues	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Other	0	197	197
Total Requests	0	197	197
All Settings	Large Agency Requests	Small Agency Requests	All Requests
Total All Settings	10,223	13,461	23,684

Findings: It is interesting to look more closely at a few of the sub-setting categories. Within Medical settings, the Out-patient sub-setting accounts for 49% of total Medical

requests. Of the 1,278 requests reported in the Out-patient sub-setting, 1,151 requests were reported by the Small Agency respondents, as compared to only 127 requests reported by the Large Agency respondents.

Within Business settings, the Client Meeting sub-setting accounts for 86% of total Business requests reported by All Respondents. Of the 8,183 requests reported in the Client Meeting sub-setting, 7,174 requests were reported by the Large Agency respondents, as compared to only 1,009 requests reported by the Small Agency respondents. Looking at Social Services settings, the VR sub-setting comprises 75% of the total Social Services requests reported by respondents. The Small Agency respondents account for 1,930 of the total 2,002 requests received in that sub-setting, or 96% of all VR service requests reported.

With regard to Education settings, requests for services in the sub-setting College/Universities account for 62% of the total Education requests reported. Of the total 3,732 requests reported in that sub-setting Small Agency respondents reported 2,294 requests and Large Agency respondents reported 1,438 requests.

H. Percentage of Service Requests Filled

Findings in this section provide respondent information regarding Requests Filled by Type of Service and Requests Filled by Interpreting Setting.

Requests Filled by Type of Service

The survey asked respondents to indicate what percentage of requests they receive for a particular type of service they were able to fill during the January 1 through June 30, 2006 timeframe. That information is reported on Table 28.

Percentage of Requests Filled by Type of Service (Jan 1 – June 30, 2006)
Table 28

Large Agency Respondents										
Type of Service	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Interpreting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
Transliterating	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Oral Facilitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Cued Speech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
VRS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
VRI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
CART	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Small Agency Respondents										
Type of Service	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Interpreting	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	2	12
Transliterating	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	10
Oral Facilitation	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
Cued Speech	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
VRS	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
VRI	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
CART	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
All Agency Respondents										
Type of Service	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Interpreting	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	3	16
Transliterating	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	15
Oral Facilitation	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10
Cued Speech	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
VRS	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
VRI	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
CART	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5

Finding: Looking broadly at data reported on Table 28, it appears that overall Small Agency respondents experience more difficulty filling requests for services than do the Large Agency respondents. This is most evident when assessing the 1-10% category.

Requests Filled by Interpreting Setting

The survey asked respondents to indicate what percentage of requests they were able to fill within each major interpreting setting and sub-setting during the January 1 through June 30, 2006 timeframe. That information is reported on Table 29.

Percentage of All Respondent Requests Filled by Setting (Jan 1 – June 30, 2006)

Table 29

Medical	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
In-patient	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	13
Out-patient	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	14
Emergency	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	12
Mental Health	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
In-patient	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	12
Out-patient	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	16
Self-help	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	9
Legal	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Court	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	9
Depositions	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	11
Attorney	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	13
Law Enforce	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Emergency	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	13
Interrogation	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	12
Business	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Client meetings	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	16
Employee needs	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	15
Social Service	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
VR	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	11
Social Security	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	13
Conferences	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Local	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	12
Regional	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	10
National	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10
Education	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Elementary	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	9
Middle School	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	9
High School	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	9
College/Univer	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	11
Voc/Technical	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	9
Religious	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Services	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	7
Education	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	5
Perform Arts	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Museum/Exhibit	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	8
Concerts	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	9
Other Venues	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%
Other	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6

Finding: While the majority of respondents reported they were able to fill requests between 90-100% of the time, it is worth noting that in each broad setting category, a

number of respondents also reported they had difficulty filling requests (1-10% and 10-20% specifically).

III. Conclusions

Based on the data collected through the Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment process, the following broad conclusions can be drawn. During the next 2 years, the NCIEC will continue to gather data from referral agencies that will help us better understand the supply and demand challenges facing referral agencies and the deaf community.

Conclusion 1

The survey achieved a 22% response rate, and therefore analysis findings and results can be viewed only as possible indicators of a particular issue or need, versus definitive evidence. That stated, there are a number of patterns and trends that did emerge through the analysis that can provide useful direction to the NCIEC.

Conclusion 2

There were a significant number of respondents unable to provide numeric data regarding the number of requests for services they received, or to identify the number of requests they received by the setting in which the service was to be provided. Future surveys that attempt to collect this information should include advance notification to ensure this data is available and accessible at the time the survey is being completed.

Conclusion 3

There appear to be differences between the large versus small interpreter referral agency respondents in a number of key areas, including number of interpreter employees, pay and benefits provided, training offered, and to a less significant extent, requests for services received and interpreting settings most served.

Conclusion 4

A majority of both large and small respondent agencies employ more part-time interpreters than full-time interpreters.

Conclusion 5

Large agencies are more likely to offer benefits packages to their full-time and part-time interpreter employees than are the small agencies.

Conclusion 6

Large agencies are more likely to provide in-service training, internships and/or mentoring opportunities to their interpreter employees than are the small agencies.

Conclusion 7

Starting salaries offered to full-time interpreters by the large agencies are higher than the starting salaries offered by the smaller agencies.

Conclusion 8

Both large and small agencies pay their part-time interpreters with national certification more than they pay their part-time interpreters with local credentials. In addition, both large and small agencies bill clients more for nationally certified interpreters than interpreters with local credentials.

Conclusion 9

Small agencies appear to pay their part-time interpreters with local credentials slightly more than do the large agencies, although the large agencies bill their clients slightly more for part-time interpreter services than do the small agencies.

Conclusion 10

The three services most commonly offered by all survey respondents are: Interpreting ASL/English, Transliterating English-like signing and Transliterating Oral Facilitation.

Conclusion 11

ASL/Spanish is not a service readily available through the survey respondent agencies. Only two large agencies and six small agencies out of the total 34 survey respondents reported they offer Interpreting ASL/Spanish interpreting services.

Conclusion 12

The most frequently requested service reported by all respondents is Interpreting ASL/English. Of the large agencies, 70% identified that service as the most frequently requested; 75% of the small agencies identified that service as most frequently requested.

Conclusion 13

The two services identified as least frequently requested by the large agencies were Interpreting ASL/Spanish and Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation. The two services identified as least frequently requested by the small agencies were Transliterating Oral Facilitation and Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation.

Conclusion 14

It appears that one or two large agencies account for most of the VRS services reported as received in the survey. Both respondents serve the DC area.

Conclusion 15

Survey respondents reported very low numbers of requests for CART, Oral Facilitation, VRI or Cued Speech services. In addition, while the number of requests reported for VRS was significantly higher than those reported for the above service categories, most requests were reported by one agency.

Conclusion 16

Large agencies reported they received most of their requests for services from Business and Education settings, which combined, account for 91% of the large agency requests

reported in the survey. Small agencies reported most of their requests come from Education, Social Services, Medical and Business settings. Requests from these four settings account for 84% of the total small agency requests reported.

Conclusion 17

Very few requests for interpreting services were received in the settings of Law Enforcement, Religious, and Performing arts. The requests in these settings account for less than 3% of all requests reported by respondents in the survey.

Appendix A

Interpreter Referral Agency Survey

National Needs Assessment: Interpreter Referral Agencies

1 In what state is your agency located?

2 What percent of your annual agency interpreter business is in this state?

3 What is the largest metropolitan area near your agency?

4 What year was your agency founded?

5 How many **full time** administrative and support staff does your agency employ? This does not include interpreters or other direct service providers.

6 How many **part time** administrative and support staff does your agency employ? This does not include interpreters or other direct service providers.

Services:

7 Is your agency a for-profit or not-for-profit agency?

- for-profit
- not-for-profit
- Other, please specify

8 What general services does your agency offer? Please select all that apply.

- Interpreting ASL/English
- Interpreting ASL/Spanish

- Interpreting ASL/other SL
- Transliterating English-like signing
- Transliterating Oral Facilitation
- Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation
- CART - your own CART services
- CART - sub-contract to another vendor
- Video Relay Service - your own VRS services
- Video Relay Service - sub-contract to another vendor
- VRI - your own VRI services
- VRI - sub-contract to another vendor
- Other, please specify

9 What is the **most frequently requested** type of service that your agency offers?

- Interpreting ASL/English
- Interpreting ASL/Spanish
- Interpreting ASL/other SL
- Transliterating English-like signing
- Transliterating Oral Facilitation
- Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation
- CART - your own CART services
- CART - sub-contract to another vendor
- Video Relay Service - your own VRS services
- Video Relay Service - sub-contract to another vendor
- VRI - your own VRI services
- VRI - sub-contract to another vendor

10 What is the **least frequently requested** type of service that your agency offers?

- Interpreting ASL/English
- Interpreting ASL/Spanish
- Interpreting ASL/other SL
- Transliterating English-like signing
- Transliterating Oral Facilitation
- Transliterating Cued Speech Facilitation
- CART - your own CART services
- CART - sub-contract to another vendor
- Video Relay Service - your own VRS services
- Video Relay Service - sub-contract to another vendor
- VRI - your own VRI services
- VRI - sub-contract to another vendor

Please click Submit to continue on to page 2...



Survey Page 1

National Needs Assessment: Interpreter Referral Agencies

Full-time Interpreters

11 How many full-time interpreters does your agency employ?

12 What is the **minimum** number of hours per week your full-time interpreters **actually interpret**?

13 What is the **maximum** number of hours per week your full-time interpreters **actually interpret**?

14 What are your agency requirements to hire someone full-time?

15 What benefits does your agency offer full-time interpreters? Please select all that apply.

- None
- Health
- Dental
- Retirement
- Profit-sharing
- Professional Development
- Education benefits
- Other, please specify

16 What is the **minimum** starting annual salary your agency pays full-time interpreters?

17 What is the **maximum** starting annual salary your agency pays full-time interpreters?

18 Does your agency require full-time interpreters to sign a non-compete agreement?

YES

NO

Part-time Interpreters

19 How many part-time interpreters does your agency employ?

20 What is the **minimum** number of hours per week your part-time interpreters **actually interpret**?

21 What is the **maximum** number of hours per week your part-time interpreters **actually interpret**?

22 What are your agency requirements to hire someone part-time?

23 What benefits does your agency offer part-time interpreters? Please select all that apply.

- None
- Health
- Dental
- Retirement

- Profit-sharing
- Professional Development
- Education benefits
- Other, please specify

24 Does your agency require part-time interpreters to sign a non-compete agreement?

25 For one-time assignments does your agency bill:

- To the nearest half hour
- To the nearest hour
- Two hour minimum
- Other, please specify

Payment and Rates

26 What is the hourly range your agency **charges/bills** for part-time **nationally certified** interpreters?

27 What is the hourly range your agency **pays** part-time **nationally certified** interpreters?

28 What is the hourly range your agency **charges/bills** for **locally credentialed (i.e. state level)** interpreters?

29 What is the hourly range your agency **pays** part-time **locally credentialed (i.e. state level)** interpreters?

Please click Submit to continue on to page 3...



National Needs Assessment: Interpreter Referral Agencies

Service Requests

30 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive for:

Interpreting	
Transliterating	
Oral facilitation	
Cued Speech Facilitation	
CART	
VRS	
VRI	
Other	

31 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Medical venues:

In-patient	
Out-patient	
Emergency	
Other	

32 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Mental Health venues:

In-patient services	
Out-patient counseling	
Self-Help (12 step programs)	
Other	

33 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Legal venues:

Court proceedings	<input type="text"/>
Depositions	<input type="text"/>
Meetings with attorneys	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

34 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Law Enforcement venues:

Emergency	<input type="text"/>
Interrogation	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

35 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Business venues:

Client meetings	<input type="text"/>
Employee needs	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

36 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Social Services venues:

Vocational Rehabilitation	<input type="text"/>
Social Security Services	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

37 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Conference venues:

Local	<input type="text"/>
Regional	<input type="text"/>
National	<input type="text"/>

38 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Educational venues:

Elementary	<input type="text"/>
Middle School	<input type="text"/>
High School	<input type="text"/>
College/University	<input type="text"/>
Vocational/Technical	<input type="text"/>

39 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Religious venues:

Services	<input type="text"/>
Education	<input type="text"/>

40 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in each of the following specific Performing Arts venues:

Museums/ exhibitions	<input type="text"/>
Concerts	<input type="text"/>

41 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 how many **total requests** for services did your agency receive in Other venues not listed above:

Other:	<input type="text"/>
--------	----------------------

Please click Submit to continue on to page 4...



Survey Page 3

National Needs Assessment: Interpreter Referral Agencies

Service Request Fulfillment

42 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill:

	1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
Interpreting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transliterating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Oral facilitation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cued Speech Facilitation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CART	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
VRS	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
VRI	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

43 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Medical venues:

	1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
In-patient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out-patient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emergency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

44 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Mental Health venues:

	1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
In-patient services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out-patient counseling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-Help (12 step programs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- 45** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Legal venues:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0-10 10-20 20-30 30-40 40-50 50-60 60-70 70-80 80-90 90-100

Court proceedings

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Depositions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Meetings with attorneys

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- 46** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Law Enforcement venues:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0-10 10-20 20-30 30-40 40-50 50-60 60-70 70-80 80-90 90-100

Emergency

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Interrogation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- 47** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Business venues:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0-10 10-20 20-30 30-40 40-50 50-60 60-70 70-80 80-90 90-100

Client meetings

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Employee needs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Other

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- 48** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Social Services venues:

1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
Vocational Rehabilitation									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social Security Services									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 49** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Conference venues:

1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
Local									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
National									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 50** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Educational venues:

1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
Elementary									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle School									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
High School									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College/University									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vocational/Technical									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 51** During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Religious venues:

1 0-10	2 10-20	3 20-30	4 30-40	5 40-50	6 50-60	7 60-70	8 70-80	9 80-90	10 90-100
Services									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education									
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

52 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in each of the following specific Performing Arts venues:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0-10	10-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-60	60-70	70-80	80-90	90-100

Museums/exhibitions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Concerts

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

53 During the six-month period from January 1, 2006 until June 30, 2006 what **percent of each request** for services was your agency able to fill in Other venues not listed above:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0-10	10-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-60	60-70	70-80	80-90	90-100

Other:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

What type of venue was this?

Please click Submit to continue on to the last page...



Survey Page 4

National Needs Assessment: Interpreter Referral Agencies

In-service Training

54 Does your agency provide in-service training for full-time and part-time interpreters?

- Yes.
- No, we only provide training for part-time interpreters.
- No, we only provide training for full-time interpreters.

55 If yes – how do you provide training?

- In-house
- Contract with outside trainers

- Combination
- Other, please specify

56 How frequent are your in-service trainings?

- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- As requested
- Other, please specify

57 What are the three most requested areas for in-service training?

1.

2.

3.

58 If no (to question 54 above) – would your agency like to see in-service training offered?

59 If no (to question 54 above) – what top three needs do you see?

1.

2.

3.

60 Does your agency provide mentoring for new full and part-time interpreters?

- Yes.
- No, they only provide mentoring for part-time interpreters.
- No, they only provide mentoring for full-time interpreters.

61 If yes, please describe your mentoring program:

62 If no, would you like to have a mentoring program?

Additional Comment

63 Does your agency provide internships for students in IEP programs?

64 If yes, how long are the student internships?

65 Are the internships paid or unpaid?

- Paid
 Unpaid

66 Please describe the internship program:

Thank you for taking our survey. Please click Submit to finish.

