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Abstract

This small scale pilot study asked how deaf and hard of hearing high school students currently perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreting services and how those same students suggest interpreting services could be improved. In order to do so data was collected via survey and focus group from deaf and hard of hearing students attending a large Midwestern school district. Results yielded themes regarding student comfort with interpreters, student satisfaction with interpreters, logistical issues with an interpreted education, interpreter attributes, and ways in which students could work alongside interpreters. From these results recommendations to the school district and educational interpreters were proposed with the aim of improving interpreting services for deaf and hard of hearing high school students. It is also suggested that similar research be done on a larger scale. This would allow educational interpreters to gain a broader understanding of the needs of deaf and hard of hearing students and guide them toward better meeting those needs.

Keywords: educational interpreting, high school students, deaf and hard of hearing
Introduction

Since the passage of PL 94-142 in 1975, which later became the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (IDEA, 2004), the number of deaf\(^1\) and hard of hearing students accessing American classrooms through sign language interpreters has increased (Jones, 2004). This has brought more deaf and hard of hearing students into mainstream or general education classrooms with interpreters. These interpreters who work in the K-12 setting are commonly referred to as educational interpreters. Although educational interpreting began as a field of interpreting decades ago, there is still much that is unknown about the interpreting happening in classrooms across the United States.

The increase in the number of deaf and hard of hearing students in mainstream classrooms has occurred because IDEA legislation states that students with disabilities, including deaf and hard of hearing students, should be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Jones, 2004). The LRE is generally taken to mean a mainstream classroom setting which has resulted in bringing more deaf and hard of hearing students into mainstream or general education classrooms (Jones, 2004). This is frequently referred to as mainstreaming. There is still much that is unknown about the mainstream education of deaf and hard of hearing students who use interpreting services across the United States. Mainstreaming a student with an interpreter is one of several placement options for parents and educators working to determine the appropriate placement for a deaf or hard of hearing student. Deaf education resources can provide information and guidance about the differences between residential schools, day schools, and mainstream options for Individualized Education Plan (IEP) teams to review (Marschark, 2007; Marschark & Hauser, 2012). There is not a single placement that can be prescribed for all deaf

---

\(^1\) The term ‘Deaf’ with a capital ‘D’ is used to signify an association with and use of American Sign Language and Deaf culture whereas ‘deaf’ simply indicates not being able to hear.
and hard of hearing students. Instead it is a decision that requires careful consideration from everyone involved. However, it is clear that many IEP teams have made recommendations for deaf and hard of hearing students to attend mainstream classrooms with interpreters. This trend makes it essential for further research to be done regarding the efficacy of educational interpreting.

Literature on educational interpreting has primarily centered on the skills, qualifications, and practices of the interpreters themselves. Seal (2004) presented a set of best practices for educational interpreters. Winston (2004) offered a collection of chapters to advise educational interpreters as to how they can be more successful in their work. Smith (2010a, 2010b, 2013, 2015) has presented a body of work that reports the observable actions of interpreters in K-12 classrooms. Her work shows that educational interpreters seek to make the educational experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students as successful as possible by making decisions regarding visual access, student needs, and participation on a frequent basis (Smith, 2013). Some studies have also focused on the importance of the relationships between interpreters and teachers (Cawthon, 2001; Kopans, 2001, Mertens, 1990, Smith, 2013).

Only a smattering of publications have focused on how deaf and hard of hearing students perceive their educational interpreting services. Of these publications, one was not research-based (Jones, 1980), some have begun to be outdated (Jones, 1908; Kurz & Langer, 2004), and another took place outside of the United States (Berge & Ytterhus, 2015). The study outlined in this paper was conducted to take a more current look at the perspectives of deaf and hard of hearing students on their educational interpreting services.

Review of the Literature

An exploration of the interpreting needs of deaf and hard of hearing high school students
Deaf and Hard of Hearing High School Students

relies on an understanding of the foundation of deaf education and interpreting. As interpreters are becoming more common as a part of deaf education, the two fields are becoming increasingly intertwined. Both fields play an integral part in educating deaf and hard of hearing students.

**Deaf Education**

Educational professionals and parents are faced with difficult choices when it comes to deciding where and how deaf and hard of hearing children should be educated. Options range from state-run residential schools for the deaf or private schools for the deaf, to public schools with varied abilities to serve deaf and hard of hearing students (Marschark & Hauser, 2012). Some public schools have developed deaf education programs with teachers who are able to communicate using American Sign Language (ASL) while others may struggle to hire necessary service professionals such as ASL interpreters or speech and language pathologists. Parents and educators must come together in the best interests of deaf and hard of hearing students to develop Individualized Education Plans (IEP’s) that determine the educational placement and services for each student. It is key to consider that each child and each family’s needs and preferences are different (Marschark, 2007). Any placement may be successful for one child and be a failure for another (Ramsey, 1997). Deaf and hard of hearing students must be seen as individuals with particular needs that must be met in order to provide an effective education.

There has been and continues to be debate as to whether an interpreted education meets the academic and social needs of deaf and hard of hearing students (Leigh, 1999; Winston, 1994). While some deaf and hard of hearing students are able to succeed with such an approach they require strong language skills, hard work, and teacher and parent support that may not be available to all students (Luckner & Muir, 2001). Stinson and Lang (1994) emphasize that even if interpreters can provide deaf students with adequate academic content, deaf students may feel
socially isolated and may not be provided with information about Deaf culture or the Deaf identity. Schick (2004) also suggests that learning through an interpreter may have an impact on the cognitive development of deaf and hard of hearing students regarding their ability to develop theory of mind. It is clear that educators, regardless of their school environment, are obliged to educate deaf and hard of hearing students about more than just academics at school.

As Winston (2004a) noted, teachers have the most control of content and presentation in an interpreted classroom. This gives them a large responsibility to make their instruction and the interpretation as visually accessible as possible for the benefit of deaf and hard of hearing students. Kopans (2001) sent a questionnaire to fifty elementary school teachers from eleven states to learn how teachers perceived working with deaf and hard of hearing students. The results showed that while the teachers stated there was no additional stress associated with working with deaf students, they also indicated that deaf students generally had weaker social skills and academic abilities (Kopans, 2001). This may coincide with Marschark and Hauser’s (2012) comment that deaf students are often met with lower expectations than hearing students. Along those lines, Cawthon (2001) studied how teachers interact with deaf students and found that teachers direct fewer statements to deaf students than hearing students. Teachers have been shown to not know how to best interact with deaf and hard of hearing students through interpreters and therefore make fewer attempts to do so (Ramsey, 1997; Shaw & Jamieson, 1997). Stinson and Liu (1999) also state that teachers set the tone for how classmates will interact with interpreters and deaf and hard of hearing students. It is essential for this example to be set in a way that encourages deaf and hard of hearing students to participate with hearing students in the classroom together. This can be fostered by providing ASL instruction to hearing students to allow for more natural peer communication (Stinson & Liu, 1999).
Deaf and hard of hearing students are often served by a classroom teacher and a special education or deaf education teacher. Anita (1999) and Anita and Kreimeyer (2001) conducted interviews and observations over a three year period which uncovered factors regarding the relationships between classroom teachers, special education teachers and interpreters. Teachers, whether they work in the classroom or special education, tend to have extensive demands on their time due to caseloads of students (Anita, 1999). Therefore it is crucial to clearly define roles in order to avoid duplicating each other’s work (Anita, 1999). Classroom teachers also had a clear preference for having one full-time interpreter rather than several part-time interpreters because it made for a more collaborative relationship (Anita & Kreimeyer, 2001). However, the special education coordinator preferred using several interpreters to reduce student dependency on the interpreter (Anita & Kreimeyer, 2001). Educational professionals do not always have a shared philosophy regarding interpreting services or the education of deaf and hard of hearing students.

**Educational Interpreting**

Mainstreaming a student with an interpreter is one of several placement options for parents and educators working to determine the appropriate placement for a deaf or hard of hearing student. However, it is clear that many IEP teams have chosen for deaf and hard of hearing students to attend mainstream classrooms with interpreters. This trend makes it essential for further research to be done regarding the efficacy of educational interpreting.

Literature on educational interpreting has primarily centered on the skills, qualifications, and practices of the interpreters themselves. Seal (2004) presented a set of best practices for educational interpreters. Winston (2004b) offered a collection of chapters to advise educational interpreters as to how they can be more successful in their work. Smith (2010a, 2010b, 2013,
2015) has presented a body of work that reports the observable actions of interpreters in K-12 classrooms. Smith’s work shows that educational interpreters seek to make the educational experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students as successful as possible by making decisions regarding visual access, student needs, and participation on a frequent basis (Smith, 2013). Some studies have also focused on the importance of the relationships between interpreters and teachers (Cawthon, 2001; Mertens, 1990; Kopans, 2001, Smith, 2013).

One of the questions posed surrounding educational interpreting is how much access it can really provide for deaf and hard of hearing students. No interpreter can capture every single aspect of classroom interaction. It is therefore unknown whether the access provided by an interpreted education is satisfactory for the educational experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students.

Research on this question has been conducted by several researchers. Winston (2004a) found that while some types of instruction are more visually accessible than others, an interpreted education is necessarily “mediated and different” (p. 135). La Bue (1998) specifically focused on the interpretation of a high school English class and found that deaf students struggled to access literary content through interpreters. Both studies pointed to the tendency of interpreters to interpret simultaneously rather than consecutively as a potential strain on interpreters that may negatively impact the accessibility of their interpretations.

At the collegiate level Johnson (1991) and Marschark et al (2005) considered how deaf students comprehend classroom interpretations. Johnson (1991) focused on the confusion that can arise from interpreter errors and corrections. Corrections are not always clear which can lead to students mistakenly believing they are misunderstanding the content (Johnson, 1991). Marschark et al (2005) additionally states that deaf students are sometimes unaware of when they...
start to misunderstand or miss information during interpreted classes. While this is detrimental to college students, there is concern that the impact could be greater for younger students, but it has yet to be researched (Marschark et al, 2005). Kurz, Schick, and Hauser (2015) even showed that deaf students in 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> grades were able to test higher regarding science content after receiving direct instruction in ASL than when the same information was presented via an interpreter. Clearly having information interpreted alters the way in which students understand what is presented which must be considered when educating deaf children.

Educational interpreters also have to consider whether interpreting is their only duty in the classroom. Anita and Kreimeyer (2001) and Smith (2010a) agree that while interpreting is the primary role of interpreters, it is not the sole responsibility of educational interpreters. Anita and Kreimeyer (2001) found that interpreters also tutored deaf students under the direction of teachers and reported student progress to teachers. Smith (2010a) showed that educational interpreters also provide visual access, meet language and learning needs, foster participation and inclusion, and get or use resources. These actions are taken by educational interpreters on a regular basis and yet some find themselves wondering whether they are breaking confidentiality, a value in the Code of Professional Conduct (RID, 2005), when speaking with other educators (Anita & Kreimeyer, 2001; Jones, 2004). Even as more is learned about educational interpreters and their role in the classroom, there is still much that needs to be researched. As that research is conducted it is also necessary to consider the wishes of deaf and hard of hearing students in addition to those of parents and educational professionals.

**Consumer Perspectives**

Beliefs and perspectives about educational interpreters differ amongst educational colleagues and the students who are consumers of interpreting services. Rittenhouse, Rahn, and
Morreau (1989) asked teachers of the deaf, interpreters, and deaf college students about their priorities for interpreters and found that each contingency had its own perspective. All three groups agreed that interpreters need to be in good placements in the room, knowledgeable about the content being presented, physically capable of the task of interpreting, and punctual. However, each group had different priorities for desirable qualities in an interpreter. Teachers emphasized confidentiality, students stressed RID certification, and the interpreters themselves focused on the clarity of their interpretations. Peterson and Monikowski (2010) surveyed educational interpreters and found that most of them felt respected and valued by the educators they worked with. However, administrators were found to lack a shared understanding of what interpreters do or what their role should be (Peterson & Monikowski, 2010).

One population’s vital viewpoint is seriously underrepresented in the research on educational interpreting. This is the perspective of deaf and hard of hearing students who have used educational interpreting services in K-12 schools. Deaf author Leo M. Jacobs expressed his concerns about the rapid rise of mainstreaming that followed the passage of PL 94-142 (Jacobs, 1980). While this view may have been representative of views held by the Deaf community at that time, his writing is based on opinions rather than evidence and is outdated in light of the requirements for educational interpreters that several states have mandated. Since that time more academic research has been conducted and needs to be continued.

A growing number of studies have represented the actual experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students who use educational interpreting services. Unfortunately most of this research focuses on deaf college students or students’ preferred school placement (Byrnes & Sigafoos, 2001; Johnson, K., 1991; Rittenhouse, Rahn, & Morreau, 1989). Only Kurz and Langer (2004)
of the United States and Berge and Ytterhus (2015) of Norway report the lived experiences of deaf and hard of hearing K-12 students using educational interpreters in classrooms.

Kurz and Langer (2004) interviewed twenty deaf and hard of hearing students, ranging from elementary to graduate school, about their use of interpreters in school. The interviews focused on topics such as interpreter role, the absence or presence of an interpreter’s skills, and suggestions for how interpreters could better work with and advocate for deaf and hard of hearing students. While these insights are valuable, they predate qualification requirements for interpreters that have been established in several states, including in the Midwest where this research was conducted. As a result, students currently receiving educational interpreting services may have different experiences and perspectives. The participants in Kurz and Langer (2004) also represented a wide range of ages, including very young students who were unable to adequately express themselves as well as college and graduate students who may have different interpreting needs than K-12 students. This study builds on the research of Kurz and Langer (2004) by asking for more current feedback from a narrower deaf student population (high school students).

Berge and Ytterhus (2015) observed classes in a Norwegian high school setting and then interviewed ten deaf and hard of hearing students as well as ten of their hearing classmates. These interviews discussed interpreters’ roles in language mediation, facilitating student dialogue, and coordinating the environment. These findings present opinions of deaf, hard of hearing, and hearing students, however students in the United States may not agree with these opinions. The standards and expectations for educational interpreters in Norway may differ from those found in the U.S. and American students holding different opinions. While Berge and Ytterhus (2015) was conducted much more recently than Kurz and Langer (2004), it is still
necessary for data to be collected from students in the United States which is what occurred in this study.

Upon reflecting on Kurz and Langer (2004) and Berge and Ytterhus (2015), along with other aforementioned resources pertaining to educational interpreting, and potential limitations for my work, two research questions emerged. How do high school students from a large Midwestern school district currently perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreting services? How do those high school students suggest these services could be improved?

Methodology

Participants

It would be beneficial to have a thorough understanding of the interpreting preferences of students at various ages in K-12 education. However, Kurz and Langer (2004) demonstrated that young students are not prepared to express themselves in a way that would answer the research questions posed by this study. As a result, this study only includes high school students. The survey portion of the study was extended to any deaf or hard of hearing students from a single large Midwestern school district who use educational interpreting services and agreed to participate (with parental consent). The opportunity to participate in the focus group interview was offered to the same pool of potential participants. The survey and focus group will be discussed at length in the methods section of this paper.

The students from this particular district were selected as the focus of this study because of my connection with that district. As someone who is familiar with the Deaf Education Dean of Students and other educators in the Deaf Education Department the opportunity to participate in the study was extended to all eligible participants: deaf or hard of hearing high school students who use educational interpreting services in the featured district. The teachers of the deaf and
itinerant teachers assisted in distributing the fliers promoting the study, consent forms, and the survey to the eligible students they serve.

Four responses to the survey were received and analyzed. This is a small sample size, however, the four responses represent a satisfactory response rate considering the survey was only distributed to deaf and hard of hearing students from one school district. Each participant answered all the questions save for the last one which merely asked if they had anything else to share. In retrospect the survey should have been made accessible in ASL in some way. It has come to my attention that Quick Response (QR) codes would have allowed for links to video clips to be embedded on the paper survey in a way that would have enabled participants to bring up recordings of the ASL interpretations of the questions. I am aware that some participants asked one another or signing adults to help them understand some of the questions. It would have been more accessible had the questions been presented in ASL for them. It is not certain whether having the survey printed only in English prevented students from participating, but it would have been a good idea to remove that potential barrier and such action would be recommended for any further research conducted in this area.

The focus group discussion also did not bring in as many participants as one would have hoped. Only two students showed interest and were able to attend the scheduled focus group. This is significantly lower than the 4-12 participants generally suggested for a focus group (Krueger & Casey, 2015; Morgan, 1996). The two students and I were able to dialogue for nearly an hour and covered quite a bit of ground. Having a smaller number of participants made it easier to allow each of them to answer the prepared questions.

Methods

As previously mentioned, this study took place in two parts: a survey followed by a focus
group. The first step to the methodology was to meet with the Deaf Education Dean of Students to procure a list of students who were eligible for the study along with contact information for teachers of the deaf or itinerant teachers who work with them. It was also at this time that I was informed that some of the potential participants had parents who would need consent forms printed in Spanish rather than English. The parent/guardian consent forms were translated into Spanish in order to ensure parents would be able to understand the research that was being conducted. The first information to be presented to students was a flier requesting participants for the survey portion of the study (see Appendix A). After these fliers were sent home, packets containing consent forms and the survey were provided to teachers of the deaf and itinerant teachers to give to students. These packets included parental consent forms in English or Spanish (see Appendices B and C), student assent forms in English (see Appendix D), and the survey itself (see Appendix E). These same teachers were also provided with a link to a YouTube video explaining the student assent form in ASL (see Appendix F). Teachers were then asked to show this video to interested students in order to ensure that students understood the intent of the study before agreeing to participate. The survey collected demographic information about the participants as well as their opinions about educational interpreting. They were asked about the number of years they have used interpreters in school, the number of interpreters they have worked with, their satisfaction with the interpreting services provided. At the close of the survey, participants were able to add any additional comments pertaining to their use of educational interpreting services. The data from the completed surveys was tabulated to provide a frame of reference prior to initiating the focus group.

After concluding the survey portion of the study, the focus group was conducted with the deaf and hard of hearing high school students who use interpreting services. To recruit
participants, fliers promoting the focus group discussion were distributed to all qualifying students by their teacher of the deaf or itinerant teacher (See Appendix G). These fliers included a portion to be returned to teachers of the deaf and in turn given back to me. These papers indicated student availability for attending the focus group. After a date and time were chosen for the focus group, parental consent forms (in English or Spanish), student assent forms, and videotape permission forms (in English or Spanish) were provided to qualifying students (See Appendices H, I, J, K, and L). It had been hoped that all of the eligible students who desired to participate in the focus group would be able to attend. Unfortunately student absences, illnesses, and change of heart resulted in only two participants attending the focus group. This is significantly lower than the 4-12 participants typically suggested for focus groups (Krueger & Casey, 2015; Morgan, 1996). Due to time and availability restraints it was not feasible for another focus group discussion to be established. It is not clear whether any other students would have volunteered their time, but this study will rely on the data gathered from the two students who were willing and able to participate.

The focus group interview was conducted in a school district facility to ensure that the participants had access to the location and could find it easily. The discussion was held at the high school that houses the majority of the deaf education high school program in the district. This location was chosen to provide another layer of comfort and familiarity to any focus group participants who attend this school. My connection with the district and the Deaf Education Department afforded me the opportunity to use such a space. In order for myself and the participants to be available, the focus group was held after the end of a school day. The exact date was chosen to coincide with when the most participants stated they would be available to attend. I moderated the focus group using ASL and the participants responded in kind. The focus
group discussion lasted approximately one hour. Prior to recording the focus group, I read a script in ASL regarding the students’ consent to be videotaped and to participate in the focus group (See Appendix M). The entirety of the focus group discussion was filmed from two different angles in order to allow me to fully attend to the conversation at hand instead of taking copious notes. One video featured myself, as moderator, in the frame. The second video focused on the two participants, but a profile view of myself was also visible which aided in transcribing the dialogue later. In order to accomplish this recording, a videotaping assistant monitored the filming of the focus group discussion. He was familiar with the technology and was not fluent in ASL. The presence of a videotaping assistant allowed me to focus on moderating the discussion without also having to run the recording devices. A non-signing assistant was chosen in order to reassure the participants that he would not be privy to the discussion we were having. My own identity as an interpreter may have already influenced what the participants shared in the discussion. I did not wish to add another interpreter to the environment because could have caused participants to censor their answers if they felt that too many interpreters were present. The video files of the focus group were transferred to a Google Drive folder and backed up to a laptop both of which are password protected. The focus group discussion was driven by the questions provided in Appendix N. Participants were provided with pizza to show appreciation for their contribution to this research.

After the focus group concluded, the entire discussion was transcribed. This particular study does not focus on ASL linguistics and therefore the signed utterances were translated into written English as opposed to using an ASL gloss. In order to create the transcript in a form that was useful for data analysis, it was produced in a Word document before being converted into an Excel spreadsheet.
Analysis, Limitations, and Application

As the data from the survey was tabulated and the conversation from the focus group was transcribed, trends and patterns emerged. This study utilized a grounded theory approach and inductive analysis which means that as the work began, there was not a hypothesis regarding the results (Charmaz, 2014). While participants did state varying personal preferences regarding their interpreting services, a number of themes were present which will be expanded upon in the analysis section of this paper.

The small number of participants and the fact that all of them attend schools in the same school district is a serious limitation to the generalizability of the findings and results produced by this study. The particular arrangement and services at this school district may be unique as compared to those found in districts of various sizes or in other geographic locations. As a result, this study serves as a pilot study and a call for further research. This study was conducted in such a way that others will be able to replicate the methods with a wider, diverse range of participants across the country. Compiling additional data from other locations would be necessary to make the results of this study more generalizable and widely applicable to educational interpreters working with deaf and hard of hearing high school students.

Despite the inability to produce broadly generalizable findings about educational interpreting from this study, the results still have a place for application. As the participants were all students from one district, their responses will be directly applicable for that district’s educational interpreters.

Analysis

The data gathered from the survey and focus group provided a small quantity of rich data for analysis. The data from both portions address how participants perceive the effectiveness of
their interpreting services and how such services could be improved. In some areas data will be triangulated to compare the data between data gathering methods (Brewer & Hunter, 2006).

**Participants**

As noted in the methodology section of this paper, there were four participants in the survey portion of this study. Demographic analysis shows these participants were aged 15-17 and in the 10th and 11th grades. There were three female participants and one male participant. They all stated having started using interpreting services in school when they were very young. The youngest experience of using an educational interpreter occurred in preschool or kindergarten and the latest grade level at which interpreting services began was between the 3rd and 5th grades. This indicates that all four survey participants had experienced several years of receiving educational interpreting services. At the time of the survey, participants reported having between 37-100% of their classes for the semester interpreted. This indicates that some students were completely mainstreamed, while others attend some of their classes with deaf education teachers and did not have interpreters for all of their classes. The survey tool (Appendix E) shows that other demographic information was collected, but is withheld here in order to keep participant identities confidential because of the small sample size.

The focus group was fortunate enough to have two student participants in attendance. The students chose their own pseudonyms at the outset of the discussion and will be referred to as Selena and Richie in the remainder of this work. The discussion regarding their use of educational interpreters lasted just under an hour and I was able to ask all the questions I had planned (see Appendix N). No other demographic information was collected from the participants at the time of the focus group.
Results

While the survey and focus group centered on the topics of student comfort and satisfaction with interpreting services, other themes appeared as well. These main themes were: 1) comfort with interpreters, 2) satisfaction with interpreters, 3) logistical issues with an interpreted education, 4) interpreter attributes, and 5) students working alongside interpreters.

Comfort with Interpreters

The topic of student comfort with interpreters was brought up in both the survey and the focus group. Participants generally stated feeling comfortable with interpreting services although there were certain exceptions that need to be examined.

The survey addressed different facets of participant comfort with using interpreting services. The response was an overwhelming statement of comfort. Questions 8, 10, and 12 (See Appendix E) asked participants about their comfort in using interpreters in the classroom, with teachers or staff, and with peers or friends. All but one response stated they agreed that they are comfortable doing so. The exception that stated he/she was not comfortable using an interpreter with peers or friends and that he/she never uses an interpreter to communicate with them. The scales in the questions did not allow for answers to provide rationale for their answers and none of the participants chose to expand on their comfort with interpreters in the more open-ended questions later in the survey. Instead, this data regarding student comfort with interpreters was kept in mind when the same topic was discussed at the focus group.

The topic of comfort in using interpreters was discussed at four different points in the focus group conversation. Early on the participants were asked if they were comfortable with their interpreters and both responded that they were. However, as the discussion continued it
became apparent that this comfort with interpreters did not apply to every interpreter in every situation.

Selena stated that she was comfortable using interpreters but that another deaf or hard of hearing friend of hers was often embarrassed and uncomfortable when using an interpreter. When asked if she is ever embarrassed by having an interpreter, Selena mentioned that having an interpreter follow her in the hallway between classes could be embarrassing. Both participants mentioned that sometimes they conversed with their interpreters during passing time, but that this was not always their preference or the preference of their deaf and hard of hearing friends. It seemed important that they stressed that their own tendency to engage with their interpreters outside of class was their own opinion and not one that was shared by all other deaf and hard of hearing students.

One situation in which Selena stated she has preferred not to have interpreters was when she met privately with a counselor. While having an interpreter for interactions with teachers may have been comfortable, the private nature of meeting with a counselor may not. Selena said she was willing to “write back and forth or text on a phone” with the counselor and only request that an interpreter be present if those efforts were not successful. This statement does not take into account how willing a counselor would be to this arrangement, but it is worth considering. It was unclear whether this school district has a policy regarding when a deaf or hard of hearing student could decline interpreting services, but it seems that there may have been times when a student may have wished to do so.

Despite generally having felt comfortable with having interpreters, Richie shared that “sometimes having an interpreter can feel different.” When asked about suggestions for interpreters who work at the high school level Richie said interpreters could help students “feel
more comfortable because high school is usually, like, hard…You want to make high school learning feel better and more comfortable.” This statement demonstrated the influence that educational interpreters have on a deaf or hard of hearing student’s overall feelings of comfort in a mainstream school environment. It is crucial that interpreters recognize this power and the effect it has on the students they serve.

**Satisfaction with Interpreters**

Satisfaction with interpreters came up in both the survey and focus group as well. Similar to student comfort with interpreters, the participants expressed usually being satisfied with their interpreters but also noted areas for improvement in interpreting services.

Survey questions 13 and 14 (See Appendix E) regarded participants’ satisfaction with their educational interpreters. Question 13 pertained to any interpreters they have had in their school district while question 14 focused attention on interpreters who were serving them at the time of the survey. While the options available ranged from “Very Satisfied” to “Very Unsatisfied”, all of the responses were either “Satisfied” or “Neutral”. This shows that there was not a severe level of complaint with the level of service provided by their interpreters, but that there was still room for improvement for participants to be more satisfied with their interpreting services. When asked to expand upon their responses, explanations provided both complaints and praise. On one hand participants said that interpreters explain things clearly, were “clear at signing”, “have good skills”, and “they are great”. On the other hand, two of the four participants stated that sometimes they were not able understand their interpreters. These responses explained how participants rated their satisfaction with interpreters, but remained fairly unspecific.

At the focus group the two participants were asked twice whether they usually understand their interpreters. This occurred once at the beginning of the discussion and then again near the
end. They replied that they did, but throughout the conversation they revealed that this was not always the case and that there was room for their satisfaction with their interpreters to improve.

Selena mentioned at three different points that she sometimes hadn’t been able to understand her interpreters. She did not expand upon when this misunderstanding had taken place or whether it had occurred with more than one interpreter. She did share that one interpreter seemed to get mad at her for not understanding, which made her feel scared of this interpreter. These encounters also made her feel bad and discouraged her from asking that interpreter for clarification when she did not understand the interpretation.

Conversely, Richie expressed that he had been generally satisfied with his interpreters and that sometimes his expectations had been exceeded. Interestingly, the example of having his expectations exceeded involved having a community interpreter rather than a district interpreter. Richie and several hearing peers had been traveling together as a team to an extracurricular sporting event. He said that the interpreter “almost heard everything they said” and “I felt almost like I was in the conversation, like joined in more easily.” When asked whether that did or did not happen in the classroom, Richie said that his interpreters in class were more focused on interpreting the teachers’ messages than what hearing classmates were talking about. Selena and Richie agreed that they wanted to know more often what their hearing peers were discussing so that they could join in the conversation if they wished. This poses a challenge for educational interpreters who will need to weigh the academic and social needs of deaf and hard of hearing students when deciding which content to interpret.

Richie and Selena did have a few concrete suggestions for how interpreters could improve. Selena shared that interpreters need to use more facial expression as she has struggled to understand the message when it was lacking. The use of body movement or gestures was also
suggested to make concepts clearer. Richie recommended that interpreters not sign too casually and should even use more formal signing when appropriate since that is what he had envisioned he would see at the college level. Both participants also said that sometimes interpreters should show a picture of a challenging word or concept when the student has no frame of reference or cannot envision what is being discussed. This is sometimes clearer than an interpreter struggling to explain or describe the concept. These suggestions indicate a desire for greater clarity from interpreters by making some small changes or improvements.

**Logistical Issues with an Interpreted Education**

One of the first topics that came up in the discussion was the challenge of having multiple inputs of visual information at the same time. Both participants stated that they have usually chosen to watch the interpreter rather than the teacher during class. However, they were still faced with the dilemma as to whether they should watch the interpreter or look at information displayed on the whiteboard or projector screen. Selena stated that her interpreter would often stand near the teacher rather than next to the whiteboard or projector screen. This would make it difficult to watch the interpreter because she would have to look back and forth between the interpreter and the other visual information. She even said that this has made her tired or hurt her neck. Richie said that he had not experienced the problem to that degree as he usually focused his attention on the interpreter. However, he agreed that it would be easier if the interpreter stood by the whiteboard. They agreed that interpreters should not worry about following the teacher around the classroom and should instead stay near the whiteboard. This would reduce the strain on students caused by having to split their attention between an interpreter and whiteboard which are not in close proximity to one another. This echoes Smith’s findings (2013) regarding multiple
visual stimuli in the classroom and how interpreters can strive to lessen the amount of work necessary on the part of the deaf or hard of hearing student.

Another major issue noted by the participants was the challenge faced by deaf and hard of hearing students who wish to take notes. Selena put it simply: “We can’t write and look at the interpreter and the teacher talks fast. It’s possible I can miss part of it.” Richie said that he has been able to get notes or PowerPoint slides from his teachers which he preferred to trying to take notes while watching an interpreter. Having these resources allowed him to watch the interpreter the whole time and see how the teacher expanded on those notes. There was some discussion of the idea of note takers, but neither participant used a service like that at the time of the focus group. While the provision of such services is outside the purview of the interpreter, they enhance students’ ability to focus their visual attention on the interpreted message (Smith, 2013).

There also appeared to be an issue with the continuity of interpreting services provided. While Richie was satisfied with having a variety of interpreters during his day, he would have preferred that each class have consistent interpreters. He said, “You don’t want to keep on switching interpreters. You don’t want it to be different every day.” Both participants noticed that when the same interpreter is available consistently the interpreters were able to know the signs that had been used and were caught up on course content which enabled the students to understand the interpretation better. While it is understandable to need substitute interpreters in the event that an interpreter is ill, Richie said that if one interpreter was gone the other interpreters’ schedules were shuffled around. This resulted in interpreters interpreting in unfamiliar classes and sometimes interpreters had to be brought up to speed during which time students may have been missing out on content. The frequency at which this kind of schedule
maneuvering occurred was not discussed, but the participants stated that they disliked it along with the resulting disruption to their regular interpreting services.

When asked what they like about their interpreters, Richie expressed that he liked when he was able to have a team of interpreters in class. He said that they were able to support each other and “manage their time and switch off.” The same topic resurfaced when they were asked if there was anything they wanted to change about their interpreters. Richie responded, “Maybe I would rather have more team interpreters.” While Selena had not experienced having a team of interpreters in class before, she stated that she would have liked to have had the opportunity as it may have been able to help her understand better. These participants perceived that having a team of interpreters had the potential to improve the clarity of interpretations.

The final logistical problem reported by the two participants was the complicated task of working with hearing teachers. Richie noted that teachers were usually more focused on the hearing students who constitute the majority of the classroom. This would result in the teacher “not thinking about the interpreter and having to talk loud.” Selena also reported having felt that the teachers ignored her or failed to pay attention to her which was frustrating. In addition to this, she frequently experienced teachers speaking to her interpreters rather than to her which she described as rude behavior. While these experiences do not speak directly to interpreting services, they do point out that these deaf and hard of hearing students were being educated in an environment designed for hearing students (Marschark & Hauser, 20012). It may be possible to improve student satisfaction with interpreting services by confronting the system in which they work.

**Interpreter Attributes**

Some of the comments related to improving interpreting services related to who the
interpreters are and how they present themselves. These remarks as have to do with the interpreters’ attributes aside from their interpreting skills.

One suggestion that arose was that the district should have more male interpreters. I was surprised that this comment originated from Selena who said “I wish we had more male interpreters…we have girls all the time.” She had not experienced having a male interpreter in class before, but wished to have the opportunity. Richie stated that he did not have a preference of male or female interpreter but liked the balance of having both. He even thought that having one male and one female interpreter work as a team in a class might be his preference. This request would have to be addressed depending upon the availability of male interpreters and through the hiring of more male interpreters.

The topic of interpreter attire was also discussed. Selena commented that although she understands why interpreters frequently wear black, she preferred that interpreters wear a broader variety of color. She wanted to have interpreters show a little personality by wearing a wider variety of colors. Although Richie was not as opposed to the monotonous colors, he did state a preference for interpreters to “dress up” more. He did not provide rationale behind this statement, but it may go in conjunction with his preference for a more formal style of signing as mentioned before.

**Students Working Alongside Interpreters**

The final theme that emerged from the discussion was that of deaf and hard of hearing students and interpreters working together to make the mainstreaming environment as successful as possible. Being open with each other could be powerful in making both parties more comfortable. Working alongside one another could allow for students’ needs to be stated and addressed more fully.
Richie brought up the importance of letting the interpreters know if something is on your mind. He recommended that deaf and hard of hearing students and their interpreters use moments when the teacher is otherwise engaged to have short exchanges with one another. These dialogues may be regarding signs being used, adjusting the placement of the interpreter, or provide an opportunity to clarify or reinterpret a message. Selena also mentioned the potential of asking an interpreter to repeat the message, but stated that she had not done so as a result of being shy or feeling awkward about asking for the repetition. This hesitancy may be explained by Richie’s statement that the “high school interpreters are a little more strict” in that they do not repeat the message if students are not attending to the interpreter. It seems that students and interpreters may need to have a conversation about when an interpreter will or will not reinterpret the message. Richie also shared that interpreters have been willing to explain English words or phrases and that he would even welcome their advice on English grammar. It may be tricky, given the academic setting, for interpreters to provide this kind of support without overstepping and taking on a teaching role.

It is also important for interpreters to be mindful of the power dynamics between students and teachers in the classroom (Fairclough, 2015). As was mentioned before, Selena was frustrated and saddened by teachers who did not look at her during interpreted exchanges. Selena was asked if her interpreters ever stepped in to tell the teacher to look at her. She said she would have liked to have the interpreter relay that information to the teacher in order to stop their rude behavior. This would be an act of education or cultural mediation on the part of the interpreter that would likely improve the dynamics of the interpreted scenario. Selena also noted that on occasion her interpreter would speak to her teacher during class without signing or interpreting any part of the conversation. She said that even after asking the interpreter what was said, the
interpreter would not tell her. This angered and frustrated her as she wondered what they were talking about. While she admitted to maybe being a little nosy, the lack of access to the conversation was irritating to her. Interpreters must consider the appearance this gives to students and how to avoid restricting access to such communications that are otherwise audible to hearing students in the classroom.

It was also suggested by Richie that perhaps interpreters and deaf and hard of hearing students could work together outside of school hours. This proposition would allow for conversations to be had without interrupting or missing instruction during class. Selena submitted that students could ask questions about content that was interpreted or talk about how the class was going in general. These discussions should be about clarifying what was interpreted and could be referred to the teacher if confusion remained about understanding the course content. Ultimately it would be up to the district to determine whether interpreters could be paid for their time or if interpreters would be strictly volunteering their time for the good of their students.

**Framework for Results**

These findings, particularly those regarding logistical issues with an interpreted education and students working alongside interpreters, relate directly to the work done by Smith (2010a, 2013). This study corroborates Smith’s (2010a, 2013) findings that students struggle with multiple visual inputs such as the interpreter, the teacher, the whiteboard, and their own notes. In addition to Smith’s (2010a) observations of educational interpreters working to direct student attention to pertinent visual information, this study indicates that deaf and hard of hearing students also see the need for assistance in managing visual input. From the combination of these
studies educational interpreters may see that this is potentially another responsibility to fall under their role in the classroom.

**Discussion**

This small-scale pilot study highlights the need to continue to address how well the interpreting needs of deaf and hard of hearing students are being met. While the difference in responses regarding comfort and satisfaction with interpreters point to a variety of student experiences, it was clear that the district attended by this study’s participants and the interpreters employed there should consider ways in which interpreting services can be improved. Some improvements would need to be initiated at the district level while some are actionable items for individual interpreters.

**School District Considerations**

The data collected from the focus group discussion brought to light some questions that need to be addressed at the district level. The first decisions for the district regarding interpreters are those to do with hiring. Both focus group participants expressed a desire to have more male interpreters employed by the school district. While this may be challenging considering the fact that the majority of sign language interpreters are female, this request should be factored into any future decisions regarding the hiring of interpreters. Richie and Selena also expressed a desire to have a team of interpreters in class on a more frequent basis. Richie appreciated the way in which his interpreters worked together to provide interpreting services by supporting one another and monitoring the quality of the interpretation. It is very likely that in order to provide this service, the district may need to hire more interpreters. These additional interpreters will present an additional cost to the school district. As a result, district officials and representatives of the Deaf Education Department of the district will need to meet and discuss whether offering team
interpreting for more classes would benefit students in such a way that it would be financially advisable. It is not clear what kinds of classes already have team interpreters, but it may be possible to structure interpreting services so that certain classes with dense subject matter such as history and English be provided with team interpreters on a regular basis. The hiring of additional interpreters may be hard for the district to support due to budgetary constraints, but at the very least a conversation could be had in an attempt to advocate for such a change.

Another topic with financial implications for the district is that of interpreters and students working and collaborating outside of school hours. While it would not seem necessary to require every interpreter to meet with students before or after school, it may prove beneficial to provide financial incentive for interpreters to do so. The school day can be an incredibly busy time for students and interpreters alike. This does not provide a meaningful amount of time for them to discuss how successful interpreting services have been in the classroom. If students desire it and interpreters are willing to meet with students to review sign choices or troubleshoot logistical problems, the district should attempt to make provisions in order for that to occur. The best way to encourage this kind of collaboration would be to allow interpreters to be paid for their time despite the fact that no interpreting would be taking place. Interpreters would still be functioning within their role to support successful communication and learning and would not be encouraged to take on a tutoring role during this time. However, to avoid overuse of such an offering, the district could also propose a policy regarding the frequency and duration of these types of after-hours meetings. Doing so would allow interpreters and students to work together without the immediate time constraints that exist during class periods where the opportunity to discuss the efficacy of the interpreting services is generally brief.
Beyond the consideration of scheduling more team interpreters, the scheduler for the interpreters in this district should also draw his or her attention to how the absences of interpreters are handled. Richie noted that in the event that one interpreter was absent, the entire interpreting schedule had sometimes been subjected to rearranging. This resulted in interpreters who were present being rerouted to classes in which they did not typically interpret rather than interpreting for the classes regularly on their schedule. This practice indicates that the district may not be acquiring substitute interpreters for absent interpreters. The reasons for this were not brought up in this study but may be related to the general shortage of interpreters rather than a lack of trying to secure substitute interpreters. Unfortunately, shuffling around the schedules of interpreters resulted in students not being able to have their regularly scheduled interpreter even if that interpreter was in the building. Richie and Selena both stated frustration with this as their substitute interpreters have not been familiar with which signs had been agreed upon and they felt as though this made them fall behind in class. Ideally each absent interpreter should be replaced by an available district interpreter or a substitute interpreter in order to avoid upsetting the scheduled interpreting services. However, if this is not possible the interpreter scheduler should keep in mind students’ concerns regarding the continuity of their interpreting services.

Finally, considerations must be made to balance students’ wish for privacy and their communication access needs. Selena mentioned her own discomfort in having interpreters present when meeting with a counselor and her friend’s general embarrassment with having an interpreter. Each deaf or hard of hearing student should have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) that covers any communication accommodations necessary for the student during the school day. It is essential that high school students be included in discussions regarding the services provided via their IEP’s. This may include students stating preferences as to when they
do or do not wish to have interpreting services. The rest of the IEP team can consider these wishes when determining the interpreting services for each student in a way that provides communication access without causing students to feel that their privacy is being violated. It may also be necessary for the district to create a policy regarding how students can decline interpreting services on a situational basis as long as any non-deaf participants, such as a counselor, agree to make the attempt at communicating without an interpreter. The policy should reflect that interpreting services would still be available in the event that any participant determines they are necessary. This would allow more flexibility, at least outside of the classroom, for determinations around interpreting services to be made on a case by case basis.

**Considerations for Individual Interpreters**

What stood out the most when reviewing the themes identified in the data was that interpreters need to work alongside the students they serve and be receptive to their feedback and concerns. The way in which this is handled will depend upon individual interpreters, students, and the relationships they have with one another. Regardless of what that relationship looks like it should incorporate some means of dialogue between the interpreter and student and advocacy by the interpreter on behalf of the student’s needs.

Richie made a concise point when he stated that high school is already hard and interpreters can work with deaf and hard of hearing students to make them feel more comfortable. Being a deaf or hard of hearing student with an interpreter may make a student feel different from his or her peers and interpreters need to be sensitive to this perception. Every student’s experience and preference with interpreters will be different and interpreters’ practice must reflect that. However, the public high school environment was not designed with deaf and hard of hearing students in mind which presents a greater challenge to these students (Marschark,
Interpreters in the classroom cannot make systematic changes to this environment, but they can work to ease the stress on deaf and hard of hearing students by not exacerbating any difficulties in their learning experiences. This can only be facilitated by discussing each student’s interpreting needs and working to meet them in the best possible manner.

During the focus group it sounded as if Selena and Richie have struggled in the past with not knowing how to communicate their interpreting needs to their interpreters. Examples of this included not feeling confident enough to ask for a repetition or clarification of the interpreted message and not being assertive in asking for interpreters to interpret the conversations of peers in the classroom. The two focus group participants referred to their interpreters as “strict” regarding their willingness to do such things. This could be a result of interpreters being rigid in their understanding of their role in the classroom or of students being unaware of their right to state their needs to their educational interpreters. In any case, the result has been that students have missed out on academic and social communication in the classroom. The first step in preventing this from happening is to open the lines of communication between educational interpreters and the students they serve. Unfortunately the time constraints imposed by school day schedules and classroom agendas may make it difficult for meaningful conversations to take place during the regular school day. This is another reason why the school district should seriously consider allowing interpreters to be paid before or after school hours if they are willing to meet with their students regarding the efficacy of their interpreting services.

Apart from their work with students, it would be beneficial for the educational interpreters in this district to hone their interpreting skills in such a way that increases the visual clarity of their interpretations. During the focus group the skills of using body movement, facial expression, and more formal or academic signing were mentioned as areas in need of
improvement for interpreters in general. By devoting professional development time to these areas, interpreters would be able to produce interpretations with increased clarity and an affect fitting for the high school academic setting. Interpreters could choose to work on these skills individually or as a cohort working together. Anything that positively impacts the interpreted message would aid students in understanding the academic content being presented.

It was also noted during the focus group that students struggle to manage multiple simultaneous visual stimuli. This occurs when students have to choose where to direct their visual attention between the teacher, the interpreter, the whiteboard, their notes and any other visual aids or distractions present in the environment. Smith (2010b, 2013) researched the same challenges for mainstreamed students and found that it is essential for interpreters to help direct the visual attention of deaf and hard of hearing students to avoid their missing of key information. Interpreters need to be careful regarding time sensitive information being displayed and direct attention to those items first so as not to deprive students of access to that information. It must be considered that watching the interpreter should not always be the top visual priority for deaf and hard of hearing students. Interpreters need to recognize that these students are working to weave together multiple visual inputs in a way that is meaningful to them. Interpreters are not typically evaluated on their ability to help students manage their visual attention, but it is essential in order for deaf and hard of hearing students to glean as much as possible from their educational environments. Interpreters must intentionally practice working with deaf and hard of hearing students to direct them to the most valuable visual information in the room. This means that this is another item that could be included in interpreters’ professional development work. It must also be discussed openly with the deaf and hard of hearing students involved so that they understand why interpreters are choosing to redirect their attention and
holding on to information that has yet to be interpreted. If students and interpreters come to an agreement as to how to manage the variety of visual information available, the tasks of interpreting and learning will be enhanced.

Educational interpreters must also be mindful of the misunderstandings that teachers continue to have regarding interpreters, deaf and hard of hearing students, and the interpreting process. It is now clear how much or how often information regarding these subjects is presented to staff members who work with deaf and hard of hearing students in this district. When this information is presented in meetings between individual interpreters and staff members or in whole staff in-services, there is much that needs to be shared. It has clearly bothered Selena that her teachers have looked at the interpreter rather than her during their interpreted interactions. This is not a wholly unusual occurrence for hearing participants in an interpreted conversation. However, this is a topic that, if not addressed by a student in the moment, could be brought to the staff member’s attention by the interpreter in the interest or helping communication flow more comfortably for the deaf or hard of hearing participants. It may require frequent reminders, but interpreters can advocate for their students by stressing that the simple change in eye gaze will make staff members more culturally sensitive. Richie also mentioned that sometimes deaf and hard of hearing students have sometimes felt ignored by their teachers and that teachers have sometimes forgotten about the presence of interpreters and their needs. Interpreters can work with teachers regarding these issues as well. Teachers need to be reminded about the interpreter’s need for textbooks and materials in advance to provide for a more effective interpretation. Interpreters can advocate for themselves be explaining how these resources benefit the clarity of their work and the students who depend upon it. Interpreters may also need to be vocal about having adequate access to auditory information shared in the classroom. This may include
relaying concerns to the teacher regarding his or her volume, pace, or clarity as they impact the interpreter’s ability to perform his or her job. Interpreters and teachers need to collaborate to make the environment as accessible as possible for interpreters in order to make it accessible for deaf and hard of hearing students.

This places a great deal of responsibility on the shoulders of educational interpreters to work with teachers as well as deaf and hard of hearing students. However, this triad should really be working together in order to make the classroom as accessible as possible for deaf and hard of hearing students. Doing the work together should ease the burden on each party involved.

Conclusion

It is difficult to ascertain the level at which the interpreting needs of deaf and hard of hearing students are being met in the mainstream school environment. This study has shown that beneath a basic satisfaction with interpreting services, there are still issues that can be addressed to increase this satisfaction more fully.

It is true that interpreters can and should continue to work to improve their skills in a variety of ways. This can include improving skills such as facial expression and body movement as a part of the interpretations rendered. However it is also clear that interpreters must work to develop strong collaborative relationships with deaf and hard of hearing students as well as hearing teachers. These relationships should allow for open communication regarding how each party is involved in the success of the interpreting process. It will likely be challenging for the needs of all parties to be met, but without revealing those needs to one another it will not be possible.

These conversations and collaborations must be fostered and encouraged at the system level by those in positions of power in the school district. Any policy or hiring changes may
require a significant amount of time to enact, but the process must be started if any changes are to take place. It is important that those in positions of power consider how they can positively impact the education of numerous deaf and hard of hearing students in their district at the present time and in the years to come.

This results of this study can only be directly applied to the school district attended by this study’s participants. However the broad themes explored here should be pondered by other educational interpreters, school districts, educators, and deaf and hard of hearing students. It is strongly recommended that research on the topic of the interpreting needs of deaf and hard of hearing high school students be continued on a broader level. Collecting data from multiple school districts from a variety of regional locations would be illuminating to the fields of deaf education and educational interpreting. The addition of this data would allow educational interpreters and deaf education programs around the country to more adequately meet the interpreting needs and preferences of these students.
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PARTICIPANTS NEEDED!

- Are you Deaf or Hard of Hearing?
- Are you a high school student?
- Do you use interpreters in class?

I am looking for volunteers to answer a survey about their use of sign language interpreters in high school.

If you are interested you can contact Ursula Dierauer at [********](voice or text) or updierauer@stkate.edu.

Or you can return the bottom portion of this form to your Deaf Education teacher who will get the survey to you.

________________________
I, ________________________,
am interested in filling out a survey
about my use of interpreters in school.

My Deaf Education teacher is ________________________________.
Appendix B: Survey Parental Consent Form (English)

Survey
Parent/Guardian Informed Consent

I am a master’s degree student at St. Catherine University in the Master of Arts Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity program under the supervision of Dr. Erica Alley. I am conducting a research study to understand how Deaf and hard of hearing students at XXXXXXXXXX Public Schools (XXXX) perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreters and am requesting your child’s participation in the data collection process.

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study Leading to a Graduate Action Research
I would like to invite your child to participate in this research study on the educational interpreting services received by students of XXXX. As a student receiving these services your child’s experiences are vitally important for improving interpreting services of XXXX. Your child’s input could inform interpreters how interpreting services better meet students’ needs.

What will your child be asked to do?
If your child decides to take part in this study he/she will be asked to fill out a survey of 17 questions which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey must be returned in the accompanying envelope within two weeks of receiving it.

Who is eligible to participate?
Deaf and hard of hearing XXXX high school students who use interpreting services in class.

Why is this research being done?
The study is looking to identify student perceptions about interpreter effectiveness in order to ensure that student needs are being met when they use interpreting services.

What are the benefits if my child is in this study?
There are no direct benefits of participating in this study. However, identifying the ways in which XXXX interpreting services have been effective or ineffective will inform XXXX interpreters’ future approach to interpreting for high school students. Study participants will benefit from knowing that their shared stories helped to further research on educational interpreting and may lead to improved interpreting services for XXXX students in the future.

What are the risks or discomforts to my child if he/she is in this study?
This project will require participants to answer questions about their experiences with educational interpreters. Your child’s name and/or any identifying information will not be used in the final action research project. There will be no physical risk of any kind.

What will you do with the information you get from my child and how will you protect his/her privacy?
The information provided by your student in this study will be collected through a written survey. Student names will not be written on the survey and data from all surveys will be combined for analysis. The surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet at the primary investigator’s home and the data analysis will be conducted on her password protected computer. Only the
research advisor and I will have access to the records while I work on this project. I will destroy all the original surveys within six months of concluding my research. Any information provided will be kept confidential, which means that your student will not be identified or identifiable in any written reports or publications.

May my child stop his/her participation in this study?
Your child’s participation in this research is completely voluntary. Your child does not have to participate if he/she does not want to. Even if he/she begin, he/she may discontinue participation at anytime without fear of retaliation.

Who can I contact for questions?
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact Ursula Dierauer, Principal Investigator at updierauer@stkate.edu or XXX-XXX-XXXX or Dr. Erica Alley, Program Director, at elalley@stkate.edu or 612-255-3386 (VP) or 651-690-6018 (voice). If you have questions about your child’s rights as a participant, you may contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St Catherine University Institutional Review Board at 651-690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkate.edu. Thank you for your participation!

About the Researcher:
Ursula Dierauer is a nationally certified ASL-English interpreter with 9 years of experience working as an interpreter for XXXXXXXXXXXX Public Schools.
Ursula Dierauer, NIC
updierauer@stkate.edu | XXX-XXX-XXXX
St. Catherine University
Masters student, MAISCE

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.
Parent/Guardian Consent
By signing below, you indicate your willingness to allow your child (under the age of 18) to participate in this study.

___________________________  ______________________
Parent/Guardian’s Name (please print)  Date

___________________________  ______________________
Parent/Guardian’s Signature  Date
Appendix C: Survey Parental Consent Form (Spanish)

Encuesta
Consentimiento informado para padres/tutelares de familia

Soy una estudiante haciendo mi maestría en el programa de Estudios de Interpretación y Equidad en la Comunicación de St. Catherine University, bajo la supervisión de Dra. Erica Alley. Estoy llevando a cabo una investigación para entender cómo los estudiantes parcial o totalmente sordos en las Escuelas Públicas de XXXXXXXXXXX (XXXX, por sus siglas en inglés) perciben la eficacia de sus intérpretes educacionales, y por eso estoy pidiendo la participación de su hijo en el proceso de coleccionar datos e información.

Invitación para participar en un estudio de investigación que llevará a una investigación-acción de maestría

Me gustaría invitar a su hijo a participar en esta investigación sobre los servicios de interpretación educacional que reciben los estudiantes de XXXX. Como estudiante que recibe estos servicios, su hijo tiene experiencias que son íntegramente importantes para mejorar los servicios de interpretación de XXXX. Las contribuciones de su hijo podrían informar a los intérpretes cómo sus servicios de interpretación podrían mejorar para cumplir con las necesidades de los estudiantes.

¿Qué le pedirán a hacer?
Si decide participar en esta investigación, su hijo tendrá que completar una encuesta que contiene 17 preguntas y que tomará aproximadamente 15 minutos para terminar. Pedimos que se devuelva la encuesta dentro del sobre que la acompaña dentro de dos semanas después de recibirla.

¿Quién es elegible para participar?
Estudiantes de XXXX que son total o parcialmente sordos y que utilizan los servicios de interpretación dentro del salón de clases.

¿Con qué fin estamos haciendo esta investigación?
El propósito de este estudio es identificar las percepciones de estudiantes sobre la eficacia de intérpretes para asegurarnos de que estén cumpliendo con las necesidades de los estudiantes cuando proveen servicios de interpretación.

¿Cuáles son los beneficios de participar en esta investigación?
No hay ningún beneficio directo en participar en esta investigación. Sin embargo, en identificar las formas en que los servicios de interpretación de XXXX han o no han sido eficaces influirá la manera que los intérpretes de XXXX interpretan para estudiantes de la preparatoria. Participantes en este estudio sacarán beneficio en saber que sus experiencias han ayudado a mejorar las investigaciones sobre la interpretación educacional y que podrían resultar en mejores servicios de interpretación para los estudiantes de XXXX en el futuro.

¿Cuáles son las dudas o riesgos que podrían afectar a mi hijo al participar en esta investigación?
Este proyecto requerirá que los participantes respondan a preguntas sobre sus experiencias con intérpretes educacionales. En el proyecto final de investigación-acción no se utilizará tu nombre y/o cualquier información que te identificaría. No le presentará ningún riesgo físico de ningún tipo.

¿Qué van a hacer con la información de mi hijo y cómo protegerán su privacidad?
Se coleccionará la información que su hijo provee mediante una encuesta escrita. No se escribirán los nombres de los estudiantes en las encuestas, y los datos de todas las encuestas se combinarán para el análisis. Se guardarán las encuestas de esta investigación dentro de un gabinete con seguro, dentro del hogar de la investigadora. Ella hará el análisis de datos en su computadora, protegida con contraseña. Tendremos acceso a los datos solamente yo y la profesora de investigación mientras que trabaje en este proyecto. Destruiré todas las encuestas originales dentro de seis meses después de concluir mi investigación. Se mantendrá cualquier información proveida de manera confidencial—significa que su hijo no será identificado o identifiable en ningún reporte escrito o publicación.

¿Podrá mi hijo dejar de participar en este estudio?
La participación de su hijo en este estudio es completamente voluntaria. No es necesario que participe si no lo desea. Si empieza a participar y decide dejar de continuar, lo puede hacer sin miedo de represalia.

¿A quién puedo contactar para mis preguntas?
Si tiene cualquier pregunta o duda sobre el estudio, favor de contactar a Ursula Dierauer, investigadora principal (updierauer@stkate.edu o al XXX-XXX-XXXX) o a la Dra. Erica Alley, directora del programa, elalley@stkate.edu, 612-255-3386 (videófono) o al 651-690-6018 (voz). Si tiene preguntas sobre los derechos de su hijo como participante, en cualquier momento puede contactar al Consejo de Revisión Institucional de St. Catherine al 651-690-7739 o jsschmitt@stkates.edu para hablar de esta investigación.

¡Gracias por su participación!

Sobre la investigadora:
Ursula Dierauer es una intérprete de ASL-ingles, certificada a nivel nacional, con 9 años de experiencia en las Escuelas públicas de XXXXXXXXXX.

Ursula Dierauer, NIC
updierauer@stkate.edu | XXX-XXX-XXXX
St. Catherine University
Estudiante de maestría, MAISCE

Usted puede conservar una copia de este formulario para sus archivos.
### Autorización del padre/tutelar

Al firmar abajo, usted está indicando su consentimiento para dejar a su hijo/a (con menos de 18 años) participar en este estudio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre del padre/tutelar (letra de molde)</th>
<th>Fecha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firma del padre/tutelar</th>
<th>Fecha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Survey Student Assent Form (English)

Survey
Participant Informed Consent

I am a master’s degree student at St. Catherine University in the Master of Arts Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity program under the supervision of Dr. Erica Alley. I am conducting a research study to understand how Deaf and hard of hearing students at XXXXXXXXXX Public Schools (XXXX) perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreters and am requesting your participation in the data collection process.

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study Leading to a Graduate Action Research
I would like to invite you to participate in this research study on the educational interpreting services received by students of XXXX. As a student receiving these services, your experiences are vitally important for improving interpreting services of XXXX. Your input could inform interpreters how interpreting services better meet students’ needs.

What will you be asked to do?
If you decide to take part in this study you will be asked to fill out a survey of 17 questions and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey must be returned in the accompanying envelope within two weeks of receiving it.

Who is eligible to participate?
Deaf and hard of hearing XXXX high school students who use interpreting services in class.

Why is this research being done?
The study is looking to identify student perceptions about interpreter effectiveness in order to ensure that student needs are being met when they use interpreting services.

What are the benefits that may happen if I am in this study?
There are no direct benefits of participating in this study. However, identifying the ways in which XXXX interpreting services have been effective or ineffective will inform XXXX interpreters’ future approach to interpreting for high school students. Study participants will benefit from knowing that their shared stories helped to further research on educational interpreting and may lead to improved interpreting services for XXXX students in the future.

What are the risks or discomforts to me if I am in this study?
This project will require participants to answer questions about their experiences with educational interpreters. Your name and/or any identifying information will not be used in the final action research project. There will be no physical risk of any kind.

What will you do with the information you get from me and how will you protect my privacy?
The information provided by your student in this study will be collected with a written survey. Student names will not be written on the survey and data from all surveys will be combined for analysis. The surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet at the primary investigator’s home and the data analysis will be conducted on her password protected computer. Only the research advisor
and I will have access to the records while I work on this project. I will destroy all the original surveys within six months of concluding my research. Any information provided will be kept confidential, which means that your student will not be identified or identifiable in any written reports or publications.

**May I stop my participation in this study?**
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. Even if you begin, you may discontinue your participation at any time without fear of retaliation.

**Who can I contact for questions?**
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact Ursula Dierauer, Principal Investigator at updierauer@stkate.edu or XXX-XXX-XXXX or Dr. Erica Alley, Program Director, at elalley@stkate.edu or 612-255-3386 (VP) or 651-690-6018 (voice). If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St Catherine University Institutional Review Board at 651-690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkate.edu. Thank you for your participation!

**About the Researcher:**
Ursula Dierauer is a nationally certified ASL-English interpreter with 9 years of experience working as an interpreter for XXXXXXXXXX Public Schools.
Ursula Dierauer, NIC
updierauer@stkate.edu | XXX-XXX-XXXX
St. Catherine University
Masters student, MAISCE

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.
Participant (Student) Assent

By signing below, you indicate your willingness to participate in this study.

__________________________________________  ________________________
Participant (Student’s) Name (please print)  Date

__________________________________________  ________________________
Participant (Student’s) Signature  Date
Appendix E: Survey Tool

Survey Questions:

1. How old are you: ___

2. What grade are you in (circle one): 9 10 11 12

3. (Check all that apply.) Are you:
   - White
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Black or African American
   - Native American
   - Other__________________
   - Prefer Not to Answer

4. Are you:
   - Female
   - Male
   - Non-binary/third gender
   - Prefer to self-describe __________
   - Prefer Not to Answer
5. How many classes are you taking this semester? ___

6. How many of those classes are interpreted? ___

7. When was the first time you had an interpreter in your classroom?
   - Preschool or Kindergarten
   - 1st or 2nd grade
   - 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade
   - Middle School
   - High School
   - Don’t remember

8. I am comfortable having an interpreter in my classroom.
   Agree  Not sure  Do not agree

9. How often do you use an interpreter to communicate with teachers or other staff members?
   Always  Sometimes  Never

10. I am comfortable using interpreters to communicate with teachers and other staff.
    Agree  Not sure  Do not agree

11. How often do you use an interpreter to communicate with classmates or friends?
    Always  Sometimes  Never

12. I am comfortable using interpreters to communicate with classmates and friends.
    Agree  Not sure  Do not agree
13. From your experience using interpreters, how satisfied are you with their interpreting skills as a group? (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Why? ______________________________________

14. How satisfied are you with the interpreting skills of your current interpreter(s)? (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Why? ______________________________________

15. What have interpreters done in class that you appreciate?

_________________________________________________________________

16. What have interpreters done in class that you dislike?

_________________________________________________________________

17. Is there anything else about your interpreters at school that you want me to know?

_________________________________________________________________
Appendix F: Survey Student Assent Explanation (ASL)

Survey
Participant Informed Consent

The link below is for a video I created that presents the informed consent information in American Sign Language (ASL) for the Deaf and hard of hearing high school students who will be taking the survey. This is an attempt to ensure that the students understand the consent form they are signing.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XXxdRu9jXko
PARTICIPANTS NEEDED!

• Are you Deaf or Hard of Hearing?
• Are you a high school student?
• Do you use interpreters in class?

I am looking for volunteers to participate in a focus group
to talk about their use of sign language interpreters in high school.

The focus group will be held after school
at [blank] on a day when as
many participants as possible are available.
Pizza will be provided for participants.

If you are interested you can contact Ursula Dierauer at
[blank] (voice or text) or updierauer@stkate.edu.

Or you can return the bottom portion of this form
to your Deaf Education teacher who will get the survey to you.

I, _______________________________,

am interested in participating in a focus group discussion
about my use of interpreters in school.

My Deaf Education teacher is _________________________________.

The best day of the week for me to participate after school is (circle one):

MONDAY  TUESDAY  WEDNESDAY  THURSDAY  FRIDAY

This is not a [blank] publication and is being provided
as a courtesy to inform you of other community activities and opportunities available.
Appendix H: Focus Group Parental Consent Form (English)

**Focus Group**

**Parent/Guardian Informed Consent**

I am a master’s degree student at St. Catherine University in the Master of Arts Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity program under the supervision of Dr. Erica Alley. I am conducting a research study to understand how Deaf and hard of hearing students at XXXXXXXXXX Public Schools (XXXX) perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreters and am requesting your participation in the data collection process.

**Invitation to Participate in a Research Study Leading to a Graduate Action Research**

I would like to invite your child to participate in this research study on the educational interpreting services received by students of XXXX. As a student receiving these services your child’s experiences are vitally important for improving interpreting services of XXXX. Your child’s input could inform interpreters and improve interpreting services to meet students’ needs.

**What will your child be asked to do?**

If your child decides to take part in this study he/she will be asked to participate in a focus group with other Deaf and hard of hearing XXXX high school students. The discussion will be filmed in order to allow me to transcribe the conversation and identify themes and patterns from the group discussion. The group will discuss experiences with their interpreters and suggestions for how interpreting services could be improved. This focus group will last approximately 1-1.5 hours.

**Who is eligible to participate?**

Deaf and hard of hearing XXXX high school students who use interpreting services in class.

**Why is this research being done?**

The study is looking to identify student perceptions about interpreter effectiveness in order to ensure that student needs are being met when they use interpreting services.

**What are the benefits if my child is in this study?**

There are no direct benefits of participating in this study. However, identifying the ways in which XXXX interpreting services have been effective or ineffective will inform XXXX interpreters’ future approach to interpreting for high school students. Study participants will benefit from knowing that their shared stories helped to further research on educational interpreting and may lead to improved interpreting services for XXXX students in the future.

**What are the risks or discomforts to my child if he/she is in this study?**

Participants will be asked to share personal information regarding their use of interpreters. This may be uncomfortable for some students, but they will not be required to share information if they choose to withhold it. Your child’s name and/or any identifying information will not be used in the final action research project. Due to the fact that there will be multiple participants, I cannot guarantee complete confidentiality from them although it will be requested. There will be no physical risk of any kind.
What will you do with the information you get from my child and how will you protect his/her privacy?
The names of participants will not be used in the labeling of videos or the transcripts that are created from the video. Participants will have the opportunity to choose their own pseudonym that they prefer be used in reference to them for the purpose of this study. All documents associated with this study will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home. All videos will be stored electronically on a password protected computer and a password protected Google Drive folder. The data analysis will be shared in an action research project with no identifying information – specific names will not be used. Only the research advisor and I will have access to the records while I work on this project. I will destroy all the videos within six months of concluding my research. Any information provided will be kept confidential, which means that your student will not be identified or identifiable in any written reports or publications.

May my child stop his/her participation in this study?
Your child’s participation in this research is completely voluntary. Your child does not have to participate if he/she does not want to. Even if he/she begins, he/she may discontinue participation at any time without fear of retaliation. Your child may stop participating at any time during the focus group if he/she wishes.

Will my child be compensated for participating in this study?
There will be no monetary compensation, but pizza will be provided to participants of the focus group.

Who can I contact for questions?
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact Ursula Dierauer, Principal Investigator at updierauer@stkate.edu or XXX-XXX-XXXX or Dr. Erica Alley, Program Director, at elalley@stkate.edu or 612-255-3386 (VP) or 651-690-6018 (voice). If you have questions about your child’s rights as a participant, you may contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St Catherine Institutional Review Board at 651-690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkates.edu at any time regarding the study.
Thank you for your participation!

About the Researcher:
Ursula Dierauer is a nationally certified ASL-English interpreter with 9 years of experience working as an interpreter for XXXXXXXXXXX Public Schools. 
Ursula Dierauer, NIC 
updierauer@stkate.edu | XXX-XXX-XXXX
St. Catherine University
Masters student, MAISCE

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.
Parent/Guardian Consent
By signing below, you indicate your willingness to allow your child (under the age of 18) to participate in this study.

Parent/Guardian’s Name (please print)  Date

Parent/Guardian’s Signature  Date
Grupo de enfoque
Consentimiento informado para padres/tutelares de familia

Soy una estudiante haciendo mi maestría en el programa de Estudios de Interpretación y Equidad en la Comunicación de St. Catherine University, bajo la supervisión de la Dra. Erica Alley. Estoy llevando a cabo una investigación para entender cómo los estudiantes parcial o totalmente sordos en las Escuelas Públicas de XXXXXXXXXX (XXX por sus siglas en inglés) perciben la eficacia de sus intérpretes educacionales, y por eso estoy pidiendo la participación de su hijo en el proceso de colección de datos e información.

Invitación para participar en un estudio de investigación que llevará a una investigación-acción de maestría

Me gustaría invitar a su hijo a participar en esta investigación sobre los servicios de interpretación educacional que reciben los estudiantes de XXXX. Como estudiante que recibe estos servicios, su hijo tiene experiencias que son íntegramente importantes para mejorar los servicios de interpretación de XXXX. Las contribuciones de su hijo podrían informar a los intérpretes cómo sus servicios de interpretación podrían mejorar para cumplir con las necesidades de los estudiantes.

¿Qué le pedirán a hacer?
Si decide su hijo participar en esta investigación, tendrá que participar en un grupo de enfoque con otros estudiantes de la preparatoria de XXXX que son parcial o totalmente sordos. Esta conversación será filmada para que la investigadora pueda transcribir el discurso e identificar temas y patrones que surgen de la discusión. El grupo platicará de sus experiencias exitosas y no exitosas con intérpretes, tanto como sugerencias de cómo se podría mejorar los servicios de interpretación. El grupo de enfoque se reunirá por aproximadamente 1-1.5 horas.

¿Quién es elegible para participar?
Estudiantes de la preparatoria de XXXX que son total o parcialmente sordos y que utilizan los servicios de interpretación dentro del salón de clases.

¿Con qué fin estoy haciendo esta investigación?
El propósito de este estudio es identificar las percepciones de estudiantes sobre la eficacia de intérpretes para asegurarnos de que estén cumpliendo con las necesidades de los estudiantes cuando proveen servicios de interpretación.

¿Cuáles son los beneficios de participar en esta investigación?
No hay ningún beneficio directo en participar en esta investigación. Sin embargo, en identificar las formas en que los servicios de interpretación de XXXX han o no han sido eficaces influirá la manera que los intérpretes de XXXX interpretan para estudiantes de la preparatoria. Participantes en este estudio sacarán beneficio en saber que sus experiencias han ayudado a mejorar las investigaciones sobre la interpretación educacional y que podrían resultar en mejores servicios de interpretación para los estudiantes de XXXX en el futuro.

¿Cuáles son las dudas o riesgos que podrían afectar a mi hijo al participar en esta investigación?
Este proyecto requerirá que los participantes comparten información personal acerca de su uso de intérpretes. Esto podría causar emociones incomodas para algunos estudiantes, pero no les pediré
compartir información si no desean hacerlo. En el proyecto final de investigación-acción no se utilizará tu nombre y/o cualquier información que te identificaría. Como van a participar algunos otros estudiantes, no puedo garantizar confidencialidad completa de parte de ellos, pero se la solicitaré. No le presentaré ningún riesgo físico de ningún tipo.

¿Qué van a hacer con la información de mi hijo y cómo protegerán su privacidad?
No se utilizarán los nombres de los participantes para etiquetar los videos o transcripciones de los videos. Participantes tendrán la oportunidad de escoger sus propios seudónimos para referir a ellos en el estudio. Se guardarán todos los documentos de esta investigación dentro de un gabinete con seguro, dentro del hogar de la investigadora. Todos los videos se guardarán electrónicamente en una computadora protegida con contraseña y dentro de una carpeta electrónica de Google Drive, también protegida con contraseña. Se compartirá el análisis de datos dentro de un proyecto de investigación-acción sin ninguna información que se podría utilizar para identificar a los participantes—no se utilizará nombres específicos.

¿Podrá mi hijo dejar de participar en este estudio?
La participación de su hijo en este estudio es completamente voluntaria. No es necesario que participe si no lo desea. Si empieza a participar y decide dejar de continuar, lo puede hacer sin miedo de represalia. Su hijo puede cesar su participación en cualquier momento durante el grupo de enfoque si lo desea.

¿Me van a indemnizar por participar en este estudio?
No podremos dar ninguna indemnización monetaria, pero se les proveerá pizza a los participantes del grupo de enfoque.

¿A quién puedo contactar para mis preguntas?
Si tiene cualquier pregunta o duda sobre el estudio, favor de contactar a Ursula Dierauer, investigadora principal (updierauer@stkate.edu o al XXX-XXX-XXXX) o a la Dra. Erica Alley, directora del programa, elalley@stkate.edu, 612-255-3386 (videófono) o al 651-690-6018 (voz). Si tiene preguntas sobre los derechos de su hijo como participante, en cualquier momento puede contactar al Consejo de Revisión Institucional de St. Catherine al 651-690-7739 o jsschmitt@stkates.edu para hablar de esta investigación.

¡Gracias por su participación!

Sobre la investigadora:
Ursula Dierauer es una intérprete de ASL-ingles, certificada a nivel nacional, con 9 años de experiencia en las Escuelas Públicas de XXXXXXXXXXX.
Ursula Dierauer, NIC
updierauer@stkate.edu | XXX-XXX-XXXX
St. Catherine University
Estudiante de maestría, MAISCE
Usted puede conservar una copia de este formulario para sus archivos. **Autorización del padre/tutelar**
Al firmar abajo, usted está indicando su consentimiento para dejar a su hijo/a (con menos de 18 años) participar en este estudio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre del padre/tutelar (<em>letra de molde</em>)</th>
<th>Fecha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firma del padre/tutelar</th>
<th>Fecha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Focus Group Student Assent Form

Focus Group
Participant Informed Consent

I am a master’s degree student at St. Catherine University in the Master of Arts Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity program under the supervision of Dr. Erica Alley. I am conducting a research study to understand how Deaf and hard of hearing students at XXXXXXXX Public Schools (XXXX) perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreters and am requesting your participation in the data collection process.

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study Leading to a Graduate Action Research
I would like to invite you to participate in this research study on the educational interpreting services received by students of XXXX. As a student receiving these services your experiences are vitally important for improving interpreting services of XXXX. Your input could inform interpreters and improve interpreting services to meet students’ needs.

What will you be asked to do?
If you decide to take part in this study you will be asked to participate in a focus group with other Deaf and hard of hearing XXXX high school students. The discussion will be filmed in order to allow me to transcribe the conversation and identify themes and patterns from the group discussion. The group will discuss experiences with their interpreters and suggestions for how interpreting services could be improved. This focus group will last approximately 1-1.5 hours.

Who is eligible to participate?
Deaf and hard of hearing XXXX high school students who use interpreting services in class.

Why is this research being done?
The study is looking to identify student perceptions about interpreter effectiveness in order to ensure that student needs are being met when they use interpreting services.

What are the benefits if I am in this study?
There are no direct benefits of participating in this study. However, identifying the ways in which XXXX interpreting services have been effective or ineffective will inform XXXX interpreters’ future approach to interpreting for high school students. Study participants will benefit from knowing that their shared stories helped to further research on educational interpreting and may lead to improved interpreting services for XXXX students in the future.

What are the risks or discomforts to me if I am in this study?
Participants will be asked to share personal information regarding their use of interpreters. This may be uncomfortable for some students, but they will not be required to share information if they choose to withhold it. Your name and/or any identifying information will not be used in the final action research project. Due to the fact that there will be multiple participants, I cannot guarantee complete confidentiality from them although it will be requested. There will be no physical risk of any kind.
What will you do with the information you get from me and how will you protect my privacy?
The names of participants will not be used in the labeling of videos or the transcripts that are created from the video. Participants will have the opportunity to choose their own pseudonym that they prefer be used in reference to them for the purpose of this study. All documents associated with this study will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home. All videos will be stored electronically on a password protected computer and a password protected Google Drive folder. The data analysis will be shared in an action research project with no identifying information – specific names will not be used. Only the research advisor and I will have access to the records while I work on this project. I will destroy all the videos within six months of concluding my research. Any information provided will be kept confidential, which means that your student will not be identified or identifiable in any written reports or publications.

May I stop my participation in this study?
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. Even if you begin, you may discontinue your participation at any time without fear of retaliation. You may stop participating at any time during the focus group if you wish.

Will I be compensated for participating in this study?
There will be no monetary compensation, but pizza will be provided to participants of the focus group.

Who can I contact for questions?
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact Ursula Dierauer, Principal Investigator at updierauer@stkate.edu or XXX-XXX-XXXX or Dr. Erica Alley, Program Director, at elalley@stkate.edu or 612-255-3386 (VP) or 651-690-6018 (voice). If you have questions about your child’s rights as a participant, you may contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St. Catherine Institutional Review Board at 651-690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkates.edu at any time regarding the study.
Thank you for your participation!

About the Researcher:
Ursula Dierauer is a nationally certified ASL-English interpreter with 9 years of experience working as an interpreter for XXXXXXXXXX Public Schools.
Ursula Dierauer, NIC
updierauer@stkate.edu | XXX-XXX-XXXX
St. Catherine University
Masters student, MAISCE

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.
Participant (Student) Assent

By signing below, you indicate your willingness to participate in this study.

________________________________________  ____________________________
Participant (Student’s) Name (please print)  Date

________________________________________  ____________________________
Participant (Student’s) Signature  Date

________________________________________
Participant’s Pseudonym (Fake name for student)
Appendix L: Videotape Release Form (English)

Videotape Release Form

I ____________________ agree that my child, _________________ may be videotaped as part of his/her participation in the study “Meeting the Interpreting needs of Deaf and Hard of Hearing High School Students” conducted by Ursula Dierauer. I understand that the videotape will be labeled using a chosen pseudonym and kept secure on a password protected computer stored in the researcher’s home. I understand that the video will be kept by the researcher and used for research purposes. The video will not be shown to others without my written permission.

Please read the following and check whether or not you give consent. Please note: your child cannot participate in the experiment if you are unwilling for him/her to be video-recorded.

- YES, I give permission for my videotaped data to be used in scholarly presentations and publications.

- NO, I DO NOT give permission for my videotaped data to be used in scholarly presentations and publications.

___________________________  _____________________
Parent/Guardian’s Signature  Date

___________________________  _____________________
Participant (Student’s) Signature  Date
Appendix L: Videotape Release Form (Spanish)

Formulario de autorización para filmar

Yo, __________________________, doy mi autorización para que filma(n) a mi hijo/a, __________________________, como parte de su participación en el estudio “Cumpliendo con las necesidades de interpretación de estudiantes total o parcialmente sordos”, que realizará Ursula Dierauer. Yo entiendo que se etiquetará el video con un seudónimo escogido y que se archivará en una computadora, protegida con contraseña dentro del hogar de la investigadora. Yo entiendo que la investigadora se quedará con el video para usarlo para propósitos de investigación. No se compartirá el video con ninguna otra persona sin mi autorización.

Por favor lea lo siguiente y marque los elementos para los cuales usted da la autorización. Por favor tome en cuenta: su hijo/a no puede participar en el experimento si usted no está dispuesto a dar autorización para que lo/la filmemos.

o SÍ, yo doy permiso para que mis datos grabados se incluyen en presentaciones y publicaciones eruditas.

o NO, YO NO doy permiso para que mis datos grabados se incluyan en presentaciones y publicaciones eruditas.

___________________________  _______________________
Firma del padre/tutelar  Fecha

___________________________  _______________________
Firma del participante (estudiante)  Fecha
Appendix M: Focus Group Informed Consent and Videotaping Consent Script

Thank you for your interest in participating in this focus group discussion about your experiences with educational interpreters. Before we begin I need to read this script to ensure you understand the consent forms.

We are here today to talk about your experiences with interpreters here at school. I am studying this as a part of my Master’s degree program at St. Catherine University. My goal is to find out how you, as Deaf and hard of hearing students at XXXX, perceive the effectiveness of your interpreters and find out how your interpreting services could improve. Our discussion today will last around 1-1.5 hours. When I use the information from our conversation, I will not use your real names. Instead you can choose a fake name for me to use. This way people who read my work will not know who gave me the information. I hope this will be a comfortable discussion for you, but if you feel uncomfortable at any time you can choose not to answer questions. In fact your presence here is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. Even if you begin, you may stop participating at any time. If you agree to move forward with the discussion please turn to the Focus Group Informed Consent paper. Print your name on the first line and date it. Sign your name on the second line and date that also. The next line is where you can make up a name for yourself that I will use instead of your real name when I use the data in my research.

Our conversation today will be videotaped in order for me to transcribe the discussion later. It will not be shown to others without your written permission. I will not refer to you by name in my research and you can choose a fake name for me to use instead. The video will be kept on a computer that is password protected in my home. I will use the video for my research on educational interpreting. If you agree to that, please check the box next to YES on your Videotape Release Form, sign your name as the participant/student, and write in the date on the line. Unfortunately because sign language is a visual language you will not be able to participate if you do not agree to being videotaped.

If you have any questions about this focus group or my research feel free to contact me or my graduate program director. Our email addresses and phone numbers are included on the Informed Consent page.

During our discussion today, please avoid using the names of interpreters or teachers to respect their privacy. After you leave today I ask that you please keep our topics of discussion confidential to respect each other’s privacy as well. I can’t prevent you from sharing information outside of the group, but I would appreciate it.

Thank you so much! Now let’s move on to our discussion.
Appendix N: Focus Group Questions

1. Are you comfortable using interpreters in class?

2. How well do you think you understand your interpreters?

3. What do interpreters in class do that works well for you?

4. What do you wish interpreters would stop doing?

5. What would you change about the way interpreters work in your classes?

6. What suggestions do you have for interpreters that work with high school students?

7. Do you ever have the chance to talk with your interpreter about what you prefer your interpreters to do? Would you want to?

8. What else do you want me to know about what it’s like to use interpreters in class?
Appendix O: IRB Application

**ST. CATHERINE UNIVERSITY REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FOR THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH APPLICATION**

**IRB APPLICATION DOCUMENT CHECKLIST**

The items listed below are the application, forms and supporting documents to be uploaded to Mentor IRB for your protocol/application submission. Consent forms and additional supporting documents may be uploaded to separately; see [Mentor IRB Directions](mailto:irb@stkate.edu). For questions, contact the IRB Assistant at 651-690-6204 or irb@stkate.edu.

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Application</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Documentation/CITI Training for Investigator(s)*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Documentation/CITI Training for Faculty Adviser (if applicable)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent form</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child assent form (if applicable)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting materials (phone script, fliers, ads, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/questionnaire(s), focus group or interview questions (if applicable)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest/financial interest disclosure (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of support (if you are conducting research at another agency, school, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PI Documentation/CITI Training is the completion report received for fulfilling the required Human Subjects Research education requirements in CITI Program. Each person will need to upload their PI Documentation to their individual Mentor IRB account. Directions are located in Mentor IRB.*
ST. CATHERINE UNIVERSITY REQUEST FOR APPROVAL
FOR THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH APPLICATION

Complete the following application in its entirety. You may excerpt material from your thesis or grant proposal, but your application should be relatively concise. Consent forms and additional supporting documents may be uploaded to separately; see Mentor IRB Directions. For questions, contact the IRB Assistant at 651-690-6204 or irb@stkate.edu.

Date of application: October 16, 2017

Investigator name(s) and credentials (e.g., PhD, RN, etc.): (List all co-investigators)

Ursula Dierauer, NIC

Project Title: Meeting the Interpreting Needs of Deaf and Hard of Hearing High School Students

Department: Interpreting

Level of Review:
In the Mentor IRB system, you must select the Review Type; selecting Exempt and Expedited will prompt additional questions for you to fill out. The default level of review is Full if not selected. For more information on the levels of review, go to the Mentor IRB Info page: Determine the Level of Review.

Exempt [X] Expedited [ ] Full

Has this research been reviewed by another IRB?

[ ] Yes [X] No

If YES, you may not need to complete a St Kates IRB application and may be able to use your external IRB application instead. Please include a copy of the letter of approval and approved IRB application from the external IRB with your Mentor IRB submission, or indicate the status of your application here. Contact the IRB coordinator at IRB@stkate.edu with any questions. Examples: “See attached” or “Pending approval”

Will this research be reviewed by another IRB?

[ ] Yes [X] No

If YES, please indicate your plans for review

Note: Cooperative Research is when a research protocol requires approval from outside institutions (e.g., a hospital IRB or other college/university) as well as St. Catherine University. Sometimes it is possible for an IRB to accept an external IRB’s review to reduce duplication of review effort. Contact the
IRB coordinator at IRB@stkate.edu if you have questions about cooperative research and how to determine when only one IRB will need to review your IRB application.

1. **RESEARCH SUMMARY:** Complete each section in clear, easy to read language that can be understood by a person unfamiliar with your research and your field.

   **a. Purpose of the research:** Provide a clear, concise statement of your purpose.

   The goal of my research project is to identify the perspectives of Deaf and hard of hearing high school students regarding the educational interpreting services they receive in their classrooms and use them to identify ways in which educational interpreting services could better meet students’ needs.

   **b. Background:** Provide a concise summary in 1 - 2 brief paragraphs to explain the importance of the research and how it fits with previous research.

   Literature on educational interpreting has primarily centered on the skills, qualifications, and practices of the interpreters themselves. Seal (2004) presented a set of best practices for educational interpreters. Winston (2004) offered a collection of chapters to advise educational interpreters as to how they can be more successful in their work. Melissa B. Smith has presented a body of work that reports the observable actions of interpreters in K-12 classrooms (2010a, 2010b, 2013, 2015). Her work shows that educational interpreters seek to make the educational experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students as successful as possible by making decisions regarding visual access, student needs, and participation on a frequent basis (Smith, 2013). Some studies have also focused on the importance of the relationships between interpreters and teachers (Cawthon, 2001; Mertens, 1990; Kopans, 2001, Smith, 2013). 

   One population’s vital viewpoint is seriously underrepresented in the research on educational interpreting. This is the perspective of Deaf and hard of hearing students who have used educational interpreting services in K-12 schools. Deaf author Leo M. Jacobs expressed his concerns about the rapid rise of mainstreaming that followed the passage of PL 94-142 (Jacobs, 1980). While this view may have been representative of views held by the Deaf community at that time, his writing is based on opinions rather than evidence and is outdated in light of the requirements for educational interpreters that several states have mandated. A growing number of studies have represented the actual experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students who use educational interpreting services. Unfortunately most of this research focuses on deaf college students using interpreters or students’ preferred school placement (Byrnes & Sigafoos, 2001; Johnson, K., 1991; Rittenhouse, Rahn, & Morreau, 1989). Only Kurz and Langer (2004) and Berge and Ytterhus (2015) report the lived experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students using educational interpreters in classrooms. However, these studies do not depict what is currently being experienced in the United States by deaf and hard of hearing students using K-12 educational interpreters. Berge and Ytterhus (2015) was conducted in Norway while Kurz & Langer (2004) was conducted over a decade ago before many states implemented interpreter qualification standards. The proposed study seeks to provide a more current report of what Deaf and hard of hearing high school students in the United States are experiencing.

   **References**


c. **Research Methods and Questions:** Give a general description of the study design and specific methods you will use in your investigation. Specify all of your research questions and/or hypotheses. Reviewers will consider whether the information you are gathering is necessary to answer your research question(s), so this should be clear in your application.

**Research Question 1:** How do high school students from a large Midwestern school district currently perceive the effectiveness of their educational interpreting services?

**Research Question 2:** How do high school students suggest these services could be improved?

The first step to my methodology is to meet with the Deaf Education Dean of Students of the school district to procure a list of students who are eligible for the survey portion of my study along with contact
information for teachers of the deaf or itinerant teachers who work with them. Upon receiving this information I will give fliers about the survey to the teachers of the deaf to send home with interested, eligible students. Following that, parental consent forms and student assent forms along with envelopes will be given to the teachers of the deaf to distribute to interested, eligible students. When the consent forms are returned in the sealed envelopes, I will provide the survey instrument on paper to the consenting participants in the same way. The survey will collect demographic information about the participants as well as their opinions about educational interpreting. At the close of the survey, participants will be able to add any additional comments or questions pertaining to educational interpreting. The data from the completed surveys will be tabulated to observe trends and patterns as well as guide discussion in the focus group portion of the study.

After concluding the survey portion of the study, my attention will turn to a focus group with deaf and hard of hearing high school students who use interpreting services. Fliers promoting the focus group will be sent home in the same manner as the fliers for the survey portion of the study. Then parental consent and student assent forms will again have to be sent home with the qualifying students. The parental consent forms will be collected the same way the survey consent forms were collected while student consent forms can wait to be presented the day of the focus group to allow me to present its contents in ASL to ensure the participants understand its contents. When the parental consent forms are gathered, the list of participants for the focus group will be determined. Ideally I would like to include all of the eligible students that wish to participate in the focus group. However, Hale and Napier (2013) recommend limiting focus groups to 8-10 participants. This indicates that if all eligible students express interest and availability, I will have to determine which 8-10 students will be invited to participate. If more than 10 students are available to meet together, I will include the first ten students to respond. The focus group interview will be conducted in a classroom at one of the district’s high schools after school hours when teachers and interpreters have concluded their work day. This will provide another layer of comfort and familiarity to the focus group participants who attend this school. My relationship with the school district and particularly the Deaf Education Department will afford me the opportunity to use such a space. In order for myself and the participants to be available, the focus group will have to be held after the end of a school day. The exact date will be chosen dependent upon when the most participants are available to attend. I will conduct the focus group using sign language and the participants will respond in kind. I anticipate that the focus group discussion will last approximately 1-1.5 hours. I do not intend to force the discussion to continue if it takes less time or stop a strong dialogue if it takes longer. However, I will not allow the focus group to extend beyond two hours. This is to ensure that the discussion is productive, does not become sidetracked, and accommodates the limits of the filming technology at my disposal. The entirety of the focus group discussion will be filmed from 2-3 devices capturing different angles in order to allow me to fully attend to the conversation at hand instead of taking copious notes. This video will be captured via iPad’s. In order to accomplish this, I have asked Gordon Dierauer, my father, to be an assistant to monitor the filming of the focus group discussion. He will be familiar with the technology and is not an interpreter. In fact, he knows very little sign language which will mean he is not privy to the information shared during the discussion. He will not have any access to the data after the recording is completed. My own identity as an interpreter may already influence what the participants share in the discussion. I do not wish to add another interpreter to the environment because I fear that participants may censor their answers if too many of us are in the room. In the script I will read prior to the discussion, I have asked that participants not use the names of interpreters or teachers involved in their anecdotes. This is to protect the privacy of those individuals as well as prevent me from having personal reactions if I know the individuals. The video files of the focus group will be transferred to my personal laptop, deleted from the iPad’s, and backed up to my Google Drive. My laptop and Google Drive account are both password protected. At the conclusion of the focus group I will show my appreciation to the participants by ordering pizza for the group. I will personally provide the funds for this purchase.

After the focus group is concluded, I will transcribe the entire discussion. This particular study will not
focus on American Sign Language (ASL) linguistics and therefore I will interpret the signed utterances into written English as opposed to using an ASL gloss. In order to create the transcript in a form that is useful for data analysis, it will be produced using a program called ELAN. I will download the program to use on my password protected computer. This program will allow me to enter the comments of each participant and annotate them with recurring themes for further analysis.

After the conclusion of the research and compilation of the action research project required for my degree program I will present a brief summary to the school district that has allowed my research. This report will not include any identifying information of the student participants and will instead present aggregated data showing my findings.

References

d. **Expectations of Participants:** Give a step by step description of all procedures that you will have participants do. Attach any surveys, tests, instruments, interview questions, data collection forms, etc. that you will use with participants.

1. Participants will be invited to complete a 17 question survey.
2. Participants will be invited to participate in a focus group to discuss their experiences and thoughts about their experiences as users of educational interpreting services.

e. **Estimated Time Commitment for Participants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>Number of sessions for each participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20 min./1-1.5 hours</td>
<td>Time commitment per session for each participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 hours and 20 minutes</td>
<td>Total time commitment for each participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. **Access to Existing Data:** If you are analyzing existing data, records, or specimens, explain the source and type, means of access, and permission(s) to use them. If not accessing existing data, indicate “NA”

NA

2. **SUBJECTS:** Provide your best estimates below.

a. **Age Range of Subjects Included:** High School Students ranging in age from 13-18

b. **Number:**

(Indicate a range, or maximum, if exceeded, you will need to submit an amendment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. **Target Population:** Describe your target population (the group you will be studying; e.g. seniors, children ages 9-12, healthy adults 18 or over, etc.)

Deaf and hard of hearing high school students who use sign language interpreting services in their classrooms at a large Midwestern school district.
d. **Specific Exclusions:** If women and/or minorities are to be excluded from the study, a clear rationale should be provided in section “f” below.

| None |


e. **Special Populations Included:** Select any special population that will be the focus of your research.

NOTE: These groups require special consideration by federal regulatory agencies and by the IRB.

- [x] Minors (under age 18)
- HIV/AIDS patients
- [ ] St. Catherine Employees
- [ ] Economically disadvantaged
- [x] Students
- Educationally disadvantaged
- [ ] Pregnant women
- Hospital patients or outpatients
- [ ] Elderly/aged persons
- Prisoners
- [ ] Cognitively impaired persons
- Minority group(s) and/or non-English speakers *(please specify)*
  - American Sign Language users
- Other Special Characteristics and Special Populations *(please specify)*

f. **Provide reasons for targeting or excluding any special populations listed above.**

I am studying the perspectives and experiences of Deaf and hard of hearing students who use interpreters. Subjects must be personally receiving interpreting services in school and be willing to share their anecdotes and experiences regarding those services in order for this study to gather information about how interpreting services can better meet their needs.

| X | Yes |

| No |

g. **Do you have any conflict of interest (financial, personal, employment, dual-role) that could affect human subject participation or protection?** Dual-role examples: faculty–student (does not apply to action research projects for education students), medical practitioner-patients, supervisor-direct reports, etc.

| X | Yes |

| No |

*If Yes, please indicate the steps you will take to minimize any undue influence in your research, recruitment and consent process.*

As I research students’ perceptions of educational interpreters from a large Midwestern school district, I am an educational interpreter with that school district. However, I work with elementary students so I will not be gathering data from any students I am currently working with.

3. **RECRUITMENT: LOCATION OF SUBJECTS** *(Select all that apply)*:

- [ ] St. Catherine University students
X School setting (PreK – 12)

Hospital or clinic

Other Institution (Specify): 

None of the above (Describe location of subjects):

NOTE: If subjects are recruited or research is conducted through an agency or institution other than St. Catherine University, submit either written or electronic documentation of approval and/or cooperation. An electronic version should be sent from the email system of that particular institution. The document should include the name of the PI, Title of the approved study, as well as the name and title of the appropriate administrator sending the approval. You should include an abstract/synopsis of your study when asking for approval from an external institution.

a. Recruitment Method: Describe how you will recruit your subjects? Attach a copy of any advertisement, flyer, letter, or statement that you will use for recruitment purposes.

Fliers will be sent home with any qualifying potential participant: Deaf and hard of hearing high school students. Separate fliers will be created and distributed for the survey and focus group portions of the study.

b. Incentives: Will the subjects be offered inducements for participation? If yes, explain. Note: Please contact the ORSP office about the use of incentives within your research, There are important university policies that fall outside of the protection of human subject, orsp@stkate.edu or x6156

Participants in the survey will receive no incentives
Participants in the focus group will be provided with pizza at the conclusion of the discussion.

4. RISKS AND BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION

a. Select all that apply. Does the research involve:

Use of private records (medical or educational records)

Possible invasion of privacy of the subjects and/or their family

Manipulation of psychological or social variables

Probing for personal or sensitive information in surveys or interviews

Use of deception

Presentation of materials which subjects might consider offensive, threatening or degrading

Risk of physical injury to subjects

Other risks:
b. **Risks:** Briefly describe the risks of participation in your study, if any. Describe the precautions taken to minimize these risks. Please use “no foreseeable risk” rather than no risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the focus group portion of the study, students will be asked to share personal information regarding their use of interpreters. This may be uncomfortable for some students, but they will not be required to share information if they choose to withhold it. Student participants will be video recorded in order to capture their comments on interpreting. Recording the participants may cause them stress or cause them to feel some discomfort. To help put participants at ease, their comments will be collected together as a group so as not to feel interrogated or quizzed. The names of participants will not be used in the labeling of videos or the transcripts that are created from the video. Participants will have the opportunity to choose their own pseudonym that they prefer be used in reference to them for the purpose of this study. Additionally, their images will not be shown to anyone other than the researchers. All documents associated with this study (e.g., informed consent) will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home. All videos will be stored electronically on a password protected computer and a password protected Google Drive folder. Additionally, all participants will be asked to sign an Informed Consent form indicating their willingness to participate giving their permission to be video recorded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| c. **Benefits:** List any anticipated direct benefits to your subjects. If none, state that here and in the consent form. |
| 1. **Direct Benefits:** List any anticipated direct benefits to your subjects. If none, state that here and in the consent form. |
| There are no direct benefits to participants as a result of participation in this study. |
| 2. **Other Benefits:** List any potential benefits of this research to society, including your field of Study. |
| Results of this study may benefit the school district’s interpreting staff by offering feedback on the services they provide to the study’s participants. This feedback will allow the interpreters to better meet students’ needs in the future. The improved interpreting services may be provided for some of the participants in this study which would be a benefit to them. |
| d. **Risk/Benefit Ratio:** Justify the statement that the potential benefits (including direct and other benefits) of this research study outweigh any probable risks. |
| While there are no direct benefits to participation in this study, the participants would be providing the seriously lacking perspective of Deaf and hard of hearing users of interpreting services to improve educational interpreting services. The risks of this study are minor as the researchers will be the only viewers of survey and video data. All references to participants will be only by the pseudonym they choose. In comparison to these minor risks, there is the potential that the information shared with me will result in an improvement of interpreting services for these and future students with this school district. |
| e. **Deception:** The use of deception in research poses particular risks and should only be used if necessary to accomplish the research, and when risks are minimized as much as possible. The researcher should not use deception when it would affect the subject’s willingness to |
participate in the study (e.g., physical risks, unpleasant emotional or physical experiences, etc).

**Will you be using deception in your research?**

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

*If yes, justify why the deceptive techniques are necessary in terms of study’s scientific, educational or applied value. Explain what other alternatives were considered that do not use deception and why they would not meet the researcher’s objective. Attach a copy of a debriefing statement explaining the deception to participants.*

---

5. **CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA**

a. **Will your data be anonymous?**

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

(Anonymous data means that the researcher cannot identify subjects from their data, while confidential data means that the researcher can identify a subject’s response, but promises not to do so publicly.)

b. **How will you maintain anonymity/confidentiality of the information obtained from your subjects?**

*Interview Example: I will assign pseudonyms to each interview participant. I will de-identify the data, and store the key separate from the recordings and transcripts. I will have the transcriptionist sign a confidentiality statement.*

In order to minimize risk, the names of participants will not be used in the labeling of videos or the transcripts that are created from the video. The participant will have the opportunity to choose his/her own pseudonym, which will be used in reference to them for all publications and presentations that are developed as a result of this research.

Additionally, participants’ images will not be shown to anyone other than the researchers. All paper documents associated with this study (e.g., informed consent, surveys) will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home. All video recordings will be stored electronically on my password protected computer in my home and in my password protected Google Drive folder. Original video recordings will be erased from the recording devices directly after the video files are transferred to my computer and Google Drive.

I will personally conduct all transcription of the video data and will conduct the analysis of the interpretations. Transcripts will be in written English and will not include any identifiable information associated with the participant other than the participant’s self-chosen pseudonym for the study.

c. **Data Storage:** Where will the data be kept, and who will have access to it during that time?

*Examples: I will store audio files and electronic files on a password protected computer or cloud (indicate which; please avoid using flash drives as they are the one of the hardest 'tools' to protect and one of the easiest to exploit or lose, it is suggested to encrypt data on the cloud such as use a file password). I will store all paper files in a secure location (a locked filing cabinet) that is accessible only to myself and my advisor.*

All paper documents associated with this study (e.g., informed consent) will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home. All videos will be stored electronically on a password protected computer and a Google Drive folder.
d. **Data Destruction:** How long will it be kept? What is the date when original data will be destroyed? (All studies must specify a date when original data that could be linked back to a subject’s identity will be destroyed. Data that is stripped of all identifiers may be kept indefinitely). Example: I will destroy all records from the study within six months of the conclusion of the study but no later than June 2017.

All survey documents and video recordings from this study will be destroyed within six months of the conclusion of the study but no later than December 31, 2019 (two years from the beginning of this study).

e. **Availability of Data:** Will data identifying subjects be made available to anyone other than you or your advisor? If yes, please explain who will receive the data, and justify the need. Example: The data will only be available to me and my advisor.

No

f. **Official Records:** Will the data become a part of the medical or school record? If yes, explain. No

6. **INFORMED CONSENT**

   a. **How will you gain consent?** State what you will say to the subjects to explain your research.

   Consent documents must be signed by each participant’s parent/guardian and him/herself before they will be permitted to complete the survey or join the focus group.

   b. **Consent Document:** Attach the consent or assent form or text of oral statement. A template is available in Mentor IRB. Example: “See attached”

   See attached documents.

   c. **Timing of Consent Process:** Note: In studies with significant risk or volunteer burden, the IRB may require that subjects be given an interim period of 24 hours or more before agreeing to participate in a study

   n/a

   d. **Assurance of Participant Understanding:** How you will assess that the subject understands what they have been asked to do (Note: It is not sufficient to simply ask a yes/no question, such as “do you understand what you are being asked to do?”)

   Students participating in this study will have access to the informed consent for the survey portion via a video communicated in American Sign Language (ASL) in addition to the consent form printed in English in order to ensure understanding. The video has been created by the researcher who is a nationally certified ASL/English interpreter. The consent forms for the survey and focus group portions will also be available in Spanish. They have been translated and reviewed by a BEI certified trilingual interpreter. Prior to the recording of the focus group students will be read a script regarding their assent to being videotaped and participating in the study and their right to leave the study.

7. **CITI TRAINING** – Work with your faculty advisor or contact IRB@stkates.edu if you have any questions about whether you should complete additional training modules within CITI.
a. Select all the CITI training courses/modules you completed:

**REQUIRED COURSE:**
Human Subject Research Training Course – only one course is required

- [ ] Human Subject Research - Social & Behavioral Research Investigators
- [X] Human Subject Research - Education Action Research Program
- [ ] Human Subject Research - Biomedical Research Investigators

**OPTIONAL MODULES:**

- [ ] Financial Conflict of Interest Course (suggested if you answered YES to Section 2 part g)
- [ ] Avoiding Group Harms - U.S. Research Perspectives (suggested if you checked any special populations in Section 2 part e)
- [ ] International Research (suggested for PIs doing research outside of the US that is NOT federally funded)
- [ ] International Studies (suggested for PIs doing research outside of the US that IS federally funded)
- [ ] Cultural Competence in Research (suggested when conducting research across cultures, i.e. with a population that is culturally different from one's own)
- [ ] Internet Based Research (suggested for PIs using internet resources during their research (outside of recruitment) – Skype, survey tools, internet activity monitoring, etc)
- [ ] Other (prisoners, pregnant women, children):

8. **ASSURANCES**

By submitting this application, the researcher certifies that:

- The information furnished concerning the procedures to be taken for the protection of human subjects is correct.
- The investigator, to the best of his/her knowledge, is complying with Federal regulations and St. Catherine University IRB Policy governing human subjects in research.
- The investigator will seek and obtain prior written approval from the IRB for any substantive modification in the proposal, including, but not limited to changes in cooperating investigators, procedures and subject population.
- The investigator will promptly report in writing to the IRB any unexpected or otherwise significant adverse events that occur in the course of the study.
- The investigator will promptly report in writing to the IRB and to the subjects any significant findings which develop during the course of the study which may affect the risks and benefits to the subjects who participate in the study.
- The research will not be initiated until the IRB provides written approval.
• The term of approval will be for one year. To extend the study beyond that term, a new application must be submitted.
• The research, once approved, is subject to continuing review and approval by the IRB.
• The researcher will comply with all requests from the IRB to report on the status of the study and will maintain records of the research according to IRB guidelines.
• If these conditions are not met, approval of this research may be suspended.