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# Overview

The materials presented here on interpreting with DeafBlind people are intended for interpreters and interpreter educators, as well as for DeafBlind people seeking resources on advocacy and working with interpreters. There is also information useful to researchers, interpreter coordinators, vocational rehabilitation specialists, and others seeking to increase their knowledge in this area.

This document is available in electronic format on the DBI website at [www.dbinterpreting.org](http://www.dbinterpreting.org). It can also be found in the DBI digital repository online at <http://digitalcommons.wou.edu/dbi>, and in the NCDB Library.
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# About DBI


In 2017, Western Oregon University’s Regional Resource Center on Deafness (RRCD) was awarded five-year federal funding to establish a national center on DeafBlind interpreting.

With a strong commitment to evidence-based practice, the DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource Center (DBI) was established. The goal of the Center is *to enhance communication access for persons who are DeafBlind by increasing the number of interpreters able to effectively interpret utilizing tactile communication and other strategies.*

The Center’s corpus of work falls within two broad-based activities: (1) conduction of a training program and (2) provision of a resource center and repository for service providers, including interpreters, who seek information to better serve their constituents.

DBI is located on the Western Oregon University campus in Monmouth, 25 miles west of the Oregon School for the Deaf in the capital of Salem. For over 50 years, Western has been awarded funding to support pre-professionals in fields such as interpreter training, Deaf and hard of hearing education, and rehabilitation counseling. Grant awards from the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) continue to support innovative educational programs and emerging research and practice in these fields.

**DBI Vision**

DBI envisions a world that celebrates the life and culture of DeafBlind persons, a world where DeafBlind people have influence and control over their destiny and dreams.

**DBI Mission**

The mission of DBI is to honor the diversity and range of communication preferences of DeafBlind individuals, or those who have a combination of vision and hearing loss, by increasing the range and number of culturally-competent and qualified interpreters and mentors.
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# Executive Summary

An online survey among 752 respondents conducted in the summer of 2017 assessed the current status of the availability and knowledge set of DeafBlind interpreters in the United States.

Respondents to this survey are spread widely across the United States, with California providing one in ten respondents. New York, Texas, and Washington provided between five and six percent each. Other states provided just one respondent. One would think that the interpreter population might follow the population patterns across the states, this does not appear to be the case. While it is unsurprising that states with large populations, such as California and New York, have large interpreter populations, it is interesting to note that states whose population fell in the lower 50% percentile, such as Oregon and Utah, have relatively large interpreter populations. This indicates that there are areas that may be oversaturated with interpreters, while other locations could be viewed as deserts, and the needs of the DeafBlind residents within the area may not be met.

Over nine in ten respondents have interpreted for DeafBlind individuals, with seven in ten interpreting in the past year. The majority of DeafBlind interpreters have spent less than one-fourth of their time on interpreting for DeafBlind individuals in the past year. Just one in six have spent half or more of their time interpreting for DeafBlind individuals in the past year. DeafBlind interpreters have spent about 100 hours on average interpreting for DeafBlind individuals in the past year. However, there is a wide range of interpreting hours, ranging from just one hour to 3,360 hours. This indicates that interpreting services for DeafBlind people do not constitute a large part of interpreters’ time. Among those who have spent 50% or more of their time interpreting for DeafBlind individuals, New York, North Carolina, and Washington seem to have higher concentration of interpreters who focus their time on DeafBlind individuals.

By far, the most widely given reason quoted for not providing interpreting services over the past year involves the lack of opportunity to work with DeafBlind individuals in their state or area. Lack of appropriate skills or training is stated as the second most common reason. While only a very small portion of interpreters (under ten percent) has never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals, lack of the requisite training is the most often cited reason for not doing so.

A large portion of respondents indicated that they are either nationally, state-level, or agency-level certified for interpreting services. Over three in five are nationally certified interpreters, while one in four hold a state-level certification. One in ten are both nationally and state-level certified for interpreting in general. About two in five DeafBlind interpreters identify themselves as proficient, with comprehensive skills in the field of DeafBlind interpreting. Just as many view themselves as having intermediate skills in this field.

By far, ASL and Tactile ASL (TASL) are the most widely used communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind individuals, used always or often by about four in five DeafBlind interpreters. Protactile ASL, by contrast, is always or often used by only about three in ten interpreters. Two in five never use PTASL, although over one in four stated that they had protactile ASL training. Overall, interpreters listed a wide variety of communication modalities for their work with DeafBlind individuals. One interpreter responded that they use whatever works, demonstrating that there seems to be no clear-cut method of communication with the DeafBlind community.

About seven in ten DeafBlind interpreters learned their skills from DeafBlind individuals. Nearly two in three learned their skills from conferences or workshops specific to working with DeafBlind individuals. Half indicated they learned with experienced DeafBlind interpreters.

Interest in the field of DeafBlind interpreting is clearly shown by nearly three-fourths of respondents who agreed to future contact from the DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource Center. One-third want their contact information added to the shared interpreting grants general interest mailing list, while slightly more agreed to future contact about DeafBlind Interpreting. Three in five DeafBlind interpreters are interested in joining a national directory of DeafBlind interpreters. This interest is especially high among interpreters who consider themselves to have proficient DeafBlind interpreting skills.

Likewise, interest in training on protactile American Sign Language (PTASL) is very high. Overall, nearly nine in ten respondents show interest in receiving PTASL training. Interest is especially high among those who already know a little about PTASL, demonstrating that interpreters do not feel too comfortable with their current skill level. Of those who responded they have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals, due to no relevant training or feeling intimidated, three-fourths are still interested in receiving PTASL training. This again points toward the increased need to offer such training to prepare more qualified DeafBlind interpreters.

When it comes to trainers and programs to teach DeafBlind interpreting skills, there is quite a large amount of skew, with only five to six trainers providing the vast majority of the instruction. Increasing access to training may entail increasing the number of qualified and competent instructors throughout the United States. In addition, the programs that train the most interpreters correspond with universities, and these universities are, for the most part, within states that have relatively large interpreter populations. As stated above, the main reason cited for not interpreting in the last year is due to lack of opportunity. These statements suggest that interpreters are staying near where they received their education and are not moving to where the need may be highest.

The information in this *Baseline Survey* will be used to drive the creation of a needs assessment of the DeafBlind community in regard to DeafBlind interpreting. In addition, the information will be used as a pre-assessment of the interpreting population to determine how well the current project is able to address the needs of the community.

# Survey Background

The DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource Center (DBI) conducted a baseline survey to establish the number of interpreters who are working with DeafBlind individuals in various capacities. The survey invitation was sent to all members of the DeafBlind Member Section of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, and the Professionals Serving DeafBlind Consumers email distribution list. Additionally, the survey invitation was distributed via the following Facebook groups and pages:

* DBI
* DeafBlind Member Section
* Discover Interpreting
* NTFDBI, the National Task Force on DeafBlind Interpreting
* Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf
* Support Service Providers for our DeafBlind Community
* Seabeck DeafBlind Retreat

The Regional Resource Center on Deafness at Western Oregon University

online responses were captured using the Qualtrics survey platform. The survey opened on Friday, June 23rd and closed on Monday, August 7th, 2017. An informed consent page explained the background and purpose of the survey; respondents who agreed to the terms were subsequently able to participate in the survey.

A total of 857 survey responses were collected. During the database preparation, 65 responses were deleted as they stopped after agreeing to the consent form. An additional 32 responses were deleted as the respondents answered only the first question, while another 8 responses were completed by respondents residing outside of the United States. The final database contains 752 responses. As some questions were voluntary and other questions were based to specific previous survey answers (meaning respondents had to answer in a specific way to a previous question to see a follow-up question), respondents did not complete all questions; some also dropped out before they finished the survey. *All percentages given are based on those who answered the specific question.*

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. In questions with multiple responses, percentages do not add to 100%.

# Demographic Information of Survey Respondents

## Geographic Distribution

Respondents are widely distributed across the United States, with California providing one in ten (10.2%: N=66) respondents. New York, Texas, and Washington provided between five and six percent each. Just one respondent came from each Alaska, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

### Table 1. Geographic Distribution of Respondents

| **State (N=650)** | **Percent** | **Count** | **State (N=650)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alabama | 0.3 | 2 | Montana | 0.2 | 1 |
| Alaska | 0.2 | 1 | Nebraska | 1.1 | 7 |
| Arizona | 1.2 | 8 | Nevada | 0.6 | 4 |
| Arkansas | 1.2 | 8 | New Hampshire | 0.6 | 4 |
| California | 10.2 | 66 | New Jersey | 2.9 | 19 |
| Colorado | 1.7 | 11 | New Mexico | 1.1 | 7 |
| Connecticut | 0.3 | 2 | New York | 5.5 | 36 |
| District of Columbia | 1.8 | 12 | North Carolina | 2.9 | 19 |
| Florida | 4.6 | 30 | North Dakota | 0.2 | 1 |
| Georgia | 3.7 | 24 | Ohio | 2.5 | 16 |
| Hawaii | 0.6 | 4 | Oklahoma | 0.5 | 3 |
| Idaho | 1.2 | 8 | Oregon | 4.0 | 26 |
| Illinois | 2.3 | 15 | Pennsylvania | 2.8 | 18 |
| Indiana | 0.6 | 4 | Puerto Rico | 0.5 | 3 |
| Iowa | 1.2 | 8 | Rhode Island | 0.2 | 1 |
| Kansas | 1.7 | 11 | South Carolina | 0.2 | 1 |
| Kentucky | 0.6 | 4 | South Dakota | 0.2 | 1 |
| Louisiana | 0.8 | 5 | Tennessee | 0.3 | 2 |
| Maine | 0.2 | 1 | Texas | 5.8 | 38 |
| Maryland | 4.8 | 31 | Utah | 4.6 | 30 |
| Massachusetts | 2.5 | 16 | Vermont | 0.9 | 6 |
| Michigan | 2.3 | 15 | Virginia | 2.8 | 18 |
| Minnesota | 3.2 | 21 | Washington | 6.3 | 41 |
| Mississippi | 1.4 | 9 | Wisconsin | 1.7 | 11 |
| Missouri | 3.1 | 20 | Wyoming | 0.2 | 1 |

Results were further analyzed by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) regions. As Table 2 shows, more respondents reside in RID Region V (28.9%; N=188) than in other regions, mostly driven by the higher proportion of California respondents. Region II (23.2%; N=151) contributes the second highest proportion.

### Table 2. Geographic Distribution of Respondents by RID Region

| **RID Region (N=650)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Region I** **(STATES:** Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia) | 15.8 | 103 |
| **Region II****(STATES:** Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland & District of Columbia (Potomac Chapter), Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia) | 23.2 | 151 |
| **Region III**(***STATES:*** Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin) | 13.2 | 86 |
| **Region IV****(STATES:** Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Wyoming) | 18.8 | 122 |
| **Region V**(**STATES:** Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington) | 28.9 | 188 |

## Hearing/Blind Status

Over seventeen percent (N=113) of respondents identified as Deaf, and another 4.3% (N=28) identified as hard of hearing. Three respondents identified as either DeafBlind or Hearing & Blind.

### Table 3. Status

| **Identity Reported (N=649)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Deaf | 17.4 | 113 |
| Hard of Hearing | 4.3 | 28 |
| Hearing | 77.8 | 505 |
| DeafBlind | 0.3 | 2 |
| Hearing & Blind | 0.2 | 1 |

## Demographics

Over four in five respondents (87.5%; N=568) indicated they are White/Caucasian, with few (5.7%; N=37) subsequently indicating they are Hispanic. Nearly four in five (78.9%; N=512) are women.

### Table 4. Demographic Information

| **Demographic Criterion (N=649)****(Multiple Responses Allowed)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Race/Ethnicity:White/Caucasian | 87.5 | 568 |
| Race/Ethnicity:Black/African American | 5.4 | 35 |
| Race/Ethnicity:American Indian/Alaska Native | 2.3 | 15 |
| Race/Ethnicity:Asian | 1.7 | 11 |
| Race/Ethnicity:Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 0.8 | 5 |
| Race/Ethnicity:Refuse to Provide | 5.6 | 37 |
| Hispanic: Yes | 5.7 | 37 |
| Hispanic: No | 90.4 | 587 |
| Hispanic: Refuse to provide | 3.9 | 25 |
| Gender: Male | 18.2 | 118 |
| Gender: Female | 78.9 | 512 |
| Gender: Trans/Non-binary | 0.8 | 5 |
| Gender: Refuse to provide | 2.2 | 14 |

# Interpreting for the DeafBlind Community

## DeafBlind Interpreting Status

Seven in ten (71.0%; N=534) respondents have interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year. For another two in ten (21.9%; N=165), such interpreting occurred prior to that time period. Only a small proportion (7.0%; N=53) of respondents have ***never*** interpreted for the DeafBlind community.

### Table 5: Interpreting for DeafBlind in Past Year

| **Status (N=752)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Have interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year | 71.0 | 534 |
| Have not interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year | 21.9 | 165 |
| Have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals | 7.0 | 53 |

On average, DeafBlind interpreters (N=533) have spent about 100 (101.0) hours interpreting for DeafBlind individuals in the past year. However, there is a wide range of interpreting hours, with some respondents (1.9%; N=10) only interpreting for just one hour, while eight (1.1%) respondents indicated they interpreted for 1,000 hours or more (overall, responses ranged from 1 to 3,360 hours).

## Length of Interpreting Career

On average, respondents have interpreted for about 18 years (18.1%; N=613). Just over one in ten (13.9%; N=85) have interpreted for less than 5 years. However, over four in ten (45.4%; N=278) have interpreted for 20 or more years.

## Certifications or Screenings

While about one in six (16.0%; N=104) indicate that they hold no certification or screening, over three in five (62.7%; N=407) are nationally certified interpreters, while one in four (23.3%; N=151) hold a state-level certification. One in ten (11.1%; N=72) are both nationally and state-level certified for interpreting.

### Table 6: Certifications Held

| **Certification (N=649)****(Multiple Responses Allowed)**  | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Nationally certified (e.g., RID, NAD, EIPA, ASLTA) | 62.7 | 407 |
| State QAST or certified | 23.3 | 151 |
| Both nationally and State QUAST or certified | 11.1 | 72 |
| Agency screened | 13.4 | 87 |
| Working on license/certification | 2.5 | 16 |
| Educational degree  | 1.5 | 10 |
| Specialty Certification/Endorsement via RID or affiliate | 1.2 | 8 |
| Lapsed certification | 1.1 | 7 |
| Other  | 0.2 | 1 |
| None | 16.0 | 104 |

Among those who hold *any* certification (national/state/agency screened/specialty certification or endorsement), 9.9% (N=51) are Deaf. Another 3.7% (N=19) are hard of hearing.

Region V (28.8%; N=147) and Region II (23.9%; N=122) contain the most respondents who have national, state, agency level, or specialty certification. These regions also supplied a higher portion of respondents. Within each region, about three-fourths of interpreters hold either national or state certification or are agency screened.

### Table 7: Certifications Held by RID Region

| **(N=511)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Region I (N=103) | 15.1 | 77 |
| Region II (N=151) | 23.9 | 122 |
| Region III (N=86) | 13.1 | 67 |
| Region IV (N=122) | 19.2 | 98 |
| Region V (N=188) | 28.8 | 147 |

## Past DeafBlind Interpreters

Among DeafBlind interpreters who have not interpreted in the past year, over one in three (35.2%; N=58) have done so 1 to 2 years ago. About one in six (16.4%; N=27) have not interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in 11 or more years.

### Table 8: Last Time Interpreted for DeafBlind

| **Time PeriodBase: Have Not Interpreted in Past Year (N=165)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1-2 years ago | 35.2 | 58 |
| 3-5 years ago | 33.9 | 56 |
| 6-10 years ago | 14.5 | 24 |
| 11 or more years ago | 16.4 | 27 |

By far, the most widely given reason for not interpreting for DeafBlind individuals in the past year involves the lack of opportunity to do so in their area or state (41.9%; N=67). One in five (19.4%; N=31) feel they lack the skills or training for it. Quite a few interpreters hold a position where DeafBlind interpreting is not required (16.9%; N=27) or they switched to a different field and/or retired from interpreting (8.1%; N=13).

### Table 9: Reasons for NOT Interpreting for DeafBlind in Past Year

| **Reason for not interpreting for DeafBlind in the past yearBase: Have Not Interpreted for DeafBlind in Past Year (N=160)****(Open Ended Question; Upcoded; Multiple Responses)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No opportunity to work with DeafBlind in area/state | 41.9 | 67 |
| Feel like no skills or experience/lack of training | 19.4 | 31 |
| Current position does not require DeafBlind interpreting | 16.9 | 27 |
| I work in a different field/I'm retired/semiretired from interpreting | 8.1 | 13 |
| Schedule conflict/other issues | 6.3 | 10 |
| Feel like lack of physical endurance | 5.6 | 9 |
| No credential for it | 4.4 | 7 |
| Do not care for it | 3.8 | 6 |
| Partnered with Deaf Interpreters (DIs or Certified DIs) | 2.5 | 4 |
| Other | 6.3 | 10 |

## Interpreters Who Have Never Interpreted for DeafBlind Individuals

Among respondents who have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals (N=53), three in four (75.5%; N=40) lack the needed training. Half (52.8%; N=28) say there are few DeafBlind individuals in their area.

### Figure 1. Reasons Not to Interpret for DeafBlind Individuals

## DeafBlind Interpreters in Past Year

The majority of interpreters (70.4%; N=376) have spent less than one-fourth of their time on interpreting for DeafBlind individuals in the past year. One in six (16.3%; N=87) have spent half or more of their time interpreting for the DeafBlind in the past year.

### Figure 2: Proportion of Time Spent on Interpreting for DeafBlind Individuals in Past Year

Among respondents who interpreted for the DeafBlind in the past year, the most common setting was in the community, such as in medical settings (73.2%; N=391). Over two in five either interpreted at social events or activities (45.9%; N=245), with nearly as many interpreting at work (39.0%; N=208). Clearly, DeafBlind interpreters work in a variety of settings as the table below illustrates.

### Table 10. Settings to Interpret for DeafBlind Individuals

| **SettingBase: Interpreted for DeafBlind in Past Year (N=534) (Multiple Responses Allowed)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Community (e.g., Video Relay Settings, medical settings, such as hospitals, doctor appointments) | 73.2 | 391 |
| Recreational and social activities or DeafBlind events | 45.9 | 245 |
| Work | 39.0 | 208 |
| Postsecondary educational settings / adult community classes/adult education | 18.4 | 98 |
| Religious or spiritual services  | 18.0 | 96 |
| Conferences/workshops/trainings | 9.0 | 48 |
| K-12 | 8.6 | 46 |
| Families/friends of DeafBlind  | 6.2 | 33 |
| Committee meetings | 4.5 | 24 |
| Government/Agency/Voc Rehab settings | 3.4 | 18 |
| Pre K/early intervention | 1.7 | 9 |
| Presentations led by DeafBlind leaders | 1.1 | 7 |
| Court/legal settings | 1.1 | 7 |
| Support Service Provider (SSP role) | 1.1 | 6 |
| DeafBlind residence/in-home | 0.9 | 5 |
| Other  | 0.6 | 3 |

## DeafBlind Interpreters Who Spent 50% or More of Their Time Interpreting for DeafBlind Individuals in Past Year

Table 11 shows the geographic distribution of the 87 interpreters who have spent 50% or more of their time interpreting for DeafBlind individuals. Of the 81 respondents who indicated their state of residence, New York (N=5), North Carolina (N=5), and Washington (N=8) have a higher concentration of interpreters who focus their time on DeafBlind individuals.

### Table 11. Residence of Respondents Interpreting 50%+ in Past Year

| **State (N=81)** | **Percent** | **Count** | **State (N=81)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Arizona | 1.2 | 1 | Nebraska | 1.2 | 1 |
| Arkansas | 2.5 | 2 | New Jersey | 1.2 | 1 |
| California | 4.9 | 4 | New York | 6.2 | 5 |
| Colorado | 1.2 | 1 | North Carolina | 6.2 | 5 |
| District of Columbia | 4.9 | 4 | Ohio | 2.5 | 2 |
| Florida | 3.7 | 3 | Oklahoma | 1.2 | 1 |
| Georgia | 3.7 | 3 | Oregon | 3.7 | 3 |
| Illinois | 2.5 | 2 | Pennsylvania | 6.2 | 5 |
| Iowa | 1.2 | 1 | Texas | 6.2 | 5 |
| Kansas | 1.2 | 1 | Utah | 1.2 | 1 |
| Louisiana | 1.2 | 1 | Vermont | 2.5 | 2 |
| Maryland | 4.9 | 4 | Virginia | 2.5 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | 3.7 | 3 | Washington | 9.9 | 8 |
| Michigan | 1.2 | 1 | Wisconsin | 1.2 | 1 |
| Minnesota | 7.4 | 6 | Wyoming | 1.2 | 1 |
| Mississippi | 1.2 | 1 |  |  |  |

RID Region II contributes the most interpreters who spent 50% or more of their time in the past year interpreting for DeafBlind individuals (see Table 12).

### Table 12. Residence of Respondents Interpreting for DeafBlind 50%+ in Past Year by RID Region

| **RID Region (N=81)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Region I | 19.8 | 16 |
| Region II | 27.2 | 22 |
| Region III | 14.8 | 12 |
| Region IV | 17.3 | 14 |
| Region V | 21.0 | 17 |

Among these DeafBlind interpreters who then also identified their hearing status (N=81), fully half (50.6%; N=41) describe themselves as Deaf, with 3.7% (N=3) saying they are hard of hearing. One person identifies as DeafBlind.

Among respondents who interpreted 50% or more of their time for DeafBlind individuals in the past year, the most common settings were in the community, such as medical settings (71.3%; N=62), or during recreational or social events (75.9%; N=66). Over half (55.2%; N=48) interpreted at work.

### Table 13. Settings to Interpret for DeafBlind among Those interpreting 50%+ in Past Year

| **Setting****Base: Interpreted for DeafBlind in Past Year 50% or more of their time (N=87)****(Multiple Responses Allowed)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Community (e.g., Video Relay Settings, medical settings, such as hospitals, doctor appointments) | 71.3 | 62 |
| Recreational and social activities or DeafBlind events | 75.9 | 66 |
| Work | 55.2 | 48 |
| Religious or spiritual services  | 24.1 | 21 |
| Postsecondary educational settings / adult community classes/adult education | 21.8 | 19 |
| K-12 | 14.9 | 13 |
| Conferences/workshops/trainings | 10.3 | 9 |
| Families/friends of DeafBlind | 8.0 | 7 |
| Government/Agency/Voc Rehab settings | 2.3 | 2 |
| Committee meetings | 2.3 | 2 |
| Pre K/early intervention | 1.1 | 1 |
| Presentations led by DeafBlind leaders | 1.1 | 1 |
| Court/legal settings | 1.1 | 1 |
| DeafBlind residence/in-home | 1.1 | 1 |
| Support Service Provider (SSP role) | 1.1 | 1 |
| Other  | 1.1 | 1 |

# Skills and Abilities as DeafBlind Interpreters

## Proficiency as DeafBlind Interpreter

About two in five DeafBlind interpreters (39.7%; N=265) identify themselves as proficient, with comprehensive skills and knowledge in the field of DeafBlind interpreting. Just as many (41.5%; N=277) view themselves as having intermediate skills, while far fewer (18.7%; N=125) consider themselves to be novices in this interpreting field.

### Figure 3. Level of Skills as DeafBlind Interpreter

A greater percentage of respondents from RID Region III consider themselves as proficient DeafBlind interpreters when compared to other regions (52.5%; N=42). Half of RID Region V (50.6%; N=82) consider themselves to have intermediate skills.

### Figure 4: Level of DeafBlind Interpreting Skills by RID Region

## Communication Modalities

By far, ASL and Tactile ASL (TASL) are the most widely used communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind people, used always or often by about four in five DeafBlind interpreters. Protactile ASL, by contrast, is always or often used by only about three in ten interpreters (30.0%; N=200). Two in five never use PTASL (40.3%; N=269). Haptics and Sim-Com/sign-supported speech are also not widely used.

### Table 14. Communication Modalities Used for DeafBlind Interpreting

| **Modality****Base: Interpreted for DeafBlind People** **(N=667)** | **Always/****Often** | **Always** | **Often** | **Seldom** | **Never** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tactile ASL (TASL) (Visual ASL communicated via touch, including environmental information) | 78.1%(N=521) | 30.1% (N=201) | 48.0% (N=320) | 14.8%(N=99) | 7.0%(N=47) |
| ASL (Visual, gestural language) | 79.3%(N=529) | 30.0%(N=200) | 49.3%(N=329) | 15.3% (N=102) | 5.4% (N=36) |
| Protactile ASL (PTASL) (Tactile language using receiver’s body to convey linguistic information and emotions; sociocultural movement developed in the DeafBlind community) | 30.0%(N=200) | 9.3%(N=62) | 20.7%(N=138) | 29.7%(N=198) | 40.3%(N=269) |
| Haptics/Touch Signals (Nonverbal communication using touch with a set inventory of symbols) | 15.0%(N=100) | 3.1%(N=21) | 11.8%(N=79) | 23.5%(N=157) | 61.5%(N=410) |
| Tracking (DeafBlind individual holds the signer’s wrists or elbows to better follow (“track”) their signing) | 35.7%(N=238) | 7.3%(N=49) | 28.3%(N=189) | 38.8%(N=259) | 25.5%(N=170) |
| Sim-Com/Sign-supported speech | 14.4%(N=96) | 2.7%(N=18) | 11.7%(N=78) | 29.5%(N=197) | 56.1%(N=374) |
| Other | 6.4%(N=43) | 1.3%(N=9) | 5.1%(N=34) | 10.6%(N=71) | 82.9%(N=553) |

A follow-up question asked respondents which modalities they used when interpreting for DeafBlind individuals. Such communication modes were close vision ASL, printing on palm, English/voice, and a wide variety of techniques such as variations on tactile or fingerspelling. They are listed below:

* Close vision ASL, includes smaller signing space; finger spelling, etc. (12)
* Print on palm (12)
* English/voice (9)
* Sign Language/Tactile (8)
* Rochester fingerspelling (7)
* Braille/other close captioning devices (7)
* Drawing/pictures (6)
* Assistive Listening Technologies/FM/Spoken English (6)
* All of the above from given list (5)
* Rochester tactile/Tactile Fingerspelling (4)
* Gestures, body language (3)
* Written (3)
* Lip Reading (3)
* Protactile ASL (3)
* Manipulatives (2)
* Other (2)
* Cues (2)
* ASL (1)
* Tactile ASL (1)
* Various, whatever works (1)
* Nothing (10)

## Training for DeafBlind Interpreting

Among DeafBlind interpreters who indicated the use of any communication modality, the majority (72.0%; N=472) learned these skills from DeafBlind individuals. Nearly two in three (64.3%; N=422) learned their skills from conferences or workshops specific to working with DeafBlind individuals. Half (51.1%; N=335) indicated they learned with experienced DeafBlind interpreters. Over one in four (29.3%; N=192) stated that they had protactile ASL training.

### Table 15. Learning of Communication Skills to Interpret for DeafBlind

| **Learning Resource****Base: Indicated Use of Any Communication Modality for DeafBlind Interpreting (N=656)****(Multiple responses allowed)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| From DeafBlind individuals [e.g., family, friends, mentors, educators] | 72.0 | 472 |
| Workshops/conferences specific to working with DeafBlind individuals  | 64.3 | 422 |
| With experienced DeafBlind interpreters  | 51.1 | 335 |
| Interpreter Education Program  | 39.9 | 262 |
| Protactile ASL Training  | 29.3 | 192 |
| ASL coursework  | 24.4 | 160 |
| I am a heritage (native) ASL signer | 23.6 | 155 |
| Private training program  | 10.2 | 67 |
| No formal training | 5.2 | 34 |

### Interpreter Training Program

Two hundred fifty-five respondents named 107 different programs where they received their education. A respondent could name multiple training programs. Of the 107 unique programs, 49 (45.7%) were mentioned more than once, with Seattle Central Community College (a program that is no longer available) being mentioned most often. The five most attended programs were:

| **Program** | **Count** |
| --- | --- |
| ITP (program not specified)  | 21 |
| Seattle Central CC ITP | 17 |
| Western Oregon University CC ITP  | 15 |
| University of Georgia Perimeter College | 8 |
| Gallaudet University  | 7 |

Three in five individuals (59.5%; N=154) who indicated they learned their interpreting skills from an Interpreter Training Program received specific coursework related to DeafBlind interpreting and DeafBlind culture. Overall, respondents reported that this coursework consisted of one dedicated DeafBlind interpreting course or it was a component of a required specialization course:

* 1 dedicated DeafBlind Culture/interpreting course (39.0%; N=60)
* A component of a required specialization course (27.3%; N=42)
* Isolated lecture/workshop (18.8%; N=29)
* 2 or more dedicated DeafBlind Culture/interpreting courses (14.9%; N=23)

Over one-third (36.4%; N=56) also reported that their coursework included a DeafBlind instructor. In addition, nearly half (47.4%; N=72) stated their coursework included an internship or other in-depth experience working with people who are DeafBlind. Out of these, 59 respondents reported the hours spent on this internship or experience. On average, such an internship or specialized experience demanded 68 hours (68.2), with some requiring just ten or fewer hours (18.6%; N=11) and others running as high as 200 to 400 hours (8.5%; N=5).

The respondents mentioned 38 different DeafBlind instructors from their coursework. Of these instructors, the vast majority (76.3%) were mentioned once, and only four individuals were mentioned more than twice. The instructors who trained multiple people within a traditional coursework setting were:

| **Instructor** | **Count** |
| --- | --- |
| aj granda | 8 |
| Patrick Cave | 6 |
| Jelica Nuccio | 5 |
| Isabel Florence | 3 |

### Protactile ASL Program

One hundred thirty-three different trainings/groups of trainers were named by the respondents, with the combination of aj granda and Jelica Nuccio providing by far the greatest number of trainings (44 out of 133; 33.1%). The next most frequently mentioned trainer was aj granda, providing training alone at six mentions. When breaking the trainings down to the individual trainers involved, again aj granda and Jelica Nuccio provide the highest number of trainings with 63 and 61, respectively. The most often mentioned protactile ASL training providers were:

| **Protactile ASL Training Provider** | **Count** |
| --- | --- |
| aj granda  | 63 |
| Jelica Nuccio  | 61 |
| Bryen Yunashko | 11 |
| Jamie Pope  | 10 |
| Hayley Broadway | 9 |

### Private Training Program

Among the 67 respondents who indicated they learned their interpreting skills though a private training program, 56 provided an estimate of the length of their program. This ranged from a half day of training to one year of tutoring, involving online training as well as week-long immersions.

Sixty-one respondents answered the question about where they received private training, with 12 respondents unable to remember. Of the 49 other responses, only two—HKNC (40.8%; N=20) and SSP (4.1%; N=2)—were mentioned more than once; the other 27 training programs were mentioned only once.

There were 38 unique private training sessions and 37 unique trainers cited by the respondents. The vast majority (72.9%) of the trainers provided a single private training. Of those that provided multiple trainings, only 8 provided more than two, and the highest number an individual provided was 5.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Private Training Provider** | **Count** |
| Susanne Morgan Morrow | 5 |
| Maricar Marquez | 4 |
| Jelica Nuccio  | 4 |
| Ashley Benton | 4 |
| Marilyn Trader | 3 |

### Workshops/Conferences

The respondents named 405 different conferences/workshops where they had received protactile ASL training. The American Association of the DeafBlind conferences were cited most often (6%; N=24) as the location/organization that provided training. A general response of Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) was the second (4%; N=18) most cited location for receiving training. However, if RID is broadened to include the network of regions and state-affiliated chapters, it becomes by far the largest location that respondents received training at 85 (20%) responses.

Appendix A provides the full lists of all training programs, trainers, and workshops/conferences mentioned in these open-ended questions.

## Skills and Knowledge When Working with DeafBlind

DeafBlind interpreters were asked to assess their ability to incorporate specific skills and knowledge into their work with DeafBlind individuals. Using a scale from 1 (no skill) to 10 (proficient), respondents tended to rate themselves highest on their understanding of the ADA in regard to interpreting access. Understanding of assistive listening devices was rated lower. Intervenor skills – working with children in schools – was rated very low (average of 3.4).

### Table 16. Ability to Incorporate Skills/Knowledge into Work with DeafBlind People

| **Skill****Base: Interpreted for DeafBlind (N=630)*****Scale: 1 (No Skill) to 10 (Proficient)*** | **Average**  |
| --- | --- |
| Understanding of the ADA in regard to interpreting access | 7.9 |
| Ability to describe environment | 7.1 |
| Support Service Provider skills (human/sighted guide techniques) | 7.0 |
| Understanding of DeafBlind Culture | 6.8 |
| Orientation and Mobility | 6.7 |
| Communication Facilitator skills (i.e., in-person phone call assistance and interpreting) | 6.5 |
| Understanding of assistive listening technologies | 5.9 |
| Intervenor skills (working with children in schools) | 3.4 |

# Future Contact and Interest in Training Among Respondents

## Future Contact

Nearly three in four (72.1%; N=471) respondents agreed to future contact from the DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource Center. One-third (34.3%; N=224) agreed to have their contact information added to the shared interpreting grants general interest mailing list, while slightly more (37.8%; N=247) agreed that they could be contacted again in the future about DeafBlind interpreting.

### Table 17. Future Contact

| **Response (N=653)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ok to contact (Net) | 72.1 | 471 |
| Ok to contact in future about DeafBlind Interpreting | 37.8 | 247 |
| Ok to contact about DeafBlind interpreting AND add information to shared interpreting grants general interest mailing list | 34.3 | 224 |
| Do not add to mailing list and use information only to validate data | 27.9 | 182 |

## National Directory of Deaf Blind Interpreters

Three in five DeafBlind interpreters (61.0%; N=379) are interested in joining a national directory of DeafBlind interpreters (see Figure 5).

### Figure 5: Interest in Joining National Directory of DeafBlind Interpreters

Clearly, interest in joining the National Directory of DeafBlind Interpreters is very high among those interpreters who consider themselves as having proficient skills (76.6%: N=190). Over half of those with intermediate skills also express interest in joining (61.0%; N=155). (See Figure 6.)

### Figure 6. Interest in Joining National Directory of DeafBlind Interpreters by Skill Level

## Interest in Protactile American Sign Language (PTASL) Training

Nearly nine in ten respondents (86.4%; N=586) say they are interested in receiving protactile American Sign Language (PTASL) training. Interest is especially high among those who know a little about PTASL already (58.3%; N=395).

### Figure 7. Interest in Protactile American Sign Language (PTASL)

While just a small percentage of total survey respondents, those who have never interpreted for DeafBlind people because they have no training in this area or because they feel intimidated by DeafBlind individuals’ needs (N=40), fully three-fourths (75.0%) say they are interested in receiving PTASL training.

# Survey Invitation

## Invitation Sources

By far, respondents indicated that they received their survey invitation through an email from the DeafBlind Interpreting National Resource Center (DBI) (56.2%; N=381). One in four (23.3%; N=158) was referred by others to the survey link, while another 15 respondents (2.2%) mentioned specific people who referred them. Another 13.1% received their survey invitation via an organization, company, or agency.

### Table 18. Survey Invitation Received

| **Invitation Source (N=678)****(Multiple responses allowed)** | **Percent** | **Count** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Email from the DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource Center (DBI) | 56.2 | 381 |
| Somebody referred me to a link to this survey | 23.3 | 158 |
| Organization/Company/Agency | 13.1 | 89 |
| DBI Facebook Page | 6.3 | 43 |
| Another Facebook group/page  | 5.8 | 39 |
| RID  | 5.6 | 38 |
| RID: DeafBlind Member Section | 2.5 | 17 |
| Email from National Center on DeafBlindness | 2.4 | 16 |
| Specific people | 2.2 | 15 |
| The DeafBlind Interpreting website | 1.9 | 13 |
| PSDBC Listserv (Professionals serving DeafBlind Consumers) | 1.8 | 12 |
| Email | 0.7 | 5 |
| Email from National Clearinghouse of Rehabilitation Training Materials | 0.4 | 3 |
| Twitter | 0.1 | 1 |

Other Facebook pages that were mentioned included:

* Specific organizations, such as DeafBlind Living Well Services (16)
* RID (7)
* Seabeck DeafBlind Retreat (4)
* CM Hall’s page, the Co-Director of the National DeafBlind Interpreting Center (3)
* Other (7)

# Conclusion

The information summarized in this report will help guide the building of a PTASL DeafBlind Interpreters Training program to address the needs of the DeafBlind community. As has been demonstrated, the skills of self-identified interpreters vary widely, spanning from no experience/education to those interpreters that have extensive knowledge, skills, and education. It is not surprising that states with larger populations also have larger interpreter populations, but states whose populations fall into the lower 50% percentile also have relatively large interpreter populations. This indicates that there are areas that may be oversaturated with interpreters, while other locations could be viewed as deserts and the needs of the DeafBlind residents within the area may not be met. As one of the main reasons stated for not interpreting for DeafBlind people is a lack of opportunity (i.e., no DeafBlind people in the area or no knowledge of them) to do so, it is important to match the geographic area of individuals in need of interpreting services and trained interpreters to serve them. The data also point to where the gaps in education and experience of the interpreters exist; there are certain vocations and locations that could benefit from increased training opportunities that could greatly help this community.

# Appendix A: List of Trainers/Workshops/Universities

## Table 1. Interpreter Education Programs

| **You mentioned you learned these skills in an Interpreter Education Program. Please provide the name of the program.** | **Frequency**  |
| --- | --- |
| ASL Classes | 1 |
| Cincinnati State  | 1 |
| Cleveland State ITP | 1 |
| Colin County Community College | 1 |
| College of Staten Island S.I.P. | 1 |
| Community College | 1 |
| Community College of Allegheny County | 1 |
| Towson University | 1 |
| Deaf communications Studies | 1 |
| Dekalb College | 1 |
| Delgado | 1 |
| Dept of Interpretation - Gallaudet University | 1 |
| Des Moines Area Community College ASL/English interpretation program | 1 |
| Douglas College (Canada ITP) | 1 |
| DTCC | 1 |
| Florida Gateway College | 1 |
| Floyd College | 1 |
| Harper College | 1 |
| Hinds Community College ITT | 1 |
| Deaf | 1 |
| ITP Northern Essex Community College | 1 |
| JALC | 1 |
| John A. Logan College ITP | 1 |
| Keystone Interpreting Solutions | 1 |
| Kirkwood Community College | 1 |
| M.A.R.I.E CENTER | 1 |
| Manual Communication | 1 |
| Maple woods | 1 |
| Miami Dade Community College | 1 |
| Moraine Valley Community College | 1 |
| NIEC | 1 |
| Northcentral Technical College | 1 |
| Northern Illinois University | 1 |
| Baker College | 1 |
| OCE ITP | 1 |
| Kapiolani Community College | 1 |
| Palomar College ITP | 1 |
| PCC | 1 |
| Pierce College | 1 |
| Pima Community College | 1 |
| Professions in Deafness | 1 |
| Road to Deaf Interpreter | 1 |
| San Antonio College | 1 |
| San Diego Mesa College | 1 |
| SECC | 1 |
| Seymour Joseph | 1 |
| Spokane Falls Community College | 1 |
| St. Louis Community College, Florrisant Valley | 1 |
| Tarrant County College | 1 |
| Umpqua Community College | 1 |
| University of New Hampshire ITP | 1 |
| University of North Colorado | 1 |
| University of Wisconsin Milwaukee | 1 |
| UVU: Deaf Studies (ACIPP) | 1 |
| Valdosta State University | 1 |
| Valdosta State University | 1 |
| Wilson Community College | 1 |
| Wright State University | 1 |
| American Sign Language School of Seattle | 2 |
| Austin Community College | 2 |
| Bethel College | 2 |
| Bloomsburg University | 2 |
| Catonsville Community College ITP | 2 |
| Columbus State Community College | 2 |
| Community College of Baltimore County | 2 |
| Deaf Interpreting Training | 2 |
| El Camino ITP | 2 |
| Front Range Community College | 2 |
| Goshen College | 2 |
| Hillsborough Community College | 2 |
| Kent State ITP | 2 |
| Lansing Community College ITP | 2 |
| Oakland Community College | 2 |
| Oklahoma State University OKC | 2 |
| Salt Lake Community College | 2 |
| Troy University ITP | 2 |
| U of So FL  | 2 |
| University of Arizona | 2 |
| University of North Florida | 2 |
| University of Southern Maine | 2 |
| UNM | 2 |
| American River College ITP | 3 |
| Columbia College ITP | 3 |
| Community College of Philadelphia ITP | 3 |
| JCCC ITP | 3 |
| Northeastern University | 3 |
| Saint Paul College ITP | 3 |
| Sinclair Community College | 3 |
| St Paul ITP | 3 |
| St. Catherine University ITP | 3 |
| University of North Carolina at Greensboro | 3 |
| Waubonsee Community College | 3 |
| CSUN | 4 |
| Iowa Western Community College ITP | 4 |
| Mott Community College | 4 |
| NTID ITP | 4 |
| UNF ITP | 4 |
| Union County College | 4 |
| Eastern Kentucky University ITP | 5 |
| Ohlone ITP | 5 |
| UALR ITP | 5 |
| LaGuardia ITP | 6 |
| William Woods ITP | 6 |
| Gallaudet University  | 7 |
| University of Georgia Perimeter College | 8 |
| WOU ITP | 15 |
| Seattle Central CC ITP | 17 |
| ITP (no program specified) | 21 |
| *Grand Total* | *255* |

## Table 2. DeafBlind Instructors

| **You mentioned your coursework included DeafBlind instructor(s). What were the names of these instructors?** | **Frequency** |
| --- | --- |
| a guy I don't remember | 1 |
| Angie Orlando | 1 |
| Arizona Welsh | 1 |
| Bapin Bhattacharyya | 1 |
| Bob Green | 1 |
| Catherine DuBois | 1 |
| Cheryl Poff | 1 |
| Community member Christine "Chris"  | 1 |
| Doris Fedrid | 1 |
| Dr. Trisha Wooten | 1 |
| Haley Broadway | 1 |
| Harry Anderson | 1 |
| Janet Marcous | 1 |
| Jason Herbers | 1 |
| Jeff Bohrman | 1 |
| Jill Gaus | 1 |
| John Lee Clark | 1 |
| Laura Godbold | 1 |
| Les Peterson | 1 |
| Mike | 1 |
| Patty Starr | 1 |
| Paul Ducharme | 1 |
| Professor Godbold | 1 |
| Rhonda Voight | 1 |
| Richard McGann | 1 |
| Roger Poulin | 1 |
| Sarah Morrison | 1 |
| Stephen Erlich | 1 |
| Steve Collins | 1 |
| Art Roehrig | 2 |
| Charlotte Whitacre | 2 |
| Jamie Pope | 2 |
| Lee Clark | 2 |
| Mark Landreneau | 2 |
| Isabel Florence | 3 |
| Jelica Nuccio | 5 |
| Patrick Cave | 6 |
| aj granda | 8 |
| *Grand Total* | *61* |

## Table 3. Protactile ASL Training Providers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **You mentioned you learned these skills through protactile ASL training. What was the name of training?** | **Frequency** |
| aj granda | 63 |
| Annie Welch | 1 |
| Ashley Benton | 1 |
| at RID Region 5 conference | 1 |
| Bryen Yunashko | 11 |
| Cassondra Holly | 1 |
| Chad Metcalf | 1 |
| Chris Woodfield | 1 |
| CM Hall | 4 |
| DeafBlind Training and Interpreter and Professional Development | 1 |
| Harry-FSDB | 1 |
| Hayley Broadway | 10 |
| I didn't have one | 1 |
| Isabel Florence | 4 |
| Jamie Pope | 10 |
| Jason Herbers | 4 |
| Jasper Norman | 2 |
| Jelica Nuccio | 61 |
| Jill Gaus  | 4 |
| John Lee Clark | 3 |
| Kevin Richmond | 1 |
| Kim Powers | 1 |
| Kimberly Williams | 5 |
| Lee Clark | 2 |
| Maricar Marquez | 1 |
| Marilyn Trader | 1 |
| Mike Sims | 1 |
| NC Div of Services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing | 1 |
| Online through DB-TIP | 1 |
| Oscaar Chacon | 1 |
| Pam Wellumsun | 1 |
| Peggy Johnson | 1 |
| Randy Pope | 2 |
| Rebecca Cowan-Story | 1 |
| Rhonda Jacobs | 1 |
| Roxanne Homstead | 1 |
| Sarah Morrison | 7 |
| Seabeck | 1 |
| Shannon Simon | 1 |
| Steve Oglesbee | 1 |
| Steven Collins | 8 |
| Vicky Maggliochino | 1 |
| Volunteered at Seabeck 2016 | 1 |
| Yvenne | 2 |
| *Grand Total* | *229* |

## Table 4. Private Training Providers

| **What were the name(s) of the instructor(s) at this private training program?** | **Frequency** |
| --- | --- |
| aj granda | 1 |
| Angela Theriault | 3 |
| Arthur Röhrig | 1 |
| Ashley Benton | 4 |
| Bapin Bhattacharyya | 3 |
| Bob Green | 1 |
| Bryen Yunashko | 1 |
| Cindi Robinson | 1 |
| DB participant | 1 |
| Deaf blind participant | 1 |
| Elaine Ducharme | 1 |
| et al...training staff | 1 |
| Ira Padhye | 1 |
| Jackie Engler-Morris | 1 |
| Jamie Pope | 1 |
| Jamie Pope & Steve Collins | 1 |
| Janice Cagan-Teuber | 1 |
| Jason Herbers | 1 |
| Jeff Trader | 1 |
| Jelica Nuccio | 2 |
| Jelica Nuccio & aj granda | 2 |
| John Clark | 1 |
| John Mascia | 1 |
| Julie Durando | 1 |
| Katherine Gabry | 1 |
| Kathy Zarate | 1 |
| Marilyn Trader | 3 |
| Marsha Drenth | 1 |
| Mericar Marquez | 4 |
| Multiple Guest Speakers | 1 |
| Rhonda Jacobs | 1 |
| Robert Smithdas | 1 |
| Rosie Gibson | 1 |
| Shannon Wright  | 1 |
| Sister Bernie | 2 |
| Stacey | 1 |
| Sue Oulette | 1 |
| Susanne Morgan Morrow | 5 |
| *Grand Total* | *57* |

## Table 5. Workshops and Conferences

| **Workshops/conferences** | **Frequency** |
| --- | --- |
| (NAD) AJ PT Workshop | 1 |
| A second DB interpreting workshop with Teresa Smith and others from the Lighthouse in Seattle | 1 |
| AADB | 24 |
| ABL- SSP workshop | 1 |
| Ad hoc Local Workshop | 1 |
| ADARA | 2 |
| Advanced DeafBlind Interpreting | 1 |
| aj & Jelica | 1 |
| aj granda | 1 |
| Annual Deaf Blind Camp De Salles Center MI  | 1 |
| Another local deaf blind conference  | 1 |
| ARID Biennial Conference 2011 | 1 |
| ASLIS Pro-Tactile Workshop | 1 |
| Bapin group international deaf blind convention  | 1 |
| Beyond Arms Reach OM for DB | 1 |
| Bryen Yunashko | 2 |
| BYU  | 1 |
| CA Dept. of Rehabilitation SB105 2012 | 1 |
| camps | 1 |
| Cannot remember the names of the other conferences | 1 |
| Can't remember the name of the other conference | 1 |
| CASA | 1 |
| CHARGE Syndrome Conference | 1 |
| Chicago Hearing Society | 1 |
| Chicago lighthouse for the blind  | 1 |
| CIT | 6 |
| CM Hall (Benicia workshop) | 1 |
| CODA conference | 1 |
| Colorado RID | 1 |
| Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind DeafBlind Workshop | 3 |
| Communication Skills Workshop (TX) | 1 |
| Community workshops | 1 |
| Conference in Bloomsburg, PA, 1990s | 1 |
| Conference in Philadelphia, 1990s | 1 |
| Copd trainings | 1 |
| CSUN Symposium | 1 |
| DARS - Deaf Interpreter Training  | 1 |
| DB 101 | 1 |
| DBPT Happy Hour (had a very short intro "workshop" at the beginning) | 1 |
| DBR in Chicago | 1 |
| DB-TIP | 6 |
| DBYAA | 1 |
| DeafBlind Project of Minnesota | 1 |
| DeadBlind Workshop | 1 |
| Deaf Action Center (Dallas) I can't remember name of workshop | 1 |
| Deaf inc- deaf blind workshop  | 1 |
| Deaf Interpreter Conference | 3 |
| Deaf Interpreter Conference 2 | 1 |
| Deaf Interpreter Conference 2017 | 1 |
| Deaf Interpreter Trainings | 1 |
| Deaf/Blind - WOU in the 1970's | 1 |
| Deaf/Blind PA Conference | 1 |
| DeafBlind 101 | 2 |
| DeafBlind Awareness Week | 1 |
| DeafBlind camp | 1 |
| DeafBlind camp in Minnesota | 1 |
| Deafblind Camp of Texas | 1 |
| DeafBlind Camp of West River, Maryland | 1 |
| DeafBlind Camp SSP | 1 |
| DeafBlind Community Class offered to the community where the students from the program partnered with experienced interpreters | 1 |
| Deafblind Interpreter Allies | 1 |
| DeafBlind Interpreting | 3 |
| DeafBlind Interpreting  | 1 |
| DeafBlind Interpreting Workshop at Ohlone College (1985) | 1 |
| DeafBlind Intervener in Minnesota  | 1 |
| DeafBlind Project for PA | 1 |
| DeafBlind Retreat | 1 |
| DeafBlind Symposium  | 1 |
| DeafBlind Symposium (Texas) | 1 |
| DeafBlind Transition Institute | 1 |
| DeafBlind weekend | 1 |
| DeafBlind Workshop | 1 |
| DeafBlind Workshop  | 1 |
| DeafBlind workshop at desales center  | 1 |
| DeafBlind workshop provided by ASLIS | 1 |
| DeafBlind Camps of Maryland | 1 |
| DIC | 1 |
| DIC2 | 1 |
| Do not remember names | 1 |
| DSDHH Utah Interpreter Program | 1 |
| DVR-sponsored SSP/DB training w/Paul Deeming | 1 |
| EDbU | 1 |
| Educationally Interpreters Project sponsored workshop | 1 |
| Falling into DeafBlind World | 1 |
| FDBA training  | 1 |
| First National DeafBlind Online Conference | 1 |
| Florida- deaf blind expo | 1 |
| Florida Silent Weekend 2017 | 1 |
| From the Db Perspective | 1 |
| GAD SSP Training | 1 |
| Gallaudet course  | 3 |
| Golden Rule | 1 |
| Great Lakes Area Regional Resource Center | 1 |
| GVRRID | 3 |
| Haptic Language | 1 |
| Haptics and Touch Signals hosted by Florida Educational Interpreter Project | 2 |
| Haptics training | 1 |
| HKNC | 5 |
| IDBE | 2 |
| Illinois Deaf and Hard of Hearing Annual Conference  | 1 |
| Illinois DeafBlind Retreat | 1 |
| in San Francisco, CA | 1 |
| in Spokane, WA | 1 |
| International DeafBlind Conference | 2 |
| International DeafBlind Expo | 6 |
| Interpreting and SSP workshop | 1 |
| Interpreting for DeafBlind Individuals | 3 |
| Interpreting for DeafBlind Individuals in Health Care Settings | 1 |
| Interpreting for Students Who Have Dual Sensory Loss: Deaf-Blindness with Sue Ann Houser | 1 |
| It was at Chicago Lighthouse | 1 |
| Johnson County Community College | 1 |
| Justice for Deaf Victims National Coalition (JDVNC) | 1 |
| KAI | 1 |
| Kansas Associate for the Deaf | 1 |
| Kentucky Deafblind Retreat | 2 |
| Kevin Richmond | 1 |
| LA School for the Deaf | 1 |
| LA-RID | 1 |
| Local MN workshops | 1 |
| Local workshop | 2 |
| LRID | 1 |
| many conferences over 25 years | 1 |
| Many over my 38 year career | 1 |
| Maple woods workshop for db  | 1 |
| Minnesota RID | 1 |
| Missouri commission for the deaf | 1 |
| Missouri Interpreter Conference | 3 |
| MRID | 1 |
| MWADB  | 1 |
| MWDB  | 1 |
| NAD | 6 |
| NAD  | 1 |
| NAD Conference  | 1 |
| NAD RID Region V conference in Arizona  | 1 |
| NAD/RID conference w/Deaf Blind Haptics training | 1 |
| NAOBI Power Hour Workshop | 1 |
| American Association of Deaf-Blind Experience | 1 |
| National Association of the Deaf 2016 | 1 |
| National Deaf Blind Association  | 2 |
| National Deaf Education | 1 |
| National Deafblind Conference (presented as an intervenor) | 1 |
| NCDBA | 3 |
| NCRID | 2 |
| New England DeafBlind weekend in 2005 | 1 |
| New Mexico RID | 1 |
| NJAD/NJRID Conference  | 1 |
| NorCRID | 2 |
| North Carolina national conference | 1 |
| Northeastern University mini sessions | 1 |
| Northeastern University's SNIN Conference 2016 | 1 |
| not a conference, but a DB Adult Camp in Maine (2004/5?) | 1 |
| Now I teach these workshops | 1 |
| NTFDBI | 1 |
| NTID Access Services Professional Development Program | 1 |
| OADB | 2 |
| Ohio Center for Deafblind Education | 1 |
| One at Purple retreat | 1 |
| Online | 1 |
| Open Hands Open Access | 1 |
| ORID Protactile workshop | 1 |
| Others I can't remember before 2014 so not on RID transcript | 1 |
| Pass Project | 1 |
| Pattan | 1 |
| PCRID | 2 |
| PEPNET 2 Interpreting for DHH with Additional Disabilities | 1 |
| Perspectives of the DeafBlind Community | 1 |
| Perspectives on Deaf/Blind Interpreting, Joan Pellerin, RI Region I Conference, Atlantic City, NJ | 1 |
| Pittsburgh workshops | 1 |
| Private Lessons | 1 |
| Protactile | 2 |
| Protactile - An Introduction | 1 |
| Protactile 1, 2 & 3 | 1 |
| Protactile 3 days workshop in Arizona | 1 |
| Protactile and Haptics | 1 |
| Protactile the deafblind way | 1 |
| Protactile vs. Haptics: What's the Difference? | 1 |
| Protactile workshop | 1 |
| Protactile Workshop at Seabeck DeafBlind Retreat | 1 |
| Protactile workshop by Steven Collins | 1 |
| Protactile workshop through ASLIS | 1 |
| Protactile: The DeafBlind Way in the Interpreting World Hosted by WSRID and the Seattle Lighthouse for the Blind, Inc | 1 |
| Rainbow Alliance of the Deaf conference | 1 |
| Really a few hours within larger workshops  | 1 |
| Rebecca Cowan-Story & Dana Tarter | 1 |
| Region 1 Conference | 1 |
| regional conference workshops | 1 |
| Regional RID conferences | 1 |
| Rene Pellerin | 2 |
| RID | 18 |
| RID Conference | 2 |
| RID National & Regional Conferences | 1 |
| RID National Conference | 1 |
| RID National Conference, DeafBlind Pre-conference, Indianapolis | 6 |
| RID National/Regional/State | 1 |
| RID or Street Leverage ( I forget) | 1 |
| RID Region 3 | 2 |
| RID Region 4 Conference | 2 |
| RID Region 5 Conference | 4 |
| RID Region V Conference | 1 |
| RID Regional Conference 2013 | 1 |
| RID Regional in SD | 1 |
| RID State and National conferences | 1 |
| RID workshops | 1 |
| RID/NAD National Conference 2016 | 1 |
| Rochester Deaf Awareness Week '15, '16 | 1 |
| Sanderson Community Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Stephen Ehrlich (deaf blind presenter) | 1 |
| SDCRID Workshop | 1 |
| Seabeck | 16 |
| Seabeck  | 1 |
| Seattle DBS training/ssp | 1 |
| Seattle. Atlanta national conferences | 1 |
| SERID | 6 |
| Several NJ DB League meetings in community | 1 |
| Several others during the years that I cannot remember | 1 |
| SHIM=DB DBW (DeafBlind Workshop) | 1 |
| Silent Weekend | 2 |
| Sorenson | 1 |
| SSP | 2 |
| SSP and Interpreting Training  | 1 |
| SSP orientation | 1 |
| SSP training | 2 |
| SSP Training  | 1 |
| SSP training through Meril | 1 |
| Support Service Provider (SSP) Training, NJCB&VI | 1 |
| Support Service Provider training in Washington DC | 1 |
| Tactile Interpreting, Waubonsee Community College, Richard Ahern | 1 |
| Texas Baptist Conference for the Deaf | 1 |
| Texas DeafBlind symposium | 1 |
| Texas Society of Interpreters for the Deaf | 1 |
| The Art of Working with INdividuals Who are Deaf Blind | 1 |
| The Lighthouse for the Blind, Inc. | 1 |
| Theresa B. Smith | 1 |
| too long ago to remember - but in FL or through SERID | 1 |
| Took workshop at DBSC | 1 |
| Total Immersion Workshop, Orlando, FL | 1 |
| Touch Signals | 3 |
| Touch Signals Awareness | 1 |
| training for AIDB young adults transition institute | 1 |
| Trends to Working with DeafBlind People | 1 |
| TSID | 1 |
| TSID, various workshops | 1 |
| UCC | 1 |
| University sponsored workshop  | 1 |
| Various community workshops for DB | 1 |
| various workshops through IRID | 1 |
| Very long ago. Think it was taught by a deaf man named Mark Azzuro (sp?)  | 1 |
| Visual to tactile | 1 |
| VRID | 1 |
| VTRID workshops | 1 |
| Washington DC Deaf Blind Conferences | 1 |
| Webinar DBTIP | 1 |
| Western Oregon University | 2 |
| With Impaired Sight and Hearing | 1 |
| Working Together Conf.  | 1 |
| Working with Db | 1 |
| Workshop | 1 |
| Workshop  | 1 |
| Workshop at WOU | 1 |
| Workshop called Deaf/Blind Interpreting | 1 |
| Workshop Presented by Joan Blake | 1 |
| Workshop with Elaine Ducharme | 1 |
| Workshop with Rene and Joan Pellerin | 1 |
| Workshops at FSDB | 1 |
| Workshops by local CDIs | 1 |
| Workshops by local Deaf Blind Individual, Stephen Ehrlich | 1 |
| Workshops I have had at my place of employment (higher education) | 1 |
| Workshops in the capital | 1 |
| Workshops provided thru education facility | 1 |
| WSRID | 3 |
| FRID conference | 2 |
| *Grand Total* | *405* |

## Table 6. Private Training Programs

| What was the name of this private training program? | Frequency |
| --- | --- |
| ? Person-Centered Planning (one time ago!) | 1 |
| Addy McBride Center | 1 |
| Arizona Deafblind Project's Intervenor Team Training  | 1 |
| Cannot recall -  | 1 |
| cant remember | 1 |
| Certificate Program in the Rehabilitation of Persons who are Deaf/Blind | 1 |
| DBCAN | 1 |
| DBSM | 1 |
| DBTIP | 1 |
| Deaf blind culture | 1 |
| Deaf Blind Living Well Services  | 1 |
| Deaf Blind Service Center (DBSC)  | 1 |
| Folks from Norway  | 1 |
| HKNC | 20 |
| i can't remember it was about 10 years ago | 1 |
| i couldnt remember the name of the program was in dekalb, IL | 1 |
| I don't remember (10 years+ ago) | 1 |
| I don't remember. | 1 |
| Idk | 1 |
| Interpreting Strategies for Individuals Who Are DeafBlind | 1 |
| Intervener Certification Utah State University | 1 |
| It was a rehab center in Chicago | 1 |
| Its was just a volunteer thing | 1 |
| led by Susie Morgan Morrow | 1 |
| M.A.R.I.E. | 1 |
| MDRS Deaf Program | 1 |
| NA | 1 |
| National Institute on Deaf Blindness Northern Illinois University | 1 |
| NCDSDHH | 1 |
| NCIEC Training program | 1 |
| New Mexico State University | 1 |
| Not sure the name | 1 |
| Open Hands, Open Access Modules - National Deaf Blind Project, through VA Commonwealth University | 1 |
| Orientation  | 1 |
| part of my job at the Perkins School for the Blind | 1 |
| Protactile part 1, 2 & 3; Touch Signals, not remember what it was at IDBE LV | 1 |
| PTASL booths, coffee hours and IDBE | 1 |
| SSP | 2 |
| Tactile Communications | 1 |
| There was no formal name of the training program. I have worked directly with DB individuals that have provided me with training and feedback.  | 1 |
| Touch Communication | 1 |
| Touching Lives: Interpreting Techniques for the DeafBlind Population | 1 |
| *Grand Total* | *62* |

# Appendix B: Online Survey

## Online Baseline Survey and Instructions

Thank you for participating in the DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource (DBI) survey to assist us in establishing the number of interpreters who are working with DeafBlind individuals in various capacities. The term DeafBlind will be used throughout the survey. We recognize the combined range of hearing and vision loss and how individuals may identify differently. For our survey purposes, the definition includes individuals who are DeafBlind, deaf-blind, and/or who have dual sensory loss as well as those individuals who are late-deafened with vision loss, are close vision, or are oral DeafBlind. This survey will take about 20 minutes to complete, depending on your answers to some of the questions. You must answer the first question so we can know you have read and agree with the Consent information. You may also save your work and continue at a later time if you wish. In order to save, please finish a page and click “Next.” Without this step, your answers to the questions will not be saved. You have one week available to finish this survey. Because this is a research project, we must provide you with information about the project and any risks involved. In order to complete the survey, you must review the brief informed consent information. Next, please click on this link Informed Consent Form.pdf. It will open the informed consent form in another window. Please read it to understand your rights as a survey participant. You can also print the document. Once you have finished, click to close and return to this survey.

Please select your choice below. Clicking on the “Agree” button indicates that: - You have read the Consent information - You voluntarily agree to participate - You are 18 years of age or older

* Agree (1)
* Disagree (2)

*Condition: Disagree Is Selected. Skip To: End of Survey.*

1. In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who are DeafBlind?

* Estimate of hours in past year: (write in hours) (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* I have not interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year (2)
* I have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals (3)

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? I have not interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year Is Selected

2. When was the last time you interpreted for a DeafBlind individual?

* 1-2 years ago (1)
* 3-5 years ago (2)
* 6-10 years ago (3)
* 11 or more years ago (4)

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? I have not interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year Is Selected

3. Why haven’t you interpreted for DeafBlind individuals in the past year?

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? I have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals Is Selected

4. Why have you never interpreted for a DeafBlind individual? Please check all that apply.

* I have no training in this specialty area (1)
* I am intimidated by what their needs might be (2)
* There are very few DeafBlind individuals in my area (3)
* This is not something that interests me (4)

*Condition: I have no training in this ... Is Selected. Skip To: 38. How did you receive the invitatio....Condition: I am intimidated by what th... Is Selected. Skip To: 38. How did you receive the invitatio....Condition: There are very few DeafBlin... Is Selected. Skip To: 38. How did you receive the invitatio....Condition: This is not something that ... Is Selected. Skip To: 38. How did you receive the invitatio....*

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? Estimate of hours in past year: (write in hours) Is Selected

5. In the past year, what proportion of your time interpreting is spent with DeafBlind individuals?

* Over 75% (1)
* 50-74% (2)
* 25-49% (3)
* 24% or less (4)

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? Estimate of hours in past year: (write in hours) Is Selected

6. In the past year, in what settings have you interpreted for DeafBlind Individuals? Please check all that apply.

* Pre K/ early intervention (1)
* K-12 (2)
* Postsecondary educational settings (3)
* Work (5)
* Families of DeafBlind children (6)
* Community (e.g., doctor appointments) (7)
* Religious or spiritual services (8)
* Recreational activities (9)
* Other (please specify) (10) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? I have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals Is Not Selected

7. How would you rate your current skills/knowledge/abilities to work as a DeafBlind interpreter?

* Novice: New or inexperienced in DeafBlind interpreting field (1)
* Intermediate: Transitional; in-between novice and proficient. Emerging. (2)
* Proficient: Comprehensive skills and knowledge in field of DeafBlind interpreting (3)

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? I have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals Is Not Selected

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8. How often do you use the following communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind individuals? | Always (1) | Often (2) | Seldom (3) | Never (4) |
| Is Tactile ASL (TASL) (Visual ASL communicated via touch, including environmental information) (1) |  |  |  |  |
| ASL (Visual, gestural language) (2) |  |  |  |  |
| Protactile ASL (PTASL) (Tactile language using receiver’s body to convey linguistic information and emotions; sociocultural movement developed in the DeafBlind community) (3) |  |  |  |  |
| Haptics/Touch Signals (Nonverbal communication using touch with a set inventory of symbols) (4) |  |  |  |  |
| Tracking (DeafBlind individual holds the signer’s wrists or elbows to better follow (“track”) their signing) (5) |  |  |  |  |
| Sim-Com/Sign-supported speech (7) |  |  |  |  |
| Other (6) |  |  |  |  |

Display This Question:

If How often do you use the following communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind in... Other - Always Is Selected

Or How often do you use the following communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind in... Other - Often Is Selected

Or How often do you use the following communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind in... Other - Seldom Is Selected

9. You mentioned you use “other” communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind Individuals. What are you using?

Display This Question:

If How often do you use the following communication modalities when interpreting for DeafBlind in... - Never Is Less Than 7

10. How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply.

* I am a heritage (native) ASL signer (1)
* Interpreter Education Program (2)
* ASL coursework (3)
* Protactile ASL Training (4)
* Private training program (e.g., HKNC) (5)
* From DeafBlind individuals [e.g., family, friends, mentors, educators] (6)
* With experienced DeafBlind interpreters (7)
* Workshops/conferences specific to working with DeafBlind individuals (8)
* No formal training (9)

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Interpreter Education Program Is Selected

11. You mentioned you learned these skills in an Interpreter Education Program. Please provide the name of the institution, the city and state, and the type of degree or certificate awarded.

Name of program: (1)

City, State: (2)

Degree or certificate awarded: (3)

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Interpreter Education Program Is Selected

12. Did you take specific coursework related to DeafBlind interpreting/Culture?

* Yes (1)
* No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did you take specific coursework related to DeafBlind interpreting/Culture? Yes Is Selected

13. Was your coursework comprised of…

* 2 or more dedicated DeafBlind interpreting/Culture courses (1)
* 1 dedicated DeafBlind interpreting/Culture course (2)
* A component of a required specialization course (3)
* Isolated lecture/workshop (4)

Display This Question:

If Did you take specific coursework related to DeafBlind interpreting/Culture? Yes Is Selected

14. Did your coursework include any DeafBlind instructors?

* Yes (1)
* No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did your coursework include any DeafBlind instructors? Yes Is Selected

15. You mentioned your coursework included DeafBlind instructor(s). What were the names of these instructors?

* Name: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Name: (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Name (3) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Cannot remember name(s) (4)

Display This Question:

If Did you take specific coursework related to DeafBlind interpreting/Culture? Yes Is Selected

16. Did your coursework include an internship or other in-depth experience working with people who are DeafBlind?

* Yes (1)
* No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did your coursework include an internship or other in-depth experience working with people who are DeafBlind? Yes Is Selected

17. How many hours was your DeafBlind specialized experience or internship?

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Protactile ASL Training Is Selected

18. You mentioned you learned these skills through Protactile ASL Training. What was the name of the trainer?

* Name: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Cannot member name (2)

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Private training program (e.g., HKNC) Is Selected

19. You mentioned you learned these skills through a private training program (e.g., HKNC). What was the length of the training program?

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Private training program (e.g., HKNC) Is Selected

20. What was the name of this private training program?

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Private training program (e.g., HKNC) Is Selected

21. What were the name(s) of the instructor(s) at this private training program?

* Name: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Name: (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Name: (3) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Cannot member name (4)

Display This Question:

If How did you learn these skills? Please check all that apply. Workshops/conferences specific to working with DeafBlind individuals Is Selected

22. You mentioned you learned these skills through selected workshops/conferences specific to working with DeafBlind individuals. What was the name of the conferences?

* Name of conference (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Name of conference (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Name of conference (3) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Cannot remember (4)

23. On a scale from 1 (No skill) to 10 (Proficient), how would you assess your ability to incorporate the following skills/knowledge into your work with DeafBlind individuals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 4 (4) | 5 (5) | 6 (6) | 7 (7) | 8 (8) | 9 (9) | 10 (10) |
| Understanding of DeafBlind Culture (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orientation and Mobility (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Understanding of assistive listening technologies (3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ability to describe environment (4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support Service Provider skills (human/sighted guide techniques) (5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intervenor skills (working with children in schools) (6) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communication Facilitator skills (i.e., in-person phone call assistance and interpreting) (7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Understanding of the ADA in regards to interpreting access (8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Display This Question:

If In the past year, how many hours would you estimate you have interpreted for individuals who identify as DeafBlind? I have never interpreted for DeafBlind individuals Is Not Selected

24. Are you interested in joining a national directory of interpreters who work with individuals who are DeafBlind?

* Yes (1)
* No (2)

25. How did you receive the invitation to this survey? Please check all that apply.

* Email from the DeafBlind Interpreting National Training and Resource Center (DBI) (4)
* DBI Facebook Page (5)
* Another Facebook group/page (please specify) (6) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* RID (7)
* RID: DeafBlind Member Section (8)
* PSDBC Listserv (Professionals serving DeafBlind Consumers) (9)
* Email from National Clearinghouse of Rehabilitation Training Materials (10)
* Email from National Center on DeafBlindness (11)
* Somebody referred me to a link to this survey (12)
* The DBI website (13)
* Other (please specify) (14) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

26. How interested are you in getting Protactile American Sign Language (PTASL) training?

* I have not heard of PTASL but I am now interested (1)
* I have not heard of PTASL before and I am not interested (2)
* I know a little about PTASL and I would be interested (3)
* I know a little about PTASL but I am not interested (4)
* I am already skilled in PTASL but I am still interested (5)
* I am already skilled in PTASL and I am not interested (6)

In this section we are asking a number of demographic questions. Please provide your name and email address. Without this information, we are unable to accurately check for duplicates from the data and may not be able to use your data if the information is not complete. We will also be conducting an additional study at the end of the 5-year cycle to determine impact and will have information about our future trainings to share periodically. You will have the option to specify how we will use your name and email address shortly.

27. Which of the following do you prefer about future contact?

* Yes, it is ok to contact me in the future about DeafBlind interpreting. (1)
* Yes, it is ok to contact me in the future about DeafBlind interpreting and add my information to the shared interpreting grants general interest mailing list (e.g., Atypical Language, People of Color in Legal Interpreting settings, Mental Health interpreting). (2)
* No, only use my name and email address to validate your data. Do NOT add me to any mailing lists. (3)

28. What is your name?

* First name: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Last name: (2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Refuse to provide (3)

29. What is your email address?

* Email address: (1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Refuse to provide (2)

30. In which state do you currently reside?

* Alabama (1)
* Alaska (2)
* Arizona (3)
* Arkansas (4)
* California (5)
* Colorado (6)
* Connecticut (7)
* Delaware (8)
* District of Columbia (9)
* Florida (10)
* Georgia (11)
* Hawaii (12)
* Idaho (13)
* Illinois (14)
* Indiana (15)
* Iowa (16)
* Kansas (17)
* Kentucky (18)
* Louisiana (19)
* Maine (20)
* Maryland (21)
* Massachusetts (22)
* Michigan (23)
* Minnesota (24)
* Mississippi (25)
* Missouri (26)
* Montana (27)
* Nebraska (28)
* Nevada (29)
* New Hampshire (30)
* New Jersey (31)
* New Mexico (32)
* New York (33)
* North Carolina (34)
* North Dakota (35)
* Ohio (36)
* Oklahoma (37)
* Oregon (38)
* Pennsylvania (39)
* Puerto Rico (40)
* Rhode Island (41)
* South Carolina (42)
* South Dakota (43)
* Tennessee (44)
* Texas (45)
* Utah (46)
* Vermont (47)
* Virginia (48)
* Washington (49)
* West Virginia (50)
* Wisconsin (51)
* Wyoming (52)
* I do not reside in the United States (53)

31. Please provide us with your city and ZIP code to assist us in our federal reporting to demonstrate the reach of this survey.

City: (1)

ZIP code: (2)

32. Which of the following represents your race/ethnicity? Please check all that apply.

* White/Caucasian (1)
* Black/African American (2)
* American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
* Asian (4)
* Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (5)
* Refuse to provide (6)

33. Are you Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish?

* Yes (1)
* No (2)
* Refuse to provide (3)

34. What is your gender?

* Male (1)
* Female (2)
* Trans/Non-binary (3)
* Refuse to provide (5)

35. How many years have you been interpreting?

Years: (1)

36. Do you hold any of the following certifications or state- or agency-level screenings? Please check all that apply.

* Nationally certified (e.g., RID, NAD, EIPA) (1)
* State QAST or certified (2)
* Agency screened (3)
* Other (please specify) (4) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* None (5)

37. Are you:

* Deaf (1)
* Hard of Hearing (2)
* Hearing (3)
* DeafBlind (4)
* Hearing & Blind (5)