The National Consortium
of Interpreter Education Centers

Interpreter Education Programs
Needs Assessment

Final Report

BY DENNIS COKELY, PH.D. & ELIZABETH WINSTON, PH.D.
NATIONAL INTERPRETER EDUCATION CENTER
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
JULY 2008

Foreword

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

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

Table of Contents

National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers
Interpreter Education Program Needs Assessment Report

I. Executive Summary

The National Interpreting Education Center (NIEC) is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education. In addition to the NIEC, grants were also awarded to five Regional Interpreter Education Centers (RIECs). Together, the six Centers have established the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC). This collaborative approach to implementation of the RSA grants fosters Center-to-Center communication and coordination; better leveraging of available resources, and more effective stewardship of federal funds.

Since grant award, the NCIEC has been working on a number of national initiatives, one of which has been design, development and implementation of needs assessment activities in key focus areas. The overall objectives of the needs assessment activities are to identify current and future needs of interpreter education programs, interpreter educators, interpreters and consumers of interpreter services. This report, the **Interpreter Education Program Needs Assessment Report,** marks the second fully completed NCIEC needs assessment activity. The first needs assessment effort focused on understanding needs of interpreter practitioners. A detailed final report on that effort is available through the NCIEC upon request.

The interpreter education program (IEP) needs assessment process was carried out through design, development and implementation of a survey instrument that was disseminated to IEPs nationwide. The survey instrument was developed by the NCIEC through a collaborative process that included extensive opportunities for input and feedback on the part of content experts and stakeholders throughout the field of interpreter education. The survey was disseminated to 126 IEPs nationwide. The survey period concluded September 2007, and resulted in the compilation of 91 completed survey responses. This final report presents findings and recommendations based on extensive analysis of the data collected through the IEP needs assessment process.

This report is organized based on broad categories of respondent information and related findings as captured through two levels of data analysis. It presents findings related to Non-degree certification/in-service programs, AA/AS programs, BA/BS programs, and graduate level programs. It includes a wide range of information related to faculty, students, operations and program delivery options. Section II of the report, IEP Needs Assessment Findings, provides a detailed description of findings related to each of the questions posed by the survey instrument. That information is organized into four distinct sets of findings: Information about All Respondents, Full-time Program Respondent Information, Part-time Program Respondent Information, and Comparison of Full-time and Part-time Respondent Information.

Section III of the report provides a detailed set of recommendations related to each set of survey findings. These recommendations are intended to provide direction and focus to the NCIEC cross-cutting work-teams as they carry out their various projects and activities and will provide an important source of input to the Consortium's efforts to address the needs discovered through this process.

Completion of this report does not mark the end of the Interpreter Education Program Needs Assessment process. Findings and results will be utilized by NCIEC to develop interpreter education priorities, to identify, establish and implement effective practices, and to institute appropriate and relevant evaluation processes. In addition, the Consortium will conduct follow-up needs assessment activities to identify future IEP needs, and determine the extent to which what has been learned through this process can be used to change practices and improve outcomes in the field.

II.   IEP Needs Assessment Findings

Upon initial assessment of the 91 completed survey instruments, it was quickly determined that the most value-added analysis of the collected data would be achieved by analyzing the data reported by the 91 respondents in its totality – that is, based on the 91 total completed surveys, what portion of respondents expressed or indicated one or another characteristic, and secondly, analyzing the data reported by respondents based on the type of degree and/or coursework they offered. This second level of data analysis was considered particularly relevant as the majority of the 91 survey respondents reported they offered more than one type of degree or coursework.

To support this second level of data analysis, data filters were run on the total pool of 91 survey responses to cull out only those survey respondents that offered a particular degree or coursework, specifically: 1) Non-degree certification/in-service program respondents; 2) AA/AS program respondents; 3) BA/BS program respondents, and 4) MA/MS program respondents. Based on the two levels of data analysis, four discrete sets of findings have been developed:

>   A.   Basic Information about All Respondents
>   B.   Full-time Program Respondent Information
>   C.   Part-time Program Respondent Information
>   D.   Comparison of Full-time and Part-time Respondent Information

Each set of findings is provided in the section below.

A.   Basic Information about All Respondents

This section of findings reports basic information about the total pool of survey respondents. It provides a detailed breakdown of those 91 respondents by the type of degree and/or coursework offered, and includes specific findings related to: program establishment; faculty; student outcomes; articulation agreements; placement and exit procedures, and information related to program delivery characteristics.

Public versus Private Institution

Survey respondents were asked to identify whether their institution is public or private. Of the 91 total respondents, 80 reported their institution is public and 11 reported their institution is private.

Type of Degree and/or Coursework Offered

In the initial section of the survey instrument, respondents classified their program by the type of degree and/or coursework offered. Of the 91 total respondents to the survey, 50 respondents reported they offered undergraduate credit only; 37 respondents reported they offered both undergraduate and continuing education credit; two respondents reported they offered undergraduate and graduate credit, and two respondents reported they offered undergraduate, graduate and continuing education credit.   Graduate coursework was in interpreting or interpreting pedagogy.

A breakdown of the specific type of degree and/or coursework offered by each of the 91 respondents is provided on Table 1.

Type of Degree and/or Coursework Offered Table 1	
Degree and/or Coursework	**# of Respondents**
AA/AS degree granting program only	31
AA/AS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	33
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting programs only	5
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
BA/BS degree granting program only	14
BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
BA/BS and MA/MS degree granting	2
BA/BS and MA/MS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
Total Respondents	**91**

Finding: The majority of survey respondents reported they offered more than one type of degree and/or coursework.

As discussed above, it was determined early on that analysis of the information collected through the 91 completed survey instruments should include a second level of analysis based on the type of degree and/or coursework a respondent program offered. As an example, to understand data characteristics and develop findings related only to those survey respondents that reported they offer an AA/AS degree, it would be necessary to analyze the first four categories of respondents listed on Table 1.

Specifically, while 31 programs offer only an AA/AS degree, an additional 33 survey respondents offer an AA/AS degree as well as non-degree certificate/in-service program. Another five survey respondents offer an AA/AS degree in addition to a BA/BS degree, and two additional programs offer all three: an AA/AS degree, BA/BS degree and a certificate/in-service program. In order to truly analyze and understand data related to just the AA/AS degree granting program respondents, all four of these categories – or all 71 of the IEP respondents that offer an AA/AS degree - needed to be considered. This holds true for looking at the three additional categories of program offerings: Non-degree certificate/in-service programs, BA/BS degree granting programs, and MA/MS degree granting programs.

Table 2 groups the 91 survey respondents into the four primary categories of degree and/or coursework offerings.

Breakdown of Respondent Degree/Coursework Offerings	
Table 2	
Non-degree certificate/in-service program offerings	
AA/AS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	33
BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
BA/BS and MA/MS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
Total respondents in this category	**39**
AA/AS program offerings	
AA/AS degree granting program only	31
AA/AS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	33
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting programs only	5
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
Total respondents in this category	**71**
BA/BS program offerings	
BA/BS degree granting program only	14
BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting programs only	5
AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting programs plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
BA/BS degree granting plus MA/MS degree granting	2
BA/BS and MA/MS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
Total respondents in this category	**27**
MA/MS program offerings	
BA/BS degree granting plus MA/MS degree granting	2
BA/BS and MA/MS degree granting plus non-degree certificate/in-service program	2
Total respondents in this category	**4**

Finding: When assessing the survey respondents by type of degree and/or coursework offered, it must be remembered that the majority of the total 91 survey respondents will be reported in more than one category as they provide more than one type of offering. Organized by type of degree and/or coursework, 71 of the total 91 IEP respondents offer an AA/AS degree, comprising the majority of respondents. By comparison, 39 of the total respondents offer a non-degree certification/in-service program; 27 respondents offer a BA/BS degree, and four respondents offer a MA/MS degree. Again, in each category, these offerings are often available in addition to another type of degree or coursework.

In the initial assessment of the data by type of degree or coursework offered, it is interesting to note that 52 respondents reported they did not offer non-degree certification/in-service coursework as part of their program. Specifically, 50 of the IEPs offer only undergraduate degrees, and another two IEPs offer only BA/BS and MA/MS degrees. Typically, non-degree certification/in-service program coursework is made available by providing student access to discrete components of a program's degree level classes, so it is surprising to discover such a high number of respondents do not make non-degree certification/in-service coursework available as part of their offerings. This would be especially important to that segment of the population already holding degrees and seeking only to acquire interpreting skills not a degree.

This conclusion is borne out by additional data collected through the survey in which 51 of the 91 survey respondents indicated that degree and non-degree students are in the classroom

together. However, while considering this particular data set, it is important to remember that only 39 of the respondents reported they offered non-degree certification/in-service coursework. In other response sets in the survey, a number of respondents indicated they had discontinued one or another aspect of their program offerings over time. The difference between the 51 respondents indicating that non-degree and degree students are in the classroom together and the 39 respondents that reported they offered non-degree coursework might be explained on the basis of past or planned non-degree program offerings.

Program Establishment

Survey respondents were asked to report the year in which their program was established. The survey asked this question by program type: Non-degree certification/in-service; AA/AS degree granting; BA/BS degree granting, and MA/MS degree granting. In analyzing the data collected through the total 91 completed surveys, ten year ranges were established to capture and report timeframes for program establishment.

Table 3 provides that information for each of the four categories of program offerings.

Timeframe IEP Respondent Program Established Table 3				
Program Establishment	**Non-Degree**	**AA/AS**	**BA/BS**	**MA/MS**
1960-1969	0	0	1	0
1969-1979	12	17	3	0
1980-1989	13	22	3	1
1990-1999	6	21	14	1
2000-2006	6	9	4	0
Unsure	2	2	2	2
Total Responses	**39**	**71**	**27**	**4**

Finding: Based on the information reported, the two highest growth timeframes were 1980-89 for the Non-degree and AA/AS degree granting programs, and 1990-99 for the AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting programs. Consideration should be placed on external factors and the environment at that time to assess what federal, state or advocacy stimuli may have influenced the increase in the number of programs established during those years.

In turn, it would be interesting to assess why establishment of new programs in all four types of offerings seems to have slowed since 2000, especially in light of the continuing national challenge of insufficient numbers of qualified and certified interpreters available to meet consumer needs. Only four BA/BS degree granting programs have been established since the year 2000. Recognizing that BA/BS degree coursework is accepted from colleges and universities other than those that specialize in interpreter education (or those participating in the survey), it is still interesting to note that the BA/BS degree granting programs specializing in interpreter education have not seemed to grow proportionate to the significance of the 2013 RID requirement for a BA/BS degree as a prerequisite for certification.

IEP Respondent Faculty Information

The information reported on Table 4 is based on all 91 survey responses. Additional faculty information was collected as it related to either full-time or part-time respondent programs. That information is reported in the Full-time and Part-time Program Respondent Information sections of the report.

Respondent Faculty Information Table 4	
Number of Interpreting faculty	367
Number of ASL faculty	444
Faculty with tenure (additional 5 reported as "on track")	98
Faculty expected to retire over next 5 years	60
Additional faculty needed in next 5 years	149

Finding: In comments that accompanied survey responses, a number of respondents reported that some of their faculty members serve in both interpreting and ASL faculty roles. However, actual numbers of faculty members that fulfill both roles were not reported. Therefore, in assessing the data on Table 4, it must be assumed that the actual number of individuals working as faculty in the responding IEPs is in fact lower than the numbers reported above as some faculty members were reported in both Interpreting and ASL categories. The extent to which those numbers are lower is not reportable based on data collected in the survey.

Recognizing the limitations of data reported on Table 4, it is still assessing to understand the nature of reported faculty tenure and retirement information. If the Interpreting and ASL faculty numbers reported by respondents are combined as broadly representative of the pool of faculty employed by their programs and are assumed to be non-overlapping, the total equals 811 total faculty members. Using that total as a baseline, of those, 7% were reported by survey respondents as expected to retire over the next five years, and only 12% were reported as having achieved tenure. Again, there are limitations with using the 811 faculty total as a non-overlapping number.

It is also notable that survey respondents reported they will require 149 new faculty members in the next five years; this number is more than double the 60 faculty members reported as expected to retire over the next five years. This further bears out concern already existing in the field regarding the shortage of faculty members.

Student Outcome Information

This section of findings reports information related to graduating student achievement of state and national credentials. Specifically, Table 5 on the next page reports on the average time it takes students to achieve state-level credentials by the type of program completed.

Average Time After Graduation Before Student Achieves State Credentials Table 5				
Average Time	**Non-Degree**	**AA/AS Students**	**BA/BA Students**	**MA/MS Students**
6-12 months	7	23	6	1
12-18 months	8	8	1	0
18-24 months	0	3	2	0
More than 24 months	0	1	2	0
Do not currently track	4	5	3	1
No state level credentials offered	8	16	9	2
No response	12	15	4	0
Total program respondents	**39**	**71**	**27**	**4**

Finding: There were a significant number of 'no responses' in several of the program categories. However, for those respondents that did respond to this question in the survey, it is positive to note that the majority of students within the Non-degree, AA/AS and BA/BS program categories secure state credentials within a year. It is also interesting to note the number of respondents that reported there are 'no state level credentials offered' in their state.

Table 6 reports on the average time it takes students to achieve national credentials by the type of program completed.

Average Time After Graduation Before Student Achieves National Credentials Table 6				
Average Time	**Non-Degree**	**AA/AS Students**	**BA/BA Students**	**MA/MS Students**
6-12 months	2	2	1	1
12-18 months	1	3	8	0
18-24 months	3	8	4	0
More than 24 months	8	17	4	0
Do not currently track	13	23	8	3
No response	12	18	2	0
Total program respondents	**39**	**71**	**27**	**4**

Finding: Once again there were a significant number of 'no responses' to this question in the survey. It is also interesting to note the number of respondents that do not track this information, although they are predominantly the non-degree and AA/AS programs, whose students would be entering and completing other programs before they would have the necessary prerequisites to secure national credentials.

It is notable that the BA/BS program respondents that did respond to the survey question reported most of their graduates take more than a year to secure national credentials.

Minimum Progression Requirements

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate whether or not their institution had minimum progression requirements in place. Table 7 captures responses in that regard.

IEP Respondent Minimum Progression Requirements Table 7				
IEP Survey Respondents	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**Total**
Minimum progression requirements in place	59	24	8	91
Minimum progression requirements unique to program	48	25	18	91

Finding: The majority of respondents reported they have minimum progression requirements in place, and of those, most reported those requirements are unique to their program.

Articulation Agreements

In considering information reported regarding respondent articulation agreements it is useful to refer back to Table 2. On that table, 64 of the 71 survey respondents in the AA/AS degree granting category reported they did not offer a BA/BS degree. It is then critical to assess the extent to which the AA/AS program respondents have established articulation agreements with other institutions to create opportunities for their students to transition to a four-year bachelors program in order to meet that requirement. In addition, only 27 of the total 91 survey respondents reported they offered a BA/BS degree.

Table 8 below pulls data from the second level data analysis of filtered program data to report information related to the extent to which AA/AS and BA/BS program respondents have or plan to establish articulation agreements.

IEP Articulation Agreements Table 8		
Articulation Agreements	**AA/AS Respondents**	**BA/BS Respondents**
Formal articulation agreement in place	30	8
No articulation agreement in place	37	19
No response	4	0
Total program respondents	**71**	**27**

Finding: Of the total 71 survey respondents in the AA/AS degree granting category, only 30 indicated they had an articulation agreement in place; 37 reported they did not. In addition, only eight of the BA/BS programs reported they had articulation agreements in place; 19 reported they did not.

Once again referring back to Table 2, five respondents reported they are an 'AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting program', and another two respondents reported they are an 'AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting plus non-degree/certificate/in-service program'. In a more in-depth analysis of the individual respondent information, it was confirmed that one of the respondents classified their program in the 'AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting category,' and also reported they do have an articulation agreement in place. That respondent institution is therefore counted in both the AA/AS program and BA/BS program categories on Table 8.

The survey also sought to capture information related to respondent plans to establish articulation agreements in the future. In the AA/AS program respondent category, 42 respondents reported that they have a plan to establish an articulation agreement; five respondents indicated they planned to maintain the status quo, allowing students to take care of RID degree requirements on their own, and two programs indicated they planned to convert from an interpreting program to an ASL/Deaf Studies program.

Of the 42 respondents that reported they had a plan to establish an articulation agreement, 33 reported they planned to initiate an articulation process within two years of the point in which the survey was completed; 29 indicated they intended to complete that process within three years. If these plans are carried through on the part of those IEP respondents, most will have agreements in place by 2013 when the RID requirement for a BA/BS degree as prerequisite for national certification will go into effect. Finally, 30 of the AA/AS survey respondents indicated they needed assistance identifying resources to transition to a BA/BS program.

Both AA/AS and BA/BA survey respondents were asked to describe their existing articulation agreements. Information collected from those respondents is reported on Table 9.

Articulation Agreement Description Table 9		
Description of first agreement in place	**AA/AS**	**BA/BS**
Simultaneous enrollment	1	0
Complete AA/AS program and matriculate to four-year institution	31	8
Description of second agreement in place	**AA/AS**	**BA/BS**
Simultaneous enrollment	2	1
Complete AA/AS program and matriculate to four-year institution	12	1
Note: Not all respondents provided answers to questions related to articulation agreement descriptions		

Finding: As reported in Table 9, the majority of both AA/AS and BA/BS program respondents reporting they have articulation agreements in place have established them wherein students are required to complete their AA/AS degree prerequisites before matriculating to the four-year program.

The survey asked those AA/AS respondents that reported they have articulation agreements in place to identify the ultimate degree a student in their program receives, for both the first and second institutions with which they had established agreements. That information was collected through open-ended question format and is reported on Table 10 on the following page.

AA/AS Respondents with Articulation Agreements – Ultimate Student Degree Table 10			
Ultimate Degree Student Achieves	1st Institution BA Degree	1st Institution BS Degree	2nd Institution BA/BS Degree
Deaf Studies	3	2	1
Interpreting	4	4	3
Sign Language Interpreting	3	0	0
ASL/English	1	0	2
BA/BS	4	0	1
Arts & Science	1	0	0
General	1	2	1
Human Services	1	2	0
Advanced Technical Studies	0	0	1
Vocational Tech Adult Education	0	0	1

The survey also asked BA/BS program respondents if they had placement procedures in place to accept students from two-year programs, and if they had established exit procedures for students that graduated from their program. Table 11 reports that data.

BA/BS Respondents with Placement and Exit Assessment Procedures Table 11				
BA/BS Survey Respondents	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Placement procedures	16	6	5	27
Exit procedures	13	10	4	27

Finding: Only 16 respondents reported they had placement assessment procedures for accepting students from two-year institutions, and 13, or less than half of BA/BS respondents, reported they had established exit assessment procedures for students graduating from their program.

Full Versus Part-time Program Delivery Information

Survey respondents were asked to report whether their program was offered on a full-time, part-time, or both full- and part-time basis. Table 12 provides a breakdown of full-time, part-time and both full- and part-time program offerings for all 91 respondents to the survey.

Full Versus Part-time IEP Delivery Table 12				
Survey Respondents	Full-time	Part-time	Full & Part-time	Total
All Survey Respondents	16	3	72	**91**
Non-degree certification/in-service	5	2	32	**39**
AA/AS degree granting programs	11	3	57	**71**
BA/BS degree granting programs	6	0	21	**27**
MA/MS degree granting programs	1	0	3	**4**
Note: Respondents are counted more than once in the filtered categories as many offer more than one type of degree or coursework				

Finding: The majority of IEP respondents offer their program on both a full-time and part-time basis – 72 of the total 91 respondents. As discussed earlier, the majority of survey respondents offer more than one type of degree and/or coursework. In survey questions pertaining to whether respondent programs are offered on a full-time or part-time basis, or both, respondents were not asked to differentiate among multiple degree and/or coursework offerings. For example, there is the possibility that a respondent with more than one type of program offering may make one type of offering available on a full-time basis and another aspect of their offering available on a part-time basis. The survey was not designed in such a way as to capture this level of detail, but only can report whether the particular institution itself operates on a full, part, or both full and part-time basis. However, the second level data analysis did utilize the filtered data sets to cull out information related to program delivery by type of respondent. Therefore, it is possible to assess just AA/AS survey respondents, for example, and within those 71 responses, analyze the extent to which AA/AS respondent programs are offered full-time, part-time, or both full-time and part-time. In assessing the data captured through the filtered data runs, the distribution of full versus part-time program delivery across the four program categories remains consistent with the distribution across the total pool of survey respondents.

In subsequent sections of the survey there are a significant number of questions that are tailored to either 1) full-time program respondents, or 2) part-time program respondents. There is not a category within those questions for **BOTH** full-time and part-time academic programs. Based on the number of survey responses to questions in the full-time category, it has been determined that full-time respondents included those program respondents that earlier in the survey had identified their program as 'full-time only' or 'both full and part-time'. Likewise, once again based on the number of responses to survey questions tailored to part-time respondents, part-time respondents included those respondents that had identified their program as 'part-time only' or 'both full and part-time'. Table 13 captures that distinction for all respondents and by type of respondent program.

Full-time, Part-time and Both Full and Part-time Table 13				
Program Delivery	**Full-time**		**Part-time**	
Survey Respondents	**Full-time only**	**Both Full & Part**	**Part-time Only**	**Both Full & Part**
All respondents	16	72	3	72
Non-degree respondents	5	32	2	32
AA/AS program respondents	11	57	3	57
BA/BS program respondents	6	21	0	21
MA/MS program respondents	1	3	0	3

Table 14 combines these categories and provides the foundational numbers for understanding where program respondents fell with regard to answering survey questions tailored to either full-time respondents or part-time respondents.

Assignment of Respondents to Full-time and Part-time Table 14		
Survey Respondents	**Full-time**	**Part-time**
All respondents	88	75
Non-degree respondents	37	34
AA/AS program respondents	68	60
BA/BS program respondents	27	21
MA/MS program respondents	4	3

It must be remembered that most respondents reported their programs are offered on 'both a full and part-time basis' – 72 out of 91 total respondents. Therefore, in assigning respondents to either a full-time or part-time program delivery category, most respondents are included in both categories.

A follow-up question in the survey asked those respondents offering 'both full and part-time academic programs' to indicate whether they are offered through the same college or unit within their institution. With regard to the total pool of respondents, of the 72 in the both full and part-time program delivery category, 68 respondents reported that both their full and part-time programs are offered through the same college or unit within their institution.

B.   Full-time Program Respondent Information

This section of findings reports information collected from those survey respondents who identified their program as full-time. Table 15 provides a breakdown of the full-time program respondents by type of delivery option and type of degree and/or coursework offered.

Full-time IEP Program Respondents Table 15			
IEP Respondents	Full-time Only	Both Full & Part-time	Total Full-time
All Survey Respondents	16	72	**88**
Non-degree certification/in-service	5	32	**37**
AA/AS degree granting programs	11	57	**68**
BA/BS degree granting programs	6	21	**27**
MA/MS degree granting programs	1	3	**4**

The total full-time IEP respondent numbers reported on Table 15 serve as the baseline numbers used throughout the Full-time section.

Full-time Respondent Faculty Information

In the faculty information reported in the previous section (see Table 4), of the 367 total interpreting faculty reported by all IEP respondents, 140 of those faculty were designated by respondents as full-time faculty. In addition, of the 444 total ASL faculty reported by all survey respondents, 117 of those faculty were designated by respondents as full-time. There is an issue related to this breakdown of full-time versus part-time faculty. In the survey, 63 program respondents reported that full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together. Therefore, it is not clear how the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty applies to those 63 respondent programs in which full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together.

The information provided below reports on responses to survey questions specifically related to 'full-time faculty'. The survey asked respondents to identify the minimum academic qualifications and professional credentials they require of full-time faculty. That information is reported on Table16 on the following page.

Minimum Qualification Requirements for Full-time Faculty Table 16		
Minimum institutional academic qualifications	Interpreting Faculty	ASL Faculty
BA/BS	24	19
MA/MS	50	50
PhD	5	2
Other	6	6
Minimum professional credentials	Interpreting Faculty	ASL Faculty
None	7	25
State level	16	3
RID or NAD (ASLTA for ASL)	57	29
Other	5	19
Note: Numbers reported are number of respondents, not number of faculty members		

Finding: Most of the full-time program respondents require their full-time interpreting and ASL faculty to have at minimum a MA/MS degree. With regard to required minimum professional credentials, it is interesting to note the difference in required credentials across interpreting faculty and ASL faculty. Of the respondents, 25 do not require ASL faculty to have any minimum professional credentials, and only three require state level credentials.

With regard to professional membership, 57 of the respondents require RID or NAD membership, as compared to only 29 respondents that require ASLTA membership on the part of their ASL faculty.

A number of comments were reported in the 'other' category for both academic qualification and professional credentials. These are listed below:

- High School and AA degree
- AA/AS degree and three-six years teaching experience
- National certification
- Doctorate for instruction; MA/MS for lecturer
- Prefer MA/MS but very difficult to find
- Native users of ASL
- RID Certified Interpreters
- If hearing, must have RID certification; if deaf, none
- RSC CDI-P, SIGN
- ASL teacher training/mentoring

The survey also asked full-time program respondents to indicate the extent to which their full-time faculty had the minimum academic qualifications and professional credentials required by their institution. Table 17 on the following page reports that information.

Percentage of Full-time Faculty with Minimum Qualifications Table 17						
Percentage of full-time interpreting faculty with academic qualifications						
Academic qualification	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%	No response	Total Respondents
BA/BS	0	0	2	18	4	24
MA/MS	4	1	2	39	4	50
PhD	1	0	0	4	0	5
Percentage of full-time interpreting faculty with professional credentials						
Professional credential	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%	No response	Total Respondents
None	0	0	0	0	7	7
State level	0	0	1	10	5	16
RID or NAD	1	2	1	46	7	57
Percentage of full-time ASL faculty with academic qualifications						
Academic qualification	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%	No response	Total Respondents
BA/BS	0	0	0	15	4	19
MA/MS	2	0	4	38	6	50
PhD	1	0	0	1	0	2
Percentage of full-time ASL faculty with professional credentials						
Professional credential	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%	No response	Total Respondents
None	0	0	0	5	20	25
State level	0	0	2	0	1	3
RID,NAD,ASLTA	0	0	4	20	5	29

Finding: Of those program respondents that provided this information, the majority indicated that most of their faculty had achieved minimum academic qualifications and professional credentials required by their institution.

Average Class Size in Full-time Programs

In questions targeted to full-time program respondents, respondents were asked to report average full-time class size. That information is captured on Table 18.

Average Full-time Class Size Table 18	
Respondent Program Type	Average Class Size
Non-degree certification/in-service interpreting classes	14
AA/AS degree program interpreting classes	15
BA/BS degree program interpreting classes	13
All ASL classes	18

Finding: As mentioned earlier, in the survey 63 respondents reported that full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together. Although the question addressed by Table 18

specifically asked respondents to report average full-time class size, it is not clear if the numbers reported above may include part-time students.

Student Enrollment in Full-time Programs

The survey included questions related to student enrollment in full-time programs over previous five years and for the current year (2006). Table 19 reports on information collected in that regard.

Full-time Student Enrollment Information Table 19		
Survey Respondent	**Average Annual Enrollment 2000-2005**	**Current Year Enrollment (2006)**
Non-degree/in-service	268	265
AA/AS degree program	1,730	1,855
BA/BS degree program	485	1,136
MA/MS degree program	36	73

Finding: A significant number of respondents in the Non-degree and AA/AS degree granting categories did not provide enrollment data. In the Non-degree category, only 28 out of the 39 Non-degree respondents reported average annual enrollment numbers over 2000-2005, and only 24 respondents provided current year enrollment numbers. In the AA/AS category, only 60 out of 71 AA/AS respondents provided previous year averages, and only 56 provided current year enrollment information. Therefore, the enrollment numbers reported in the Non-degree and AA/AS respondent categories are lower than they should be. However, because the number of actual respondents was fairly close in each category, comparisons can be broadly made across the two timeframes.

In the Non-degree respondent category, enrollment is basically the same between the two timeframes. In the AA/AS respondent category enrollment has slightly increased from the previous five years. However, the most significant increases are in the BA/BS and MA/MS respondent categories. BA/BS respondents reported that current enrollment more than doubled from the previous five year averages, increasing from 485 to 1,136 for the current year (2006). Likewise, MA/MS degree enrollment also more than doubled from the previous year averages.

Because such a significant increase in BA/BS enrollment was reported, an analysis of individual responses was conducted to further understand trends related to that increase. Table 20 on the following page reports information provided by the full-time by BA/BS program respondents.

Past and Current Fulltime BA/BS National Enrollment by Respondent Table 20	
Average Enrollment 2001-2005	**2006 Enrollment**
10	28
5	10
45	65
20-25	25
18-20	58
30-35	57
15	45
10	45
30	60
-	53
10	31
-	8
12	70
36	35
20	19
8	0
100	300
10	25
20	22
20	38
15	65
15	15
10	17
20	45
485	**1,136**

Finding: While there is one program that reported an increase in enrollment from 100 average students in the previous five years to 300 in the current calendar year, most other BA/BS respondents also reported some level of an increase. The increased enrollment in the BA/BS programs is likely in direct response to the 2013 RID certification requirement of a BA/BS degree. It must also be recognized that because the survey asked respondents to provide average enrollment numbers for the previous five years, there may have been an increasing enrollment trend over the later of those years that is not evident in the averaged number.

The survey also asked full-time respondents to report on course enrollment maximums, or course capacities, for their full-time classes. That information is captured on Table 21.

Full-time Respondent Enrollment Maximums Table 21	
Program Respondent	**Full-time Class**
Non-degree/in-service program	18
AA/AS degree program	19
BA/BS degree program	16
Average of all ASL classes	20

Finding: It is interesting to note that respondents reported the average maximum number of students enrolled in each ASL class is 20. In Table 18, full-time program respondents reported the actual enrollment average in each ASL class is 18 students. This provides evidence that ASL classes are run at a high level of efficiency from an institutional perspective.

Full-time Student Graduation Information

In the first section of findings, Basic Information about All Respondents, information related to student achievement of state and national credentials is reported. In this section, information related to student graduation from full-time respondent programs is captured. Table 22 reports that information for the year in which the survey was completed (2006) as well as an average number for the previous five years (2000-2005).

Full-time Student Graduation Table 22		
Type of Program	2000-2005	2006
Non-degree certification/in-service program	144	115
AA/AS degree granting program	635	491
BA/BS full-time student graduation	352	227

Finding: Of the 88 total full-time survey respondents, 82 respondents provided data about current year graduation, and only 73 provided data about the previous five years. Therefore, the graduation numbers reported in both categories should be higher than reported. It was troublesome to note that the graduation numbers reported by respondents as 'average for the previous five years' were higher than those reported for the current year (2006). A more in-depth analysis of individual responses was conducted to assess individual responses as explanation for the higher numbers.

In the analysis of individual responses, it was discovered that a number of respondents may have provided graduation sums for the previous five years versus graduation averages. This assumption is based on a significant difference between numbers they reported in the 'average' category as compared to numbers they reported in the 'current' category. As an example, one respondent entered 50 in the average category and 5 in the current category; another respondent entered 45 in the average category and 7 in the current category. Because a number of respondents may have made this error, the data reported in the 2000-2005 column of data reported on Table 22 is likely significantly higher than it should be. However, this report is based on the data as it was reported in the survey, and no adjustment of respondent data was made.

Full-time Respondent Programs on a Semester Calendar

The survey also captured information related to whether the full-time respondent programs operated on a quarter or semester calendar. Table 23 reports that information for the full-time programs.

Full-time Respondent Programs - Semester Versus Quarter Calendar Table 23			
Full-time Respondents	**Quarter Calendar**	**Semester Calendar**	**Total**
All full-time respondents	5	83	**88**
Non-degree respondents	1	36	**37**
AA/AS program respondents	4	64	**68**
BA/BS degree granting programs	2	25	**27**
MA/MS degree granting programs	0	4	**4**

Finding: The majority of full-time survey respondents operate on a semester calendar. Because so few of the full-time programs reported they operated on a quarter calendar basis, information collected in that regard was not analyzed to the degree that information reported by those programs operating on a semester calendar was.

Information presented below is specific to full-time survey respondents who reported they operate on a semester calendar. With regard to questions related to full-time programs on a semester calendar, the survey did not distinguish between type of program offering (Non-degree, AA/AS degree, BA/BS degree or MA/MS degree). Therefore, the information reported on Table 24 cannot be accurately broken down by category of degree and/or coursework offered as respondents did not distinguish whether the courses were taken by non-degree, AA/AS, BA/BS, or MA/MS degree seeking students.

Courses Full-time Students Take in Semester Table 24	
# of Courses Students Take in Semester	**# of Full-time Respondents**
6	7
5	30
4	29
3	12

Finding: The majority of full-time students take between four to five courses per semester. The full-time respondents were also queried with regard to the total credits their full-time students typically earn per semester. Of the 83 full-time respondents, only 76 responded to this question. Responses were collected in an open-ended format. That data is reported on Table 25.

Credits Full-time Students Take in a Semester Table 25	
# of Credits Taken in Semester	**# of Full-time Respondents**
Less than 12 credits per semester	5
12-15 credits per semester	46
16-18 credits per semester	28
More than 18 credits per semester	1
Note: Some respondents are counted in more than one category as they provided a wider range of credits taken	

Finding: Most full-time students earn between 12-18 credits per semester.

Courses Taught by Full-time Faculty in a Semester Table 26	
# of Courses Taught	# of Full-time Respondents
2	1
3	7
4	25
5	27

Finding: Only 60 of the 83 full-time respondents on a semester calendar provided information related to the number of courses full-time faculty teach during a semester. For those that did respond, it was reported that the majority of full-time faculty teach between four to five courses in a semester.

Full-time Respondent ASL Program Information

The survey also collected information from full-time respondents regarding the existence, administrative location and responsibility of an ASL program within their program. Full-time respondents were asked whether their program contains an ASL program; whether the ASL program is offered in the same unit as the interpreting program, and if they have administrative responsibility for that ASL program. Table 27 reports that information.

Full-time Respondent - ASL Program Component Table 27	
Full-time respondents	# of Respondents
Respondent program contains an ASL Program	67
ASL Program offered in same unit as Interpreting Program	66
Respondent is administratively responsible for the ASL Program	57

Finding: The majority of the full-time program respondents include an ASL program component. Only a small percentage of the full-time programs do not include an ASL program. Survey respondents whose program does not include an ASL program were asked through an open-ended question to indicate where within their institution an ASL Program is offered. That information is available for review in the raw data captured through the survey upon request.

C. Part-time Program Respondent Information

This section of findings reports information collected from those survey respondents who identified their program as part-time. Table 28 provides a breakdown of the part-time program respondents by type of program delivery option and type of degree and/or coursework offered.

Part-time IEP Program Respondents Table 28			
IEP Respondents	**Part-time Only**	**Both Full & Part**	**Total Part-time**
All Survey Respondents	3	72	**75**
Non-degree certification/in-service	2	32	**34**
AA/AS degree granting programs	3	57	**60**
BA/BS degree granting programs	0	21	**21**
MA/MS degree granting programs	0	3	**3**

The total part-time program respondent numbers reported on Table 28 will be the baseline numbers used throughout the Part-time section.

Part-time Respondent Faculty Information

In the faculty information reported in the previous section (see Table 4), of the 367 total interpreting faculty reported by all IEP respondents, 227 of those faculty were designated by respondents as part-time faculty. In addition, of the 444 total ASL faculty reported by all survey respondents, 327 of those faculty were designated by respondents as part-time. There is an issue related to this breakdown of full-time versus part-time faculty. In the survey, 63 program respondents reported that full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together. Therefore, it is not clear how the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty applies to those 63 respondent programs in which full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together.

The information provided below reports on responses to survey questions specifically related to 'part-time faculty'. The survey asked respondents to identify the minimum academic qualifications and professional credentials they require of their part-time faculty. That information is reported on Table 29.

Minimum Qualification Requirements for Part-time Faculty Table 29		
Minimum institutional academic qualifications	**Interpreting Faculty**	**ASL Faculty**
BA/BS	39	36
MA/MS	26	22
PhD	0	0
Other	10	16
Minimum professional credentials	**Interpreting Faculty**	**ASL Faculty**
None	7	32
State level	17	3
RID or NAD (ASLTA for ASL Faculty)	44	24
Other	6	15
Note: Numbers reported are number of respondents, not number of faculty members		

Finding: Most of the respondents require their part-time interpreting and ASL faculty to have at minimum a BA/BS degree, although a significant number also require a MA/MS degree. With regard to required minimum professional credentials, it is interesting to note the difference in required credentials across interpreting faculty and ASL faculty.   Of the respondents, 32 respondents do not require their ASL faculty to have any minimum professional credentials and only three require state level credentials. With regard to professional membership, 44 of the respondents require RID or NAD membership of interpreting faculty, as compared to only 24 respondents that require ASLTA membership on the part of their ASL faculty.

The survey also asked program respondents to indicate the extent to which their part-time faculty had the minimum academic qualifications and professional credentials required by their institution. Table 30 reports that information.

Percentage of Part-time Faculty with Minimum Qualifications Table 30						
Percentage of part-time interpreting faculty with academic qualifications						
Academic qualification	**0-24%**	**25-49%**	**50-74%**	**75-100%**	**No response**	**Total Respondents**
BA/BS	1	0	2	32	4	39
MA/MS	2	0	2	19	3	26
PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of part-time interpreting faculty with professional credentials						
Professional credential	**0-24%**	**25-49%**	**50-74%**	**75-100%**	**No response**	**Total Respondents**
None	0	0	0	3	4	7
State level	0	0	1	11	5	17
RID or NAD	1	2	1	33	7	44
Percentage of part-time ASL faculty with academic qualifications						
Academic Qualification	**0-24%**	**25-49%**	**50-74%**	**75-100%**	**No response**	**Total Respondents**
BA/BS	0	1	4	24	7	36
MA/MS	0	0	0	18	4	22
PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of part-time ASL faculty with professional credentials						
Professional credential	**0-24%**	**25-49%**	**50-74%**	**75-100%**	**No response**	**Total Respondents**
None	1	0	0	6	25	32
State level	0	0	0	1	2	3
RID,NAD,ASLTA	4	0	3	9	8	24

Finding: Of those program respondents that provided this information, the majority indicated that most of their part-time faculty had achieved minimum academic qualifications and professional credentials required by their institution.

Average Class Size in Part-time Programs

In questions targeted to part-time program respondents, respondents were asked to report average part-time class size. That information is captured on Table 31.

Average Part-time Class Size Table 31	
Respondent Program Type	**Average Class Size**
Non-degree certification/in-service interpreting classes	14
AA/AS degree program interpreting classes	14
BA/BS degree program interpreting classes	13
All ASL classes	28

Finding: As mentioned earlier, in the survey 63 respondents reported that full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together. Although the question addressed by Table 31 specifically asked respondents to report average part-time class size, it is not clear if the numbers reported above may include full-time students.

Student Enrollment in Part-time Programs

The survey included questions related to student enrollment in the part-time respondent programs, both over previous five years and for the current year (2006). Table 32 reports on information collected in that regard.

Part-time Student Enrollment Information Table 32		
Survey Respondent	**Average Annual Enrollment 2000-2005**	**Current Year Enrollment (2006)**
Non-degree/in-service	448	407
AA/AS degree program	1,072	2,252
BA/BS degree program	79	69
MA/MS degree program	0	0
Note: Not all respondents provided enrollment averages so numbers do not reflect total pool in any category		

Finding: A significant number of respondents in the Non-degree and AA/AS degree granting categories did not provide enrollment data. In the Non-degree category, only 28 out of the 39 Non-degree respondents reported average annual enrollment numbers over 2000-2005, and only 24 respondents provided current year enrollment numbers. In the AA/AS category, only 60 out of 71 AA/AS respondents provided previous year averages, and only 56 provided current year enrollment information. Therefore, the enrollment numbers reported in the Non-degree and AA/AS respondent categories are lower than they should be. However, because the number of actual respondents was fairly close in each category, comparisons can be broadly made across the two timeframes.

In the Non-degree and BA/BS respondent categories, part-time student enrollment decreased slightly in the current year (2006) from the previous five year average. Specifically, in the Non-degree programs, part-time student enrollment decreased from an annual average of 448 students per year to 407 students for the current year. In the BA/BS respondent category, part-time student enrollment decreased from an average of 79 part-time students in the previous five years to 69 students for the current year. However, in the AA/AS respondent category, part-time student enrollment increased significantly from the previous five year average. Part-time AA/AS program respondents reported 1,072 part-time students on average for each of the previous five years, but reported part-time student enrollment at 2,252 for the current year – a more than double increase.

The survey also asked part-time respondents to report on course enrollment maximums, or course capacities, for their part-time classes. That information is captured on Table 33.

Part-time Program Enrollment Maximums Table 33	
Program Respondent	**Part-time Classes**
Non-degree/in-service program	17
AA/AS program	18
BA/BS program	14
Average of all ASL Classes	20

Part-time Student Graduation Information

In this section, information related to student graduation from part-time respondent programs is captured. Table 34 reports that information for the year in which the survey was completed (2006) as well as an average number for the previous five years (2000-2005).

Part-time Student Graduation Table 34		
Type of Program	**2000-2005**	**2006**
Non-degree program graduates	389	74
AA/AS program graduates	138	119
BA/BS program graduates	24	22
Note: Numbers are based on average rate of fulltime graduates over 5 five years		

Finding: Only 40 out of the 75 part-time programs provided data about current year graduation; only 36 respondents provided data about the previous five years, so the part-time student graduation numbers reported in both categories should be higher than reported. In addition, it is interesting to note that the graduation numbers reported by respondents in the non-degree program category as average for the previous five years were higher than those reported for the non-degree program for the current year (2006). A more in-depth analysis of individual responses was conducted to assess individual responses as explanation for the higher numbers.

In the analysis of individual responses, it was discovered that two respondents may have provided graduation sums for the previous five years versus graduation averages. This assumption is based on a significant difference between numbers they reported in the 'average' category as compared to numbers they reported in the 'current' category. Specifically, one respondent entered 300 in the Non-degree program average part-time student graduation category and 0 in the current category; another respondent entered 62 in the average category and 10 in the current category. Because these respondents may have made an error when entering those numbers, the data reported in that on Table 34 is likely significantly higher than it should be. However, this report is based on the data as it was reported in the survey, and no adjustment of individual respondent data was made.

Part-time IEP Respondents on a Semester Calendar

The survey also captured information related to whether the part-time respondent programs operated on a quarter or semester calendar. Table 35 reports that information for the part-time programs.

Part-time Respondents	Quarter Calendar	Semester Calendar	No Response	Total
Part-time Respondent Programs - Semester Versus Quarter Calendar **Table 35**				
All Survey Respondents	3	58	14	**75**
Non-degree certification/in-service	1	27	6	**34**
AA/AS degree granting programs	1	50	9	**60**
BA/BS degree granting programs	3	14	4	**21**
MA/MS degree granting programs	1	2	0	**3**

Finding: Although a number of respondents did not answer questions in this regard, it is still evident that like the full-time programs, the majority of part-time programs operate on a semester basis. Because the majority of respondents in both the full and part-time category reported they operate on a semester versus calendar basis, information related to the semester calendar is explored in more detail. For the few responses related to part-time programs that operate on a calendar basis, the raw data is available for review upon request.

Information presented below is specific to part-time survey respondents who reported they operate on a semester calendar. With regard to questions related to part-time programs on a semester calendar, the survey did not distinguish between type of program offering (Non-degree, AA/AS degree, BA/BS degree or MA/MS degree). Therefore, the information reported on Table 36 cannot be accurately broken down by category of degree and/or coursework offered as respondents did not distinguish whether the courses were taken by part-time non-degree, AA/AS, BA/BS, or MA/MS degree seeking students.

# of Courses Students Take in Semester	# of Part-time Respondents
Courses Part-time Students Take in a Semester **Table 36**	
6	1
5	0
4	4
3	22
2	29
Note: Not all part-time respondents provided responses	

Finding: The majority of part-time students take between two and three courses per semester.

Table 37 reports information related to the number of courses part-time faculty teach in a semester.

Courses Part-time Faculty Teach in a Semester Table 37	
# of Courses Taught	# of Part-time Respondents
2	22
3	3
4	2
5	2

Finding: Only 49 of the 58 part-time respondents on a semester calendar provided information in response to this question. For those that did respond, it was reported that the majority of full-time faculty teach two courses in a semester.

Part-time Respondent ASL Program Information

The survey also collected information from the part-time respondents regarding the existence, administrative location and responsibility of an ASL program within their program. Part-time respondents were asked whether their program contains an ASL program; whether the ASL program is offered in the same unit as the interpreting program, and if they have administrative responsibility for that ASL program. Table 38 reports that information.

Part-time Respondent - ASL Program Component Table 38	
Part-time program respondents	# of Respondents
Respondent program contains ASL Program	46
ASL Program offered in same unit as Interpreting Program	42
Respondent program is administratively responsible for the ASL Program	41

Finding: As with the full-time respondents, the majority of part-time respondents include an ASL program component. Only a small percentage of the part-time programs do not include an ASL program. Survey respondents whose program does not include an ASL program were asked through an open-ended question to indicate where within their institution an ASL Program is offered. That information is available for review in the raw data captured through the survey upon request.

D.   Comparison of Full-time and Part-time Respondent Information

There are a number of interesting points of comparison that emerged between analyses of the full-time versus part-time respondent information. This final section of the findings provides a number of tables designed for easy cross-referencing across the two sets of information.

Full-time versus Part-time Faculty Information

Full-time versus Part-time Faculty Information Table 39		
Faculty	**Full-time Faculty**	**Part-time Faculty**
Interpreting Faculty	140	227
ASL Faculty	117	327

Finding: Respondents report significantly more part-time faculty in both the Interpreting Faculty and ASL faculty categories. In the ASL category, there are nearly three times as many part-time faculty members as full-time. In addition, as discussed earlier in the report, a number of respondents reported that some faculty members serve in both interpreting and ASL faculty roles. However, actual numbers of faculty members that fulfill both roles were not reported. Therefore, in assessing the data on Table 39, it can be assumed that the actual number of individuals working as faculty in the respondent programs is in fact lower than the numbers reported.

Table 40 on the following page compares qualification requirements for full-time and part-time faculty.

Comparison of Qualification Requirements for Full-time and Part-time Faculty Table 40		
Minimum academic qualifications for interpreting faculty	**Full-time**	**Part-time**
BA/BS	24	39
MA/MS	50	26
PhD	5	0
Minimum professional credentials for interpreting faculty	**Full-time**	**Part-time**
None	7	7
State level	16	17
RID or NAD	57	44
Minimum academic qualifications for ASL faculty	**Full-time**	**Part-time**
BA/BS	19	36
MA/MS	50	22
PhD	2	0
Minimum professional credentials for ASL faculty	**Full-time**	**Part-time**
None	25	32
State level	3	3
ALSTA, RID or NAD	29	24

Finding: It is interesting to note the difference with regard to minimum academic qualification requirements for full-time versus part-time interpreting faculty, with the qualifications emphasis for the full-time faculty falling on MA/MS degree and for the part-time faculty on a BA/BS

degree. Likewise, the emphasis for the full-time ASL faculty also seems to be on MA/MS degree qualifications, whereas it is a BA/BS degree for the part-time ASL faculty.

Full-time versus Part-time Average Class Size

Comparison of Average Full-time versus Part-time Class Size Table 41		
Respondent Program Type	Full-time Average Class Size	Part-time Average Class Size
Non-degree interpreting classes	14	14
AA/AS degree program interpreting classes	15	14
BA/BS degree program interpreting classes	13	13
All ASL classes	18	28

Finding: It is interesting that the average full-time and part-time class size is so similar, with the exception the ASL classes in which average full-time class size is 18 and the average part-time class size is 29.   In addition, as reported in earlier sections of the findings, 63 program respondents reported that full-time and part-time students are in the classroom together. It is not clear how those programs with both full-time and part-time students in the same class may have answered the question, and if effect, if actual class size might be doubled for those programs.

Full-time versus Part-time Student Enrollment Information

Table 42 is designed to provide a sense of overall full-time and part-time student enrollment in each of the four primary categories of degree and/or coursework offering. This information is reported for the five years previous to the survey and the year the survey was completed (2006).

Full-time and Part-time Student Enrollment Table 42			
Average program enrollment 2000-2005	Full-time	Part-time	Total Enrollment
Average enrollment Non-degree programs	268	448	716
Average enrollment AA/AS programs	1,730	1,072	2,802
Average enrollment BA/BS programs	485	79	564
Average enrollment MA/MS programs	36	0	36
Current program enrollment (2006)	Full-time	Part-time	Total Enrollment
Student enrollment in Non-degree/in-service	265	407	672
Student enrollment in AA/AS degree program	1,855	2,252	4,107
Student enrollment in BA/BS degree program	1,136	69	1,205
Student enrollment in MA/MS degree program	73	0	73

Finding: As discussed in the earlier sections of the Full-time Respondent Information and Part-time Respondent Information related to student enrollment, there were a significant number of Non-degree and AA/AS survey respondents that did not provide enrollment information in either the previous year or current year categories.   Therefore, enrollment totals in both of those categories are likely lower than they should be.   However, assessing the Total Enrollment numbers reported in Table 42, it is evident that student enrollment for the current (2006) year increased significantly from the previous five year averages in the AA/AS, BA/BS and MA/MS

respondent categories. Only the Non-degree category showed a decrease in current enrollment as compared to the previous five years.

Full-time versus Part-time Student Graduation

As discussed in the earlier sections of the findings, data collected with regard to average annual student graduation for the five years previous to the survey contained respondent errors. Therefore, Table 43 has been designed to present just those graduation numbers reported by respondents for the current year (2006).

Full-time versus Part-time Student Graduation Table 43			
Program Respondent	**Full-time Graduates**	**Part-time Graduates**	**Total Graduates**
Non-degree program respondent	115	74	**189**
AA/AS program respondent	491	119	**610**
BA/BS program respondent	227	22	**249**

This concludes the **IEP Needs Assessment Findings** section of the report. The next section of the report provides detailed recommendations for responding to those findings.

III.   Recommendations

Recommendation 1:   Offer technical assistance and outreach to IEPs that do not offer non-degree certificate/in-service coursework.
The NCIEC should offer outreach and technical assistance to those 52 survey respondents that reported they do not offer non-degree certification/in-service coursework.   Providing national support, and encouraging those programs to increase their offerings in this regard, would greatly increase the availability of CEUs and in-service coursework offerings nationwide.

Recommendation 2:   Further understand why the number of new IEPs established since 2000 has slowed compared to the number of new programs established in previous periods.
Information reported by survey respondents indicates that the establishment of new IEPs has significantly decreased since 2000 (Table 3).   The timeframes in which a significant number of IEP respondent programs were established were 1980-89 for the Non-degree and AA/AS degree granting programs, and 1990-99 for the AA/AS and BA/BS degree granting programs. Analysis should consider what external factors and/or federal, state or advocacy stimulus may have influenced the increase in the number of programs established during those years, and what can be done to stimulate program establishment in future years.

Recommendation 3:   Offer outreach and technical assistance to IEPs that do not have Articulation Agreements.
The NCIEC should target outreach and technical assistance to those 37 AA/AS program respondents and 19 BA/BS program respondents that reported they did not have articulation agreements in place at the time of the survey.   A comparison of the two sets of programs could be conducted to determine if the AA/AS and BA/BS program respondents without articulation agreements can be matched up geographically.   In addition, the majority of AA/AS and BA/BS program respondents with articulation agreements in place have established them wherein students are required to complete their AA/AS degree prerequisites before matriculating to the four-year program.   The NCIEC should contact these institutions and collect information related to those agreements.   That information should then be assessed to identify best practices for establishing agreements that can then be packaged and disseminated to those program respondents without agreements.

Recommendation 4:   Offer technical assistance to AA/AS respondents seeking resources to help them transition to a four-year program.
In the survey, 30 AA/AS program respondents reported they needed help identifying resources to transition to a four-year program.   The NCIEC should establish a set of resources to provide guidance related to transition and offer targeted technical assistance to those programs.   A first step should be to contact the 30 respondent programs to see if they still needed assistance. This listing of IEPs should be compared to the 37 AA/AS program respondents that reported they did not have articulation agreements in place to avoid duplication of effort.

Recommendation 5:   Offer outreach and technical assistance related to establishment of both placement and exit assessment procedures in BA/BS programs
Only 16 of the 27 BA/BS program respondents reported they had placement assessment procedures for accepting students from two-year institutions, and 13, or less than half of the total BA/BS program respondents, reported they had established exit assessment procedures for students graduating from their program.   NCIEC should collect information from those respondents that reported they have such procedures in place.   That information should be

assessed for best practice and disseminated as appropriate to those institutions that don't have such procedures in place.

Recommendation 6: Further understand the decrease in 'current' enrollment in the category of non-degree certificate/in-service coursework

Survey information reported in the area of student enrollment indicates a decrease in student enrollment in the current year (2006) as compared to the previous five years (Table 42). Analysis in this regard should take into account Recommendation 1 and the number of survey respondents that reported they did not offer non-degree certificate/in-service coursework.