NIEC

NATIONAL INTERPRETER EDUCATION CENTER

Report on Referral Agencies Needs Assessment

Prepared for the Rehabilitation Services Administration by:

Cathy Cogen, Center Director
Dennis Cokely, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
National Interpreter Education Center at
Northeastern University

Boston, Massachusetts
March 2013

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 initiative designed and carried out to assess the needs of interpreter practitioners across the country. This Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment Trends Analysis is submitted by the NCIEC on behalf of the NIEC and the five RIECs. The report provides an overview of the needs assessment process and discusses and compares discrete assessment findings.

Acknowledgements

Foreword

The National Interpreter Education Center 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) 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 NIEC grant 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 assess the needs of interpreter referral agencies. This 2012 Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment Final Report provides an overview of the needs assessment process and a detailed discussion of primary assessment findings. The report also identifies changes in needs based on a comparative analysis to needs assessment activities completed in the previous grant cycle.

Table of Contents

2012 Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment
Final Report

Executive Summary

The American Sign Language Program at Northeastern University was been awarded a five-year grant to continue to serve as the National Interpreter Education Center (NIEC) from October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2015. The NIEC is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education, and is one of six centers that comprise a national consortium of interpreter education centers.

The terms of the RSA grant require the NIEC to: "Conduct education needs assessments and, based on results, develop educational activities for delivery through the Regional Interpreter Education Centers." In the previous grant cycle a primary focus area was the design, development and implementation of needs assessment activities in key focus areas. The overall objectives of those activities were to identify current and future needs of interpreter education programs, interpreter educators, interpreters and consumers of interpreter services. A list of needs assessment activities and reports completed in the previous cycle are available on-line at the NIEC website: http://www.interpretereducation.org/resources-technical-assistance/educational-supports-services/, and by scrolling to the Needs Assessment section of the website.

In the previous grant, the first Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment was carried out in 2008 through design, development and implementation of an on-line survey instrument. The survey instrument was developed by the NCIEC through a collaborative process that included opportunities for input and feedback on the part of content experts and stakeholders throughout the field of interpreter education. Invitations to participate in the first survey were sent to 154 referral agencies. In response, 34 agencies participated in the survey process. Those surveys form the basis for the analysis and findings presented in the first Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment Final Report, October 2008, which can be found at the web-site listed above.

Based on the findings of the 2008 effort, the interpreter referral agency survey instrument was revised and updated, and disseminated a second time to 307 interpreter referral agencies in September 2012. There were three primary objectives planned for the second dissemination of the survey:

- Improve and streamline the original survey instrument based on information captured and lessons learned in the first effort
- Collect and compare information and findings generated through the first survey effort to information collected through the second survey four years later
- Identify new or changed needs and emerging trends related to the needs of interpreter referral agencies, the practitioners they hire and the consumers they serve

The second survey period concluded in October 2012 and 135 referral agencies participated in the survey, resulting in a 44% participation rate overall. Design of the second survey drew heavily on the first interpreter referral agency survey instrument to support consistency and facilitate the effective comparison of information over time. However, information collected in the first survey also pointed to new areas of interest for future data collection, as well as areas for improvement in the overall survey design and implementation process. As a result, the 2012 survey instrument was not identical to the survey disseminated in 2008. In addition, new survey software was purchased through the grant, allowing more in-depth analysis of the data collected in the 2012 effort.

This report presents both broad and detailed findings, identified through a comprehensive analysis of the information that was collected through the survey 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 the questions posed by the 2012 Interpreter Referral Agency survey instrument. Findings are organized into a number of sub-categories based on the type and range of data collected through the survey and the results of the analysis process.

The first category of survey findings provides basic information about respondents, including the type of agency they operate, the year they were established, the number of interpreters they employ, and the geographic area they serve. The second category of findings includes detailed information related to interpreter credentials, benefits and pay. Following that section of findings, information is presented related to the demand for interpreter services; changes in demand, and factors that contribute to those changes. Another category of data presents information related to the provision of Video Relay Services (VRS) and Video Remote Interpreting (VRI). A substantial portion of the overall report findings relate specifically to the provision of interpreting services. A sub-section of findings in this regard provides information related to the frequency with which respondents received requests for interpreting services, their success filling the requests they receive, and the ease or difficulty associated with filling those requests. A final section of the report provides information related to future interpreter training and education needs.

Although 135 respondents participated in the 2012 Referral Agency Needs Assessment Survey, not all respondents answered all questions. In fact, throughout the survey, there was disparity with regard to the number of respondents that answered any of the questions. Because of this disparity, the hard number of responses received for each question is provided on each data table, and percentages are calculated on that hard number. Future survey instruments may include a feature that requires respondents to provide an answer to a question before moving on to the next question. However, overall, the respondent response rate to the questions asked in the 2012 Survey was very high.

A. Basic Respondent Information

Questions in the 2012 interpreter referral agency survey asked respondents to report on the type of agency or service they operate, the year their agency was established, the number of interpreters they employ, and the geographic area they serve.

An initial question queried respondents regarding whether their agency operates on a for-profit or not for-profit basis, or as a public service provided by the state. Responses are presented on Table 1.

Type of Referral Agency Table 1		
Type of Agency	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
For-profit agency/service	82	81%
Not for-profit agency/service	18	18%
Public service provided by the state	1	1%
Total	**101**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of survey respondents reported they are a for-profit agency or service (81% of respondents).

The survey provided a list of provider descriptors which respondents could select from to best describe their agency or service. Responses are provided on Table 2.

Description of Respondent Agency Table 2		
Description of Agency	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
State agency/service that only matches interpreters with requests and does not bill for interpreting services	2	2%
State agency/service that matches interpreters with requests and does bill for interpreting services	5	5%
Exclusively a sign language referral agency/service that bills for services	71	70%
Sign language referral agency/service that occasionally contracts with and schedules spoken language interpreters	7	7%
Sign language referral agency/service that regularly contracts with and schedules spoken language interpreters	4	4%
Spoken language referral agency/service that occasionally contracts with and schedules sign language interpreters	2	2%
Spoken language referral agency/service that regularly contracts with and schedules sign language interpreters	5	5%
Other	5	5%
Total	**101**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of respondent agencies reported they are exclusively a sign language referral agency/service that bills for services (70%).

Year Respondent Agency Established

Survey respondents were asked to report the year in which their agency or service was established. Single year responses reported in the survey are organized below into five year ranges, with the exception of the first and last categories: in the survey questionnaire the first year provided as a selection option was 1972, and the final range only includes 2011 and the current year.

Year Respondent Agency Established Table 3		
Year Established	# Responses	% Responses
1972-1975	4	4%
1976-1980	4	4%
1981-1985	3	3%
1986-1990	12	12%
1991-1995	13	13%
1996-2000	19	19%
2001-2005	20	20%
2006-2010	18	18%
2011-2012	8	8%
Total	**101**	**100%**

Finding: Nearly half of the 2012 Survey respondents, or 46%, reported they were established in 2001 or later. It is also interesting that eight new referral agencies have been established in the last year and a half alone.

Number of Interpreters Respondents Employ

Survey respondents were asked to report on the number of interpreters they employ. With regard to part-time interpreters, respondents were asked to report how many part-time interpreters they hire or refer during a typical month. Responses are presented on Table 4 for both full- and part-time interpreters.

Number of Full- and Part-time Interpreters Respondents Employ Table 4				
	Full-time Interpreters		Part-time Interpreters	
Answer	# Responses	% Responses	# Responses	% Responses
0	32	32%	2	2%
1-4	43	43%	14	14%
5-9	11	11%	9	9%
10-14	5	5%	14	14%
15-19	3	3%	11	11%
20 - 30	3	3%	5	5%
31 - 40	2	2%	11	11%
41 - 50	0	0%	6	6%
51 - 60	1	1%	5	5%
61- 70	0	0%	5	5%
71 - 80	0	0%	5	5%
81 - 90	0	0%	0	0%
91 - 100	0	0%	2	2%
over 100	0	0%	9	9%
Total	**100**	**100%**	**98**	**100%**

Finding: Of the survey respondents, 68 reported they employ full-time interpreters and 32 reported they do not employ any full-time interpreters. With regard to part-time interpreters, 96 respondents reported they employ part-time interpreters and only two respondents reported they do not employ any part-time interpreters.

Drawing upon analysis capabilities of the survey software, the mean number of full-time interpreters employed by respondents was calculated to be two, and the mean number of part-time interpreters was 24, indicating overall that respondents to the 2012 Survey rely more heavily on part-time than full-time interpreters.

Respondent Geographic Service Area

Survey respondents were asked to report information related to the geographic area they serve. An initial question in this regard queried respondents regarding whether their services are offered in one state only, across multiple states, or available nationwide. Responses are presented on Table 5.

Respondent Agency Coverage Table 5		
Answer	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Provide interpreting services to one state only	47	47%
Provide interpreting services to a multi-state region	30	30%
Provide interpreting services nationwide	16	16%
Other	8	8%
Total	**101**	**100%**

Finding: Nearly half of the survey respondents, or 47%, reported they provide interpreting services in only one state and 30% reported they serve a multi-state region.

A follow up question asked respondents to identify the region in which they provide the majority of their services. Responses are presented on Table 6.

Regional Service Delivery Area Table 6		
Answer	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Northeast	28	28%
Middle Atlantic	7	7%
Southeast	15	15%
Midwest North	11	11%
Midwest Middle	11	11%
Midwest South	3	3%
Northwest	9	9%
West Mid	6	6%
Southwest	9	9%
Total	**99**	**100%**

Finding: Half of the survey respondents reported that the majority of the requests they receive come from the East coast, or the Northeast, Middle Atlantic and Southeast regions combined. In addition, 28% of respondents reported most service requests stem from the Northeast.

Another question in the survey asked respondents to identify the one state in which their agency or service provides the majority of its interpreting services. Responses are organized on Table 7. States are grouped within the regional structure of the NIEC grant.

State Where Respondents Provide Majority of Services Table 7		
GURIEC	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Alabama	1	1%
Delaware	0	0%
District of Columbia	2	2%
Florida	2	2%
Georgia	3	3%
Kentucky	1	1%
Maryland	3	3%
Mississippi	0	0%
North Carolina	3	3%
Pennsylvania	6	6%
South Carolina	1	1%
Tennessee	1	1%
Virginia	1	1%
West Virginia	1	1%
Region total	**25**	**25%**
NURIEC	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Connecticut	1	1%
Maine	3	3%
Massachusetts	1	1%
New Hampshire	0	0%
New Jersey	1	1%
New York	14	14%
Puerto Rico	0	0%
Rhode Island	0	0%
Vermont	0	0%
Region total	**20**	**20%**

State Where Respondents Provide Majority of Services by Region Table 7 (continued)		
CATIE	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Illinois	1	1%
Indiana	0	0%
Iowa	1	1%
Kansas	0	0%
Michigan	3	3%
Minnesota	6	6%
Missouri	1	1%
Nebraska	1	1%
Ohio	4	4%
Wisconsin	4	4%
Region Total	**21**	**21%**
MARIE	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Arkansas	0	0%
Colorado	0	0%
Louisiana	2	2%
Montana	0	0%
New Mexico	1	1%
North Dakota	0	0%
Oklahoma	1	1%
South Dakota	0	0%
Texas	4	4%
Utah	2	2%
Wyoming	0	0%
Region Total	**10**	**10%**
WRIEC	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Alaska	0	0%
Arizona	1	1%
California	14	14%
Hawaii	1	1%
Idaho	1	1%
Nevada	1	1%
Oregon	2	2%
Washington	4	4%
Region Total	**24**	**24%**

Finding: Of the 100 respondents that answered this question, 28 respondents reported they provide the majority of their services in one of two states: New York or California. Specifically, 14 respondents identified New York as the state in which they provide the majority of their services and another 14 respondents identified California. In comparison, there were 15 states in which no respondent referral agency or service reported providing the majority of its services, and another 19 states in which only one agency reported doing most of its work. However, as a reminder, the survey was originally disseminated to 307 referral agencies. Because only 100 respondents reported information regarding the primary state where they provide the majority of their services, it can be broadly assumed the breakout of agency-by-state presented on

Table 7 only represents about a third of existing agencies and therefore is not a complete representation of service coverage in each state.

B.   Interpreter Credentials, Pay and Benefits

This section of findings includes information related to respondent agency requirements for the interpreters they hire, including credentials, whether they are deaf, and if they can provide trilingual interpreting services. Information regarding interpreter pay and benefits is also reported on in this second.

Interpreter Credential Requirements

Survey respondents were asked to report on the minimum credential requirements they have for interpreters they hire or refer for service. Responses are presented below on Table 8.

Minimum Interpreter Credential Requirements Table 8		
Type of Credential	# Responses	% Responses
National level credentials	43	49%
State level credentials	24	27%
Internal agency screening	15	17%
Other	6	7%
Total	**88**	**100%**

Finding: Only 49% of the survey respondents reported they require national level credentials of the interpreters they hire and/or refer for service; 27% of respondents require state level credentials.

Agency Employment of Deaf Interpreters

The survey also asked respondents to report on the number of full- and part-time deaf interpreters they hire and/or refer for service. Responses are presented on Table 9.

Number of Deaf Interpreters Respondents Hire or Refer Table 9				
	Full-time Interpreters		**Part-time Interpreters**	
Interpreters	**# Responses**	**% Responses**	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
0	80	87%	42	43%
1 - 4	12	13%	48	49%
5 - 9	0	0%	6	6%
10 - 15	0	0%	1	1%
over 15	0	0%	1	1%
Total	92	100%	98	100%

Finding: Based on the reported data, it would appear that respondent agencies are more likely to utilize deaf interpreters on a part-time basis than hire them as a full-time employee. An assessment of the data reported in the "0" column supports this conclusion: 87% of respondent agencies reported they employ no deaf interpreters, as compared to 43% of respondent agencies that reported they employ no deaf interpreters.   With regard to respondents that do hire or refer deaf interpreters, 49% of the respondent agencies reported they hire/refer between 1-4 deaf interpreters, as compared to only 13% of respondents that reported in the full-time category.

Agency Employment of Trilingual Interpreters

The survey also sought to collect information related to the respondent agency employment of trilingual interpreters (e.g. ASL, English and Spanish). Information collected on both full- and part-time interpreters is presented below.

Number of Interpreters that Can Provide Trilingual Interpreting Services Table 10				
	Full-time Interpreters		**Part-time Interpreters**	
Interpreters	**# Responses**	**% Responses**	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
0	69	74%	46	46%
1 - 4	21	23%	49	49%
5 - 9	2	2%	2	2%
10 - 15	1	1%	1	1%
over 15	0	0%	1	1%
Total	**93**	**100%**	**99**	**100%**

Finding: As with utilization of deaf interpreters, it appears that respondent agencies are again more likely to use trilingual interpreters on a part-time basis than hire them full-time. Assessing data reported in the "0" column, 74% of respondents reported they employ no full-time trilingual interpreters, as compared to 46% of respondents that reported they hire or refer no part-time trilingual interpreters.

Interpreter Benefits

Respondents were asked to report whether or not their agency provides benefits to their full- or part-time interpreters.

Provision of Benefits Table 11				
	Full-time Interpreters		**Part-time Interpreters**	
Response	**# Responses**	**% Responses**	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Yes	31	36%	8	9%
No	54	64%	79	91%
Total	**85**	**100%**	**87**	**100%**

Finding: It is surprising to note that 64% of the respondent agencies reported they do not offer benefits to the full-time interpreters they employ; only 36% of respondents reported they do. It is perhaps not as surprising but still concerning to note that only 9% of respondents reported they provide benefits to the part-time interpreters they hire or refer for service.

A follow up question in the survey asked those respondents that reported the provision of benefits to indicate what benefits were provided. Responses are presented for both full- and part-time interpreters on Table 12. Percentages are based on just those responses collected from respondents that reported they offer benefits on Table 11.

Type of Benefit Provided Table 12				
Type of Benefit Provided	**Full-time Interpreters**		**Part-time Interpreters**	
	# Responses	**% Responses**	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Health insurance	29	94%	4	50%
Dental insurance	20	65%	4	50%
Paid family leave	11	35%	0	0%
In-house professional development	20	65%	6	75%
Professional development reimbursement	23	74%	6	75%
College/university tuition reimbursement	6	19%	1	13%
Other	9	29%	2	25%

Finding: Full-time employment for interpreters does not necessarily mean full benefits; only 36% of respondents that reported they employ full-time interpreters provide benefits to those interpreters. Of the respondents that reported they provide benefits to the part-time interpreters they hire, the majority offer benefits in the form of professional development or professional development reimbursement (75% in each category).

Provision of a Mentorship Program

Survey respondents were also asked if their agency offers interpreters a formal or structured mentorship program. The question did not breakout full-time versus part-time interpreter offerings.

Availability of Mentorship Program Table 13		
Mentorship Offered	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Yes	25	28%
Not at this time	63	72%
Total	**88**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of respondents reported they do not offer a formal or structured mentorship program: 72% of respondents.   In other needs assessment activities carried out through the grant, working interpreters including those that are employed by referral agencies stressed the importance of and need for mentoring, so it is concerning that so few of the referral agency respondents in this survey reported offering a mentorship program.

A follow up survey question asked the 25 respondents that reported they did offer a mentorship program to describe their program. A list of potential descriptions was provided and respondents were able to select more than one. Responses are presented below.

Type of Mentorship Program Offered Table 14		
	# Responses	**% Responses**
Available only to full-time interpreter/employees	0	0%
Available only to part-time/contract interpreters	2	8%
Available to both full-time and part-time/contract interpreters	8	32%
Program offered at no cost	14	56%
Program offered at a cost	8	32%
Mentors are full-time interpreters/employees and offer mentorship as part of their regular responsibilities	7	28%
Mentors are full-time interpreters/employees and are paid to offer mentorship	3	12%
Other	4	16%

Finding: As a reminder, only 25 respondents reported they offered a mentorship program (Table 13). Of those that do, 14 provide their mentorship program at no cost to the interpreter, and eight charge interpreters to participate.

Length of Mentorship Program Table 15		
Length of Program	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
1-2 months	4	16%
3-6 months	9	36%
6-9 months	3	12%
9-12 months	2	8%
Other	7	28%
Total	**25**	**100%**

Finding: Of the 25 respondents that reported they offered a mentorship program, nine offer it over the course of 3-6 months; four over the course of 1-2 months, and three over 6-9 months.

A final question related to mentorship asked those 25 respondents with a program to report any prerequisites for interpreter participation. Responses are presented below.

Prerequisites for Participation in Respondent Mentorship Program Table 16		
Prerequisite	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Current student in an IEP	8	32%
Completion of an IEP	4	16%
State or local credentials	0	0%
National credentials	2	8%
Completed agency internal screening	3	12%
Other	8	32%
Total	**25**	**100%**

Finding: Eight respondents reported the interpreter must be a current student in an IEP to participate in their mentorship program. Based on this response, it is interesting to consider how many of the referral agency respondents participating in the survey potentially hire or contract with interpreters that are currently enrolled as students in an IEP. Future surveys might include a question designed to assess the extent to which referral agencies tap into and hire interpreters that have not completed their IEP coursework.

Interpreter Pay

The survey captured information related to both full- and part-time interpreter pay. Responses related to full-time interpreter pay are reported on Table 17.

Full-time Interpreter Pay Table 17		
Annual Salary	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Under $20,000	2	4%
$21,000-$25,000	2	4%
$26,000-$30,000	0	0%
$31,000 - $35,000	8	15%
$36,000 - $40,000	12	23%
$41,000 - $45,000	7	13%
$46,000 - $50,000	4	8%
$51,000 - $55,000	8	15%
$56,000 - $60,000	2	4%
$61,000 - $65,000	2	4%
$66,000 - $70,000	4	8%
$71,000 - $75,000	1	2%
above $76,000	0	0%
Total	**52**	**100%**

Finding: Utilizing the survey software capabilities, the mean annual salary reported by the respondents in this survey was calculated at approximately $42,000 per year.

It is interesting to compare this finding with information collected in the 2012 Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment Survey, available at the NIEC website identified in the Executive Summary of this report. In that needs assessment, the mean annual salary of interpreter practitioner respondents that work full-time and receive full benefits was calculated at $40,700 per year. In that same survey, interpreter practitioner respondents that worked either for a private or public referral agency also reported on annual salary. Specifically, 48 practitioners reported holding a full-time position with full benefits in a private referral agency: the mean annual salary was calculated at $55,000 per year for those respondents. An additional 36 practitioner respondents reported holding a full-time position with full benefits in a public referral agency: the mean salary for those respondents was calculated as $40,000 per year. However, when comparing the data collected through the two surveys it should be noted that in this 2012 Referral Agency Survey, the majority of respondents that reported they employed full-time interpreters further reported they do not provide benefits to those full-time employees (64% of respondents). Data presented above from the interpreter practitioner survey related to full-time interpreters that receive full benefits.

An additional point of comparison is with the estimated national mean salary. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics Program, the mean annual salary in the United States was $45,230 in May 2011. A point worth noting: all salary figures referenced above are only intended as potential indicators as all are calculated as an estimated mean and not hard income numbers.

The survey also collected information related to respondent agency pay for the part-time interpreters they hire or contract with.

Part-time Interpreter Pay Table 18		
Hourly Pay	# Responses	% Responses
Less than $20	0	0%
$21—25	4	5%
$26—30	8	10%
$31—35	10	12%
$36—40	13	16%
$41—45	14	17%
$46—50	9	11%
$51—55	7	8%
$56—60	3	4%
$61—65	2	2%
$66—70	1	1%
$71 or above	0	0%
Other	11	13%
Total	**83**	**100%**

Finding: Drawing upon the survey software capabilities, the mean hourly wage that referral agency respondents reported paying their part-time interpreters was calculated at $52.00 per hour.   It is also interesting to compare this finding with information collected in the 2012 Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment Survey. In that survey, the mean hourly wage of freelance/contract interpreters was calculated as approximately $40.00 per hour. A further point of comparison is with the national mean hourly wage. According to the same U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics survey reference above, the national hourly mean wage as of May 2011 was just $21.74.

The survey also asked respondents to report on the average hourly rate they charge clients for full-time sign language interpreting services.   Responses are presented on Table 19.

Hourly Charge To Client for Full-time Interpreter Services Table 19		
Answer	# Responses	% Responses
$10—15	1	1%
$16—20	1	1%
$21—25	2	3%
$26—30	0	0%
$31—35	0	0%
$36—40	2	3%
$41—45	3	4%
$46—50	4	6%
$51—55	13	19%
$56—60	8	12%
$61—65	11	16%
$66—70	6	9%
$71—75	2	3%
$76—80	4	6%
$121—125	1	1%
Other	9	13%
Total	**67**	**100%**

Finding: The highest number of respondents (19%) selected the $51-55 hourly range, followed by $61-66 per hour (16% of respondents). Upon analysis of comments entered in the 'Other' column, respondents stated that the hourly charge for full-time interpreter services varied depending upon the expertise and credentials of the individual interpreter and could not be assigned an average range.

C.   Demand for Services

The survey also sought collect information to assist the field in understanding changes in demand for interpreter services. To that end, respondents were whether they had seen an increase in the number of requests for interpreting services over the past three years, a decrease in requests, or whether demand had remained the same. Responses are presented below.

Demand for Interpreting Services Table 20		
Level of Demand	# Responses	% Responses
Remained the same	16	16%
Decreased	17	17%
Increased	65	66%
Total	**98**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of respondents, or 66%, reported they had seen an increase in demand for interpreting services offered by their agency over the prior three years.

Only 17% of respondents reported experiencing a decrease in the demand for services, and 16% reported that they saw no change in the demand for services.

A follow up question in the survey asked those respondents that have experienced an increase in services to identify factors they believe have contributed to an increase in the demand for agency services. Although 65 respondents reported an increase in demand on Table 20, only 55 respondents responded to the question regarding contributing factors. Those responses are presented below.

Factors Contributing to Increase in Demand Table 21		
Contributing Factors	# Responses	% Responses
Improved marketing efforts	3	5%
New contracts	19	35%
Increased awareness on part of institutions and agencies	18	33%
Local Deaf Community activism	6	11%
Other	9	16%
Total	**55**	**100%**

Finding: Of the responses that were collected, 35% of respondents identified 'new contracts' as having contributed to an increase in demand. Another 33% of respondents selected 'increased awareness on the part of institutions and agencies' as a contributing factor. Only 11% of respondents reported that 'local deaf community activism' contributed to the increase, and 5% of respondents 'improved marketing.

The survey also asked those respondents that reported a decrease in requests to identify factors that may have contributed to that decrease. Respondents were permitted to select multiple factors, making percentages impossible to report. However, hard numbers of responses are presented on Table 22.

Factors Contributing To Decrease in Demand Table 22	
Contributing Factor	# Responses
Deaf consumers using VRS more frequently	5
Institutions and agencies not providing interpreting services at the rate they once were	6
Increase in institutions and agencies creating staff interpreter positions	5
Deaf consumers using VRI more frequently	3
Increased use of CART	3
Increased competition from spoken language interpreter agencies	9
Other	8

Finding: The factor with the highest response rate was 'increased competition from spoken language interpreter agencies.' The second highest response rate was in the category 'Other'. A closer look at the comments collected in that category related to increased use of VRI, rising costs, and cochlear implants.

Demand for Deaf-Blind Interpreting Services

Survey respondents were asked to report how many requests for deaf-blind interpreting services they receive in a typical month. Responses are presented on Table 23.

Requests for Deaf-Blind Interpreting Services Table 23		
Number of Requests	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
0	36	40%
1 - 4	43	48%
5 - 9	5	6%
10 - 14	3	3%
15 - 19	0	0%
20 - 24	1	1%
25 - 29	0	0%
30 - 34	1	1%
35 - 39	0	0%
40 or more requests	0	0%
Total	**89**	**100%**

Finding: It is surprising that nearly half of the survey respondent pool (43 respondents) reported receiving between 1-4 requests for deaf-blind interpreting in a typical month. In comparison, only 36 of the respondent agencies reported they receive no requests for deaf-blind interpreting services. Another five respondents reported in the 5-9 requests per month range, three agency respondents in the 10-14 range; one in the 20-24 range, and one in the 30-34 range.   It would be interesting to assess these responses more closely to determine the extent to which requests in the higher range categories stem from services to one consumer or services to multiple consumers.

Demand for Trilingual Interpreting Services

Survey respondents were also asked to report how many requests for trilingual interpreting services they receive in a typical month. Responses are presented below.

Requests for Trilingual Interpreting Services Table 24		
Number of Requests	**Response**	**%**
0	59	66%
1 - 4	27	30%
5 - 9	2	2%
10 - 14	0	0%
15 - 19	0	0%
20 - 24	0	0%
25 - 29	1	1%
30 - 34	0	0%
35 or more requests	0	0%
Total	**89**	**100%**

Finding: A significant portion of survey respondents reported they receive no requests for trilingual interpreting services over the course of a typical month (59 respondents). Of the 30 respondent agencies that do receive requests for trilingual interpreting services, 27 respondents reported they receive between 1-4 requests per month; two respondents between 5-9 requests, and one respondent reported receiving between 25-29 requests per month.

D.   Provision of VRS and VRI Services

The advent of Video Relay Services (VRS) and Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) sign language services has contributed to dramatic changes in the field and challenged traditional delivery modes such as community-based, face-to-face interpreting. The survey sought to collect information to determine current utilization of VRS and VRI on the part of referral agencies.

In the survey respondents were asked whether their agency or service provides VRS sign language services.

Provision of VRS Sign Language Services Table 25		
Answer	**Response**	**%**
Yes	8	9%
No	81	91%
Total	**89**	**100%**

Finding: It is interesting that so few respondents reported their agency or service provides VRS sign language services: 91% of respondents reported they do not offer VRS. Of those respondents that do provide VRS services, five are for-profit and three are not-for-profit; three serve a multi-state area, and four provide services in one state only.

Those eight respondents that reported their agency does offer VRS services were asked in a follow up question to estimate approximately what percentage of their services are delivered through VRS. Although eight respondents reported they offered VRS, only six responded to the question.

Percentage of Services Delivered through VRS Table 26		
Answer	# Responses	% Responses
Less than 10%	2	33%
11-20%	0	0%
21-30%	2	33%
31-40%	1	17%
41-50%	0	0%
51-60%	1	17%
61-70%	0	0%
71-80%	0	0%
81-90%	0	0%
100%	0	0%
Total	6	100%

Finding: Drawing upon the survey software, a mean of 20% was calculated for the six survey respondents that reported delivery of services through VRS.

Survey respondents were also asked to report whether their agency provided VRI sign language services. Responses are presented on Table 27.

Provision of VRI Services Table 27		
Answer	# Responses	% Responses
Yes	33	38%
No	54	62%
Total	87	100%

Finding: Of the pool of survey respondents, 38% reported they offer VRI services and 62% reported they do not. Upon closer analysis, six of the same respondents that offer VRI also reported they offered VRS sign language services. In addition, 23 of the respondents that offer VRI services reported earlier in the survey that they have seen an increase in requests for services. Finally, 25 of the respondents offering VRI services are for-profit and seven are not-for-profit; 14 provide services to one state only, 12 to multi-states, and six nationwide.

In a follow up question, those 33 respondents that reported they offer VRI services were asked to estimate what percentage of their total services are delivered through VRI. Responses are provided below.

Percentage of Services Delivered through VRS Table 28		
Answer	# Responses	% Responses
Less than 10%	24	75%
11-20%	4	13%
21-30%	3	9%
31-40%	1	3%
41-50%	0	0%
More than 50%	0	0%
Total	**32**	**100%**

Finding: For the majority of respondents offering VRI services (75%), provision of VRI accounts for less than 10% of their services.

E.   Provision of Services by Setting

The 2012 Referral Agency Survey sought to collect a wide range of information related to the settings in which interpreters actually deliver services. This information is crucial to the development of effective training and education strategies and to understanding issues impacting interpreter demand and utilization.

A primary question related to settings provided respondents with a listing of 20 potential service sub-settings. Respondents were asked to report, regardless of fill rate, of all the requests for services they receive in a typical month which one service setting is most frequently requested. Responses to that question are presented on Table 29.

MOST Frequently Requested Setting for Interpreting Services Table 29		
Type of Setting	# Responses	% Responses
Doctor's appointments	39	44%
College/University classes	15	17%
Mental-health out-patient services	5	6%
Vocational/technical activities	5	6%
Staff meetings	4	4%
K-12 classes	4	4%
Client meetings	3	3%
Social services (e.g. VR, social security)	3	3%
Other medical settings	2	2%
Training/professional development	2	2%
Hospitalization/surgery	1	1%
Emergency rooms	1	1%
Mental health in-patient services	1	1%
Other college/university activities	1	1%
Legal settings	1	1%
Performing arts/entertainment	1	1%
Self Help (12 step) appointments	0	0%
Mental health emergency	0	0%
Other mental health settings	0	0%
Job interviews	0	0%
Other K-12 activities	0	0%
Other educational settings	0	0%
Family/personal matters	0	0%
Consumer matters (e.g. ordering pizza, customer service)	0	0%
Religious settings	0	0%
Total	**88**	**100%**

Finding: Provision of interpreting services in medical settings, and doctor's appointments in particular, is clearly a high demand area for at least half of the respondent agencies. If doctor's appointments (44%); other medical settings (2%); hospitalization/surgery (1%), and emergency rooms (1%) are all combined under a broader category of medical settings, they account for nearly 50% of the most frequently requested service for the entire survey respondent pool. The second highest ranked setting was college/university classes, selected by 17% of respondents.

However, as a reminder, respondents were only permitted to select one setting as most frequently requested. Therefore, while Table 29 provides a useful snapshot of information of the single area in which respondents receive most of their requests, it does not inform the complete picture of interpreter utilization or measure the second or third most frequently requested settings and the degree to which frequency varies between those requests and the most frequently requested service setting.

Other questions in the survey did capture more detailed information related to the frequency of requests for services, as well as information regarding the respondent's ability to fill the requests it receives, and aspects of ease and difficulty associated with filling those requests.   Data collected in each of these broad areas follows below.

Frequency of Requests for Services

The survey broke the 20 sub-settings reported on in Table 29 into five broad setting categories: medical, mental health, job-related, educational and other. The survey also provided respondents with four selection categories to assist in measuring the frequency of requests received: never, occasionally (once a month), frequently (once a week), and regularly (twice or more a week). The survey software assigned a weight to each of the categories (1-4 respectively) by which a mean was calculated by the software for each of the 20 sub-settings. That information is presented on Table 30.

Frequency of Requests for Interpreting Services By Setting Table 30						
Setting	Never 1	Occasionally 2	Frequently 3	Regularly 4	# Responses	Mean
Medical Settings						
Doctor's appointments	2%	18%	17%	63%	88	3.4
Hospitalization/surgery	11%	33%	27%	30%	86	2.8
Emergency (medical)	12%	37%	26%	26%	86	2.7
Other medical settings	7%	27%	23%	43%	84	3.0
Mental Health Settings						
Mental health in-patient services	17%	52%	12%	18%	87	2.3
Mental health out-patient services	10%	40%	25%	24%	87	2.6
Self-help (12 step) apts.	46%	41%	5%	8%	85	1.8
Emergency (mental health)	18%	60%	11%	10%	87	2.1
Other mental health settings	21%	49%	12%	18%	84	2.3
Job-related Settings						
Job interviews	1%	52%	30%	16%	86	2.6
Client meetings	1%	31%	33%	35%	86	3.0
Staff meetings	2%	24%	29%	44%	86	3.2
Training/professional dev	1%	31%	40%	28%	86	2.9
Educational Settings						
K-12	25%	24%	16%	34%	87	2.6
College/University	16%	10%	18%	55%	87	3.1
Vocational/Tech training	20%	29%	26%	26%	86	2.6
Adult education	27%	45%	15%	16%	85	2.3
Other Settings						
Social services (VR, SSA)	5%	30%	32%	33%	84	2.9
Performing arts	22%	65%	6%	7%	86	2.0
Religious activities	31%	56%	8%	5%	84	1.9

Finding: It is interesting to first look at the categories of 'frequently' (once a week) and 'regularly' (twice or more a week). For the following sub-settings, at least half of the respondents reported in the 'frequently' and 'regularly' categories combined: doctor's

appointments (80%); hospitalization (57%); emergency medical (52%); other medical settings (66%); client meetings (68%); staff meetings (73%); training/professional development activities (68%); K-12 (50%); college/university classes (73%); vocational/technical training (52%), and social services (65%). An opposite view can be derived by combining the 'never' and 'occasionally' (once a month) categories of reported data in order to assess those settings in which respondents appear to provide the least amount of their services. For the following settings, at least 50% of respondents reported they only 'occasionally' or 'never' receive requests for services: in-patient services (69%); out-patient services (50%); self-help appointments (87%); emergency mental health (78%); other mental health settings (70%); job interviews (53%); adult education (72%); performing arts (87%), and religious activities (87%).

While Table 30 provides a detailed overview of the frequency and variation associated with individual agency requests for services, it is difficult to quickly assess and identify the high versus low frequency service settings. To that end, the settings have been rank ordered on Table 31 by most to least frequently requested, based on the four categories in the survey question and the software calculated mean.

A frequency level was assigned for each of the 20 settings on Table 31 based on rounding the mean score to the nearest whole number. It is important to keep in mind the mean score when assessing the data as there can be significant variation within a given category. For example, rounding the mean score to the closest whole number places both doctor's appointments and K-12 classes within the 'frequently' requested category, but at opposite ends of the range.

Frequency of Requests for Interpreting Services Ranked By Mean Table 31					
Type of setting	Never 1	Occasionally 2	Frequently 3	Regularly 4	Mean
Doctor's appointments			X		3.4
Staff meetings			X		3.2
College/University activities			X		3.1
Other medical settings			X		3.0
Client meetings			X		3.0
Social services (VR, SSA, etc.)			X		2.9
Training/professional dev.			X		2.9
Hospitalization/surgery			X		2.8
Emergency (medical)			X		2.7
Mental health out-patient services			X		2.6
Job interviews			X		2.6
K-12			X		2.6
Vocational/technical training			X		2.6
Mental health in-patient services		X			2.3
Other mental health settings		X			2.3
Adult education		X			2.3
Emergency (mental health)		X			2.1
Performing arts		X			2.0
Religious activities		X			1.9
Self-help (12 step) appointments		X			1.8

Finding: It is important to assess the mean within each of the categories as it does vary significantly. For example, in the 'frequently' column, there are four sub-settings with a 2.6 mean, barely placing them in that column as a result of rounding to the nearest whole number.   The data presented on Table 30 provides a better agency-by-agency depiction of the frequency with which respondents receive requests for their services.

It is interesting to assess the sub-settings within the broader setting category to which they belong. As an example, doctor's appointments, other medical settings, hospitalization/surgery, and emergency medical all fall within the broader category 'medical setting'. Each of the four sub-settings were identified as 'frequently' requested service areas, and grouped together, could form a focus for developing related training and professional development for interpreting in medical settings.

Table 32 presents just those sub-settings that were identified as 'frequently' requested of respondents, based on the software assigned mean.

Frequency of Requests for Interpreting Services Ranked By Mean Organized in Setting Categories Table 32					
Type of setting	Never 1	Occasionally 2	Frequently 3	Regularly 4	Mean
Medical					
Doctor's appointments			X		3.4
Other medical settings			X		3.0
Hospitalization/surgery			X		2.8
Emergency (medical)			X		2.7
Job-related					
Staff meetings			X		3.2
Client meetings			X		3.0
Training/professional development			X		2.9
Job interviews			X		2.6
Educational					
College/University activities			X		3.1
Vocational/technical training			X		2.6
K-12			X		2.6
Social Services					
VR, social service appointments			X		2.9
Mental Health					
Out-patient services			X		2.6

Finding: It is interesting to again compare data collected through this survey with findings of the 2012 Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment Survey. On Table 38 of the Interpreter Practitioner Report, information reported by both full-time staff interpreters and part-time freelance interpreters is captured with regard to the same service settings that are reported on Table 32. In the Interpreter Practitioner Report, information was collected both with regard to settings services are provided in, and settings in which no services are provided: that second category is interesting to compare with the data on Table 32 on a setting by setting basis.

In the category of medical settings: although it was reported on as 'frequently' requested in the referral agency survey, in the interpreter practitioner survey, 85% of staff interpreters and 59% of freelance interpreters reported they do no work in that setting. With regard to job-related settings, (another frequently requested setting in the referral agency survey), 68% of staff interpreters and 63% of freelance interpreters reported they provide no service in that setting. In post-secondary settings: 77% of staff interpreters and 67% of freelance interpreters reported they do no work in the setting, yet it too is a frequently requested service setting in the referral agency survey.   With regard to K-12, also frequently requested in this survey, 66% of staff interpreters and 87% of freelance interpreters report providing no services; in social services settings, again frequently requested in the referral agency survey, 80% of staff interpreters and 63% of freelance interpreters provide no services. Finally, with regard to mental health settings, 90% of staff interpreters and 82% of freelance interpreters report provision of no services, although out-patient mental health services are also frequently requested in the referral agency survey.

Respondent Ability to Fill Requests

In the previous survey questions respondents were asked to report on the requests they receive. Subsequent questions sought to understand the extent to which respondent agencies are able to fill those requests. The survey questionnaire provided four categories relating to the respondent's ability to fill requests for services: rarely, sometimes, usually and always. The survey software assigned a weight to each of the categories (1-4 respectively) by which a mean was calculated for each of the 20 settings. That information is presented on Table 33.

Respondent Ability to Fill Requests By Setting Table 33						
Setting	Rarely 1	Sometimes 2	Usually 3	Always 4	# Responses	Mean
Medical						
Doctor's appointments	0%	2%	34%	64%	85	3.6
Hospitalization/surgery	3%	8%	41%	49%	78	3.4
Emergency (medical)	7%	12%	48%	34%	77	3.1
Other medical settings	0%	3%	49%	48%	77	3.5
Mental Health						
In-patient services	7%	7%	44%	43%	77	3.2
Out-patient services	6%	8%	41%	46%	79	3.3
Self-help (12 step) appointments.	20%	15%	33%	32%	69	2.8
Emergency (mental health)	11%	17%	44%	28%	75	2.9
Other mental health settings	12%	12%	38%	37%	73	3.0
Job-related						
Job interviews	0%	7%	33%	60%	82	3.5
Client meetings	0%	0%	37%	63%	81	3.6
Staff meetings	1%	1%	37%	61%	82	3.6
Training/professional development	1%	1%	36%	62%	81	3.6
Educational						
K-12	7%	13%	40%	40%	70	3.1
College/University	3%	1%	31%	65%	71	3.6
Vocational/Technical training	4%	4%	36%	55%	69	3.4
Adult education	5%	5%	40%	51%	67	3.4
Other						
Social services (VR, SSA)	0%	4%	41%	55%	80	3.5
Performing arts	3%	9%	42%	46%	69	3.3
Religious activities	13%	16%	44%	27%	63	2.9

While Table 33 offers a comprehensive overview of respondent ability to fill requests for services, it is cumbersome to quickly assess and identify the settings in which requests are easy versus difficult to fill. To that end, the 20 settings have again been rank ordered on Table 33 by 'always' filled through 'rarely' filled, and organized within the four categories in the survey question by the software calculated mean. A fill level was identified for each of the settings based on rounding the mean score to the nearest whole number.

Respondent Ability to Fill Requests Ranked By Mean Table 34					
Type of setting	Rarely 1	Sometimes 2	Usually 3	Always 4	Mean
Doctor's appointments				X	3.6
Client meetings				X	3.6
Staff meetings				X	3.6
College/University activities				X	3.6
Training/professional development				X	3.6
Other medical settings				X	3.5
Social services (VR, SSA, etc.)				X	3.5
Job interviews				X	3.5
Hospitalization/surgery			X		3.4
Vocational/technical training			X		3.4
Adult education			X		3.4
Mental health out-patient services			X		3.3
Performing arts			X		3.3
Mental health in-patient services			X		3.2
Emergency (medical)			X		3.1
K-12			X		3.1
Other mental health settings			X		3.0
Emergency (mental health)			X		2.9
Religious activities			X		2.9
Self-help (12 step) appointments			X		2.8

Finding: Although individual respondent responses did vary widely (as demonstrated earlier on Table 33), it is encouraging that on the whole, based on the calculated mean, respondent agencies appear to be able to successfully fill the requests for services that they receive.

It is interesting to compare the two data sets: 1) those service settings that respondents identified they are 'frequently' or 'occasionally' requested to provide interpreting services in (Table 31), and the respondent's reported success in filling requests in those settings (Table 34). This comparison is carried out on Table 35.

Requested Settings/Respondent Success Filling Requests in Those Settings Table 35		
Frequently Requested Settings	**Usually Filled**	**Always Filled**
Doctor's appointments		X
Staff meetings		X
College/University activities		X
Other medical settings		X
Client meetings		X
Social services (VR, SSA, etc.)		X
Training/professional dev.		X
Job interviews		X
Hospitalization/surgery	X	
Emergency (medical)	X	
Out-patient services	X	
K-12	X	
Vocational/technical training	X	
Occasionally Requested Settings	**Usually Filled**	**Always Filled**
In-patient services	X	
Other mental health settings	X	
Adult education	X	
Emergency (mental health)	X	
Performing arts	X	
Religious activities	X	
Self-help (12 step) appointments	X	

Finding: It is very positive to note that in each of the 13 settings that were identified as 'frequently' requested, the majority of requests were reported as 'always' filled, and those that were not 'always' filled were reported as 'usually' filled. However, as a reminder, Table 35 assesses the referral agency data in aggregate and by assigned mean; it does not capture individual differences, which can vary from agency to agency and are better presented on Table 30.

Respondent Difficulty Filling Requests

This section of data relates to the ease or difficulty associated with filling requests that are received. Once again the questionnaire provided respondents with a range of options: impossible to fill, difficult to fill, easy to fill and very easy to fill. Responses are presented on Table 36.

Difficulty Filling Requests for Interpreting Services By Setting Table 36						
Setting	Impossible 1	Difficult 2	Easy 3	Very Easy 4	# Responses	Mean
Medical Settings						
Doctor's appointments	0%	10%	56%	34%	80	3.2
Hospitalization/surgery	1%	16%	59%	24%	76	3.1
Emergency (medical)	3%	47%	40%	11%	75	2.6
Other medical settings	1%	10%	64%	26%	74	3.1
Mental Health Settings						
In-patient services	3%	21%	61%	15%	75	2.9
Out-patient services	4%	16%	63%	17%	76	2.9
Self-help (12 step) appointments	8%	19%	60%	17%	65	2.8
Emergency (mental health)	6%	39%	51%	4%	71	2.5
Other mental health settings	6%	17%	66%	11%	70	2.8
Job-related Settings						
Job interviews	1%	13%	56%	29%	82	3.1
Client meetings	0%	9%	60%	35%	81	3.3
Staff meetings	1%	9%	55%	35%	82	3.2
Training/professional development	1%	9%	56%	34%	82	3.2
Educational Settings						
K-12	9%	30%	35%	27%	71	2.8
College/University	3%	14%	45%	38%	73	3.2
Vocational/Tech training	4%	17%	44%	34%	70	3.1
Adult education	3%	15%	52%	31%	68	3.1
Other Settings						
Social services (VR, SSA)	0%	8%	54%	38%	76	3.3
Performing arts	3%	26%	41%	30%	66	3.0
Religious activities	15%	33%	34%	18%	61	2.6

Finding: Table 36 is best assessed in conjunction with Table 30, which reports on the frequency with which respondent receive requests.   An area of potential concern on Table 36 rests with those settings in which respondents reported they find it 'impossible' or 'difficult' to fill requests, as such responses may represent unmet consumer needs for services. For example, in the setting emergency medical, 50% of the survey respondents reported it 'impossible' (3%) or 'difficult' (47%) to fill requests in that setting. On Table 30, 52% of respondents reported they 'frequently' (26%) or 'regularly' (26%) receive requests for services in an emergency medical setting.   The two findings combined indicate this may be a potential setting in which consumer needs are not being successfully met.

On the other hand, on Table 36, 45% of respondents reported it is 'impossible' (6%) or 'difficult' (39%) to fill requests they receive for services in emergency mental health settings, which might initially evoke concern. However, on Table 30, 78% of respondents reported they 'never' (18%) or only 'occasionally' (60%) received requests for services in emergency mental health settings.   Looking at the two data sets in conjunction with one another indicates that although filling requests in the setting can be difficult, it is not a high volume request area.

Although Table 36 provides detailed information regarding the ease or difficulty associated with filling requests, it is not easy to quickly assess the settings in which requests are easy versus difficult to fill. To that end, the 20 settings have again been ranked by their mean score on Table 37. A fill difficulty level was assigned for each of the 20 settings based on rounding the mean score to the nearest whole number.

Difficulty Filling Requests for Interpreting Services By Setting Table 37					
Interpreting Service Setting	Impossible 1	Difficult 2	Easy 3	Very Easy 4	Mean
Social services (VR, SSA apts.)			X		3.3
Client meetings			X		3.3
Doctor's appointments			X		3.2
Staff meetings			X		3.2
College/university activities			X		3.2
Training/professional development			X		3.2
Other medical settings			X		3.1
Hospitalization/surgery			X		3.1
Job interviews			X		3.1
Vocational/.technical training			X		3.1
Adult education			X		3.1
Performing arts			X		3.0
In-patient services			X		2.9
Out-patient services			X		2.9
Self-help (12 step) appointments			X		2.8
Other mental health settings			X		2.8
K-12			X		2.8
Religious activities			X		2.6
Emergency (medical)			X		2.6
Emergency (mental health)			X		2.5

Finding: As a reminder, it should be recalled that the ranking and assignment of settings to categories is based on aggregated data and the software assigned mean, not individual agency experience. In addition, although rounding the software assigned mean to the nearest whole number placed all settings under the category 'easy' to fill, there is a significant level of variation across the individual mean scores, for example, placing social services high within the range with a mean of 3.3 and emergency mental health barely within the same range with a mean of 2.5. However, that said, it is positive to observe that in all settings respondents in aggregate reported that it is 'easy' to fill requests for services, although to somewhat varying degrees.

As a follow up question in the survey, respondents were asked to identify factors that contribute to making it difficult to fill requests. The response rate is fairly low, likely because of the high number of respondents that reported earlier they did not have difficulty filling requests.   Responses collected regarding requests in medical settings are provided on Table 38.

Factors Making Filling Requests in Medical Settings Difficult Table 38		
Contributing Factor	# Responses	% Responses
Insufficient lead time	21	43%
Lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment	13	27%
Other	7	14%
Time of the assignment	6	12%
Client not willing to meet minimum terms and conditions	2	4%
Length of the assignment	0	0%
Total	**49**	**100%**

Finding: The highest response rate with regard to difficulty filling requests for interpreting services in medical settings was reported in the category 'insufficient lead time', with 43% of respondents to the question selecting that as a factor. The second highest category was 'lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment' (27% of respondents). In the category 'other', comments largely had to do with respondents wanting to select more than one factor, and not being able to because of survey design, not selecting any factor. This is true for comments collected in that category for the other settings that follow as well.

Responses collected regarding difficulty filling requests in mental health related settings are provided on Table 39. Percentages are based just on those responses that were collected.

Factors Making Filling Requests in Mental Health Settings Difficult Table 39		
Contributing Factor	# Responses	% Responses
Insufficient lead time	14	34%
Lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment	13	32%
Other	7	17%
Time of the assignment	4	10%
Client not willing to meet minimum terms and conditions	2	5%
Length of the assignment	1	2%
Total	**41**	**100%**

Finding: As with medical settings, the highest response rate was with regard to 'insufficient lead time' (34% of respondents), followed by 'lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment (32%).

Responses collected regarding difficulty filling requests in job-related settings are provided on Table 40.

Factors Making Filling Requests in Job-Related Settings Difficult Table 40		
Contributing Factor	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Insufficient lead time	11	38%
Lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment	8	28%
Other	6	21%
Client not willing to meet minimum terms and conditions	2	7%
Length of the assignment	1	3%
Time of the assignment	1	3%
Total	**29**	**100%**

Finding: The two highest response rates were again 'insufficient lead time' (38% of respondents), followed by 'lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment (28% of respondents).

Responses collected regarding difficulty filling requests in education-related settings are provided on Table 41.

Factors Making Filling Requests in Education Settings Difficult Table 41		
Contributing Factor	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment	13	33%
Insufficient lead time	12	31%
Other	8	21%
Client not willing to meet minimum terms and conditions	2	5%
Length of the assignment	2	5%
Time of the assignment	2	5%
Total	**39**	**100%**

Finding: The difficulty filling requests in education-related settings differs slightly. The highest response rate in this setting area was 'lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment' (33%), followed by 'insufficient lead time' (31% of respondents), and 'other' (21% of respondents).

Responses collected regarding difficulty filling requests in social service settings is provided on Table 42.

Factors Making Filling Requests in Social Services Settings Difficult Table 42		
Contributing Factor	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Length of assignment	2	33%
Client not willing to meet minimum terms and conditions	1	17%
Time of the assignment	1	17%
Insufficient lead time	1	17%
Other	1	
Lack of qualified interpreters for the assignment	0	
Total	**6**	**100%**

Finding: The highest response rate in this setting area was 'length of assignment', identified by 33% of respondents to the question – or two respondents.

F. Training and Education Needs

Respondents were asked to identify the most important training need for their full-time interpreters. They were only permitted to select one training area. Responses are presented on Table 43.

Most Important Training and Education Need for Full-time Interpreters Table 43		
Answer	**# Responses**	**% Responses**
Legal settings	15	21%
Other	12	17%
Training/professional development	11	15%
Mental health in-patient services	7	10%
Mental health out-patient services	6	8%
Doctor's appointments	5	7%
K-12 classes	3	4%
Emergency rooms	3	4%
Hospitalization/surgery	2	3%
College/University classes	2	3%
Mental health emergency	2	3%
Other medical settings	1	1%
Staff meetings	1	1%
Other mental health settings	1	1%
Social services appointments (e.g. VR, social security)	1	1%
Family/personal matters	0	0%
Performing arts/entertainment	0	0%
Religious settings	0	0%
Consumer matters (e.g. ordering pizza, customer service)	0	0%
Other K-12 activities	0	0%
Job interviews	0	0%
Self Help (12 step) appointments	0	0%
Client meetings	0	0%
Other college/university activities	0	0%
Vocational/Technical activities	0	0%
Other educational settings	0	0%
Total	**72**	**100%**

Finding: The highest ranked setting was legal, selected by 21% of respondents. The second highest ranked category was 'Other' (17% of respondents). A closer look at the comments within that category revealed that two respondents identified a need for ethnical training, one respondent asked for voicing/finger spelling, and the remaining respondents reported they needed training in multiple areas and could not select just one training need as most important.

Respondents were also asked to identify the single most important training need for their part-time interpreters. Responses are presented on Table 44.

Most Important Training Need for Part-time Interpreters Table 44		
Answer	# Responses	% Responses
Training/professional development	14	18%
Other	13	16%
Legal settings	11	14%
Mental health out-patient settings	6	8%
Mental health in-patient settings	5	6%
Doctor's appointments	5	6%
Emergency rooms	5	6%
Hospitalization/surgery	4	5%
Other medical settings	4	5%
College/university classes	3	4%
Mental health emergency	2	3%
Social services appointments	2	3%
K-12 classes	2	3%
Other mental health settings	1	2%
Consumer matters (e.g. ordering pizza; customer service)	1	2%
Staff meetings	1	2%
Self Help (12 step) appointments	0	0%
Job interviews	0	0%
Client meetings	0	0%
Other K-12 activities	0	0%
Other college/university activities	0	0%
Vocational/Technical activities	0	0%
Other educational settings	0	0%
Family/personal matters	0	0%
Performing arts/entertainment	0	0%
Religious settings	0	0%
Total	79	100%

Finding: 'Training/professional development' was identified by the highest percentage of respondents (18%), followed by 'Other' (16% of respondents).   Closer assessment of the comments reported in the 'Other' category revealed four comments related to training and education in medical settings; two comments related to training in legal settings, one comment related to ethical training and one comment related to voicing/finger-spelling. The other five comments in that category were from respondents that found it impossible to select just one training and education area as most important. The third highest response rate was in the category of legal, with 14% of respondents identifying training and education in that setting as most important.

This concludes the 2012 Referral Agency Needs Assessment Final Report. The report will be disseminated widely to national organizations, interpreter practitioners, interpreter education programs, consumers and other key stakeholder groups. In addition, the information will be utilized as an important source of input in establishing priorities related to grant developed interpreter education and training practices and products.